

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- |                                     |   |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured covers /<br>Couverture de couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers damaged /<br>Couverture endommagée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers restored and/or laminated /<br>Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages restored and/or laminated /<br>Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Cover title missing /<br>Le titre de couverture manque  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/<br>Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured maps /<br>Cartes géographiques en couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages detached / pages détachées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /<br>Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transarence   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /<br>Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /<br>Qualité inégale de l'impression  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Bound with other material /<br>Relié avec d'autres documents  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Includes supplementary materials<br>Comprend du matériel supplémentaire   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Only edition available /<br>Seule édition disponible  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,<br>tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the<br>best possible image / Les pages totalement ou<br>partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,<br>une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de<br>façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible. |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion<br>along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut<br>causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la<br>marge intérieure.   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Opposing pages with varying colouration or<br>discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best<br>possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des<br>colorations variables ou des décolorations sont<br>filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image<br>possible.                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Blank leaves added during restorations may<br>appear within the text. Whenever possible, these<br>have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que<br>certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une<br>restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,<br>lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas<br>été filmées. |                                     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /<br>Commentaires supplémentaires:  |                                     |   |

Pagination is as follows: [1], [741]-1399, [i]-lxxxix p.

OFFICIAL REPORTS  
OF THE  
DEBATES  
OF THE  
**HOUSE OF COMMONS**  
OF THE  
DOMINION OF CANADA.

---

FIRST SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

---

46 VICTORIÆ, 1883.

---

VOL. XIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL TO THE  
TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF MAY, 1883.

---

*Edited and Indexed by J. CHARLES BOYCE, Assistant to Chief Reporter.*

---



OTTAWA:  
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET,  
1883.

# House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

Volume XIV.

2nd Vol. of the Session.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 20th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PETITION FROM THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ABBOTT. I presented, a few moments ago, a petition from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, asking to be permitted to present a petition for a Private Bill, notwithstanding that the time limited for that purpose has expired. The circumstances under which this petition has become necessary, are, that this morning an agreement was executed between the executive of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the three lines of railway forming a continuous line between Montreal and the terminus of the Credit Valley Railway, by which these companies agree to lease themselves to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on terms mentioned in this agreement. This agreement having only been executed this morning, it was, of course, impossible to take earlier proceedings for the purpose. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has no power to execute such lease; whether it would be proper, if it should have the power, or not, will, of course, be a subject of discussion when the Bill comes up; and I now move, as I am told is the correct mode, that the petition so presented this day for leave to permit a petition for this Bill, be now read, and that it be referred to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

### THE ORANGE INCORPORATION BILL.

Mr. ROYAL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I am requested to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) when moving the second reading of the Orange Incorporation Bill. The hon. member stated that His Grace Archbishop Taché, of St. Boniface, had, last year, when a similar Bill was before the Local House, advised the Catholic members of the Legislature not to oppose the Bill. His Grace only advised the members not to raise, or not to lend themselves to any acrimonious or useless discussion.

### HARBOR OF PICTOU.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend the Act 36 Vic., chap. 63, respecting the Harbor of Pictou, by exempting vessels exceeding forty and not exceeding eighty tons register, from the payment of harbor dues more than twice in any calendar year, whatever be the number of times for entering the harbor.

Resolution reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 108) further to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of Pictou.

Bill read the first time.

• Mr. FORTIN. Before this Bill is read the second time, I beg to ask the hon. Minister of Marine if he will introduce a similar

measure for ports where similar dues are exacted. I may tell him that, in Quebec or Montreal, dues are paid by all classes of vessels, and small vessels when they enter each of those ports pay dues every time. I think small vessels, in view of the fact that the improvements which are going on in the navigation between Montreal and Quebec, do not affect them at all beneficially, they should be exempt from paying every time they come into port. If they pay twice a year that should be enough. I hope the hon. Minister will study the question; and if he finds that in any port in the Dominion, fishing and coasting vessels pay more than twice a year, he will introduce a general measure so as to make matters equal for everyone.

Mr. McLELAN. I will give the matter attention, and will carry out the suggestion as far as possible, if it does not interfere too much with other interests.

### STANDING ORDERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the following resolution be made one of the Standing Orders of this House:—

All Private Bills for Acts of incorporation shall be so framed as to incorporate by reference the clauses of the General Acts relating to the details to be provided for by such Bills;—special grounds shall be established for any proposed departure from this principle, or for the introduction of other provisions as to such details, and a note shall be appended to the Bill indicating the provisions thereof, in which the General Act is proposed to be departed from;—Bills which are not framed in accordance with this rule, shall be re-cast by the promoters, and reprinted at their expense, before any Committee passes upon the clauses, and the substance of this Rule shall be published by the Clerk in conformity with the terms of the 50th Rule.

He said: The object of this motion is to simplify and diminish the work of the Standing Committee. The Railway Committee and the Banking Committee are kept at work a great deal longer than they should, because the Bills brought before them are not so framed as to facilitate the work. Every promoter of a Bill wants special clauses in his Bill, and declares he has not had time to look at similar Bills already accepted by Parliament, and he will come before the Committee with the measure containing the same objectionable provisions, sometimes in two or three different clauses. The Railway Committee comprises no less than 140 members, and it is because they think that work should be done by the promoter before the Bill is brought before the Committee, that it is now proposed that his resolution shall be made part of the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker: I desire to call the attention of the House, on the occasion of this motion, to the necessity of having the Rules and Regulations printed anew. I would suggest that the Federal Act be incorporated in the book, as it used to be in 1866 and before that time. At the present time, we have nothing but the Rules of the House, and when we want to consult the Federal Act, we are obliged to go to the Library to get the volume. I think it would be proper also, since we are to continue the book, to incorporate in it the Rules and Proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am gratified to observe that the hon. Minister of Public Works has brought in this motion. It is

not very often we have the pleasure of agreeing. I think, however, the hon. gentleman agrees with me, because the proposal now before the House has already been submitted from this side of the House, and was suggested many years ago. It is the first step in the right direction. No doubt many reforms may yet be adopted in the proceedings of the House, and this, I think, will be entering the thin end of the wedge. Now that we have begun the work of reform, we may go on quietly and smoothly, and perhaps arrive at a better mode of procedure. There is at present great loss of time, and I draw the attention of the Government especially to the loss of time occasioned in regard to Private Bills. These should be in the hands of the hon. Minister of Justice, or the law officers of the Crown, at the opening of the Session, so that the drudgery work of the Committee should be, to a certain extent, lightened. I suggested this course many years ago, and I suggest its adoption now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not like to take feathers belonging to other birds, and, therefore, I must say that I am only the mouthpiece of the Committee in this instance, being Chairman of the Railway Committee. A prominent member of that Committee, the hon. gentleman who sits opposite to me, proposed a motion, and it was adopted by the Committee; and in the Banking Committee another hon. member proposed another motion, a little different from this one, and I have combined the two in the motion now before the House, which will cover the whole ground, and I have no doubt it will be adopted. I, therefore, do not like the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) to give me credit for what belongs, first to the members who moved the motions, in each Committee, and then to the Committee themselves. Of course, I am always ready to receive compliments from the hon. gentleman, but in this case I, as Chairman of the Railway Committee, can receive only the one-hundred and fortieth part of the compliment. The hon. gentleman has made another suggestion. It must, however, be remembered that reforms only come by degrees; no doubt the reform now before the House will prove a good one. In regard to the suggestions of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), I think the Rules of the House might be reprinted, and that a favorable opportunity now offers to do so. I also agree with him, that the Confederation Act of 1857, might with great propriety be added to the little book supplied to each member, as well as the Rules of the House. Either the proper Committee, or perhaps the Speaker, will see that this matter is attended to next Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I think this is a step in the right direction; but the suggestion of the hon. member for L'Islet ought to receive consideration, even this Session. While we are amending the Standing Rules, I think we should take some steps to remove one of the greatest sources of evil, that is the late period to which the larger proportion of the Bills is delayed, when the work is done hurriedly. If the House were to record its insistence of the Rules for the future, we would get rid of a portion of the difficulty, and the work of the Committee would be properly done. After we have applied the Rule, one of the law officers of the House should examine each Private Bill for the use of the Committee, not for the promoter, and should make his report of it just as the Clerk of the Committee on Standing Orders compares the notices and reports. You make a Rule as to the mode in which the Bill is to be framed, that any general clauses which are sought to be applied are not to be repeated, but simply to be incorporated by reference; that any departure from this regulation is to be made only on special grounds, and noted upon the Bill indicating where the departure is. If the Committee is to consider when the Bill comes before it, whether this Rule has been complied with, half of the time now wasted in doing draughtsman's work in getting up the clauses will be spent. I think,

Mr. CASGRAIN.

therefore, we should make some other provision, either by Rule or arrangement, in order to have a report on the Bill submitted to the Committee, and have the respects which it is defective pointed out. In that way the Committee would be able to act rapidly, and, if necessary, reject Bills without their time being wasted. It has happened this Session time and again, that the Railway Committee occupy two hours in discussing a Railway Bill, the important part of which would only occupy ten minutes, the rest of the time being occupied in trying to lick the Bill into shape; and the rest of the time we are engaged in trying to lick into something like shape—and occasionally, I am afraid, into pretty bad shape—the abominable Bills presented to us for consideration. The other practical point to which I wish to direct attention is the old one, of which complaint was made, I think, by the hon. member for Hochelaga—that it was rather unjust to say that our Rules ought to be complied with, as to the time of depositing Private Bills, within eight days of the Session, because he says two months' notice is required by the Standing Rules to be given, and the Session of Parliament is not announced as early often as two months, and therefore Private Bills' promoters cannot possibly proceed. I think, if my hon. friend will permit me to say so, that this objection is founded on a misapprehension of the Rule, because the Rule says such notice—which the promoters are to give—shall be continued, in each case, for a period of at least two months during the interval of time between the close of the next preceding Session and the consideration of the petition; and, therefore, any promoter just as soon as he has determined at the next Session of Parliament to introduce a Bill, can begin publishing at once, and is not called upon to wait for the *Gazette* that summons Parliament for despatch of business. But, at the same time, I repeat the suggestion which I made before on this subject, which is, that it would be probably better to shorten the period of two months considerably, and make it terminate with the opening of the Session, than to keep it as long as two months, and make it terminate only with the consideration of the petition; for so long as we give that flexible time for termination, with our evil habits of yielding to neglectful and apathetic promoters, they will expect and rely upon that, but if it be announced that there will be the comparatively brief limit of one month instead of two, to terminate with the opening of the Session, then I think you will find a better practice. The extent to which our Rule which requires eight days before meeting, and that a copy of the Bill shall be deposited, in order to printing and translation, has been complied with, will be shown by the statistics of this Session, which I have procured. The total number of Private Bills introduced to date—a couple of days ago—was fifty-six; of these there were but seventeen deposited in accordance with the Rule; there were ten more deposited within the eight days which preceded the Session running over up to the day preceding the Session; eleven were deposited between the 9th and 27th of February, and the remaining eighteen at various intervals between the 28th of February and the 16th of April, so that the great bulk of the whole Bills deposited this Session, have not been regularly deposited at the time required by the Standing Rule. It seems to me that in place of that state of things, unless we take the opportunity of recasting the Rule, and place it on a more workmanlike basis, we should pass a solemn resolution to act under our Rules in future. How we can reasonably expect an amendment next Session, I submit for the consideration of the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman suggested just now, in accordance with what the hon. member for L'Islet stated, that it would be proper that Bills before being submitted to the Committee might be examined either by the law officers of the House, or by the Secretary

of the Committee, or by some other authority, in order to see whether the Rules of the House have been complied with. In this the hon. gentleman is right; it would simplify greatly the work of the Committee; and a party presenting a Bill, finding that it was not in accordance with the Rules of the House, could alter it, or have to withdraw it. The question arises: that all this could be done by the Rule which the hon. gentleman has read, if enforced strictly. If Bills were deposited eight days previous to the meeting of Parliament, there would be plenty of time, probably a fortnight and more, for the Bills to be examined by the proper authority—either the law officers of the House, or the Secretary of the Committee, or, perhaps, by some other Committee, such as the Standing Committee on Standing Orders. We have a Committee especially for that purpose, to see whether the notice was given in the newspapers, and in the *Official Gazette*, within the necessary time, &c., and the same Committee, perhaps, might report also on these Bills, if it were thought proper that the Committee should so report; or, as the hon. gentleman suggests, either the law officers, if they have the time, or the secretaries of the different Committees—perhaps, all the secretaries together—could do this work. I agree that something might be done in this direction, but it all depends on the strictness with which the Rule about the eight days is complied with. If we relax the Rule, as we are always disposed on both sides of the House to do, of course we must suffer for it; but that would not prevent, I think, some mode being adopted, at all events, to secure the revision and examination of the Bills before they are submitted to the different Committees.

Motion agreed to.

#### MASTERS AND MATES BILL.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 89) respecting certificates to masters and mates of inland and coasting ships.

Mr. LANDRY. Was any change made in the fees for certificates?

Mr. McLELAN. The \$4 fee was reduced to \$2.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

#### PIG IRON BOUNTY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on the resolution to provide that a bounty be paid on all pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore be received.

Motion agreed to; and resolution concurred in.

#### SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

##### 1. Charges of Management.....\$172,140.87

Mr. BLAKE. I notice that there are increases under the head of Winnipeg board allowance, and other increases at Victoria, Charlottetown, and an increase of \$2,000 in salaries of savings bank agents, and establishment of new offices.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The business at Winnipeg has increased so largely that we required another clerk, for which we ask \$900 salary. Then, again, the officers there have represented to us that, owing to the cost of living in Winnipeg they should have a general increase of salaries. It is the opinion of the Government, while we are prepared to admit that the cost of living is higher in Winnipeg than almost any other place at the present moment, that it would

not be advisable to make a permanent increase in salaries, because it is supposed that in a year or two, when that country will have a surplus production, the cost of living will not be any more there than at Ottawa. It was, therefore, thought proper to give a certain board allowance, while the expense of living continues as at present. At Victoria, there is an increase to one or two of the employés to the extent of \$200. At Charlottetown, there is an increase of \$200 to one of the employés. With regard to the salaries of savings bank agents, as the hon. gentleman understands, we now pay these agents in proportion to the deposits. The smallest sum paid is \$200 a year. If the deposits reach \$120,000, they receive \$300, and when they reach from \$200,000 to \$400,000, they receive the maximum of \$400. Under that arrangement as the deposits increase in the different savings banks, the agents are entitled to an increase of \$50 or \$100 as the case may be. Then there are numerous applications for the establishment of savings banks in different places, and these are now under consideration. A vote is now being taken for the establishment of three or four additional offices, if it is found necessary to establish these additional offices. Some of the applications are from Sydney mines, and other places in Nova Scotia where mining operations are increasing; one or two from Prince Edward Island, and two from New Brunswick.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the board allowance at Winnipeg, what is the principle upon which the allowance is made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For example, a clerk who has \$800 or \$900 a year is to get \$20 a month extra, and other salaries in proportion.

##### 2. The Governor-General Secretary's Office.....\$9,730.00

Mr. BLAKE. There is a reduction here.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; an indication of our anxiety to retrench, which I have no doubt will be very gratifying to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is occasioned by the vacation of a senior officer, and the appointment of a new one at the minimum salary of a chief clerk.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Part of it is—\$600, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. I see a first-class clerk has been reduced from \$1,800 to \$1,450.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It resulted in part from the fact that when the late deputy-head of the Department was superannuated we did not bring in an additional man. Col. Stewart, who was appointed at \$2,000 a year, had \$2,150 at the time of his death, and it is provided that his successor shall have \$1,800. We also took in a younger man:

##### 3. Office of the Privy Council for Canada.....\$17,755.00

Mr. BLAKE. That is a contrast; there is an increase here.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is an accountant and draughtsman, making \$1,100, and the remainder is mainly for increases to the different employés. There will be four second-class clerks, one additional third-class clerk, and one accountant and draughtsman.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman explain why three additional clerks are added to that Department. The increase in salaries are very considerable, as well as the increase in the number of the clerks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was found necessary that we should have a man who is competent as a draughtsman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is meant by a draughtsman?

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the fact of the matter is, that because the office has no head it wants more tails.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is something in that, and hence there is a considerable saving. A head would have to be paid \$7,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and I suppose the \$7,000 will become payable very soon.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What are the draughtsman's duties?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Reports are often made by the Department to the Privy Council, accompanied by plans. When the clerk has to send a copy of an Order in Council he has often to send a plan with it; and, therefore, a draughtsman is required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It looks very like a little plan to make an appointment that is not required.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is considerable work. When a copy of an Order in Council is sent away with regard to timber limits, &c., a plan must be copied and sent with it. We could not allow the original order and plan to be sent away.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But these plans are made in the Department of the Interior. There never was a plan made, so far I know, in the Privy Council Office. During the five years I was in that office, I never felt the want of a permanent draughtsman. Fifteen years have elapsed since the new system was inaugurated, and this is the first time such an officer has been found necessary. I do not think he is necessary. I think the hon. gentleman ought not to defend such a transaction as this.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman were there now, he would find that the work has increased immensely, and the draughtsman is required. There are no officers in any of the Departments that are more hard worked than the officers of the Privy Council, especially during certain long periods of the year; and, therefore, these additional clerks are required, and we ask Parliament to grant the necessary money.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has explained that when small plans come in to the Privy Council, with reference to timber limits, copies must be made of them, and sent out with the order. That is, of course, a reasonable thing; but I should have supposed that the business-like way of proceeding would be for the Department sending the order and the plan to the Privy Council, also to send a tracing of the plan, and not to keep an officer in the Department solely for making these plans. Then, this officer is also an accountant; he has not sufficient work as a draughtsman. Now, I filled the office of President of the Council for a short time, and I know something of it during another period, and I never heard of an accountant in the office at all. I should like to know what duties this officer discharges as an accountant.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With regard to the plans, perhaps it would be as well to have them copied in the way the hon. gentleman suggests; but if a draughtsman were employed in drawing these plans in one Department, an additional clerk would have to be employed to do the work of an accountant in the Privy Council, whereas this officer will be doing the work both of an accountant and a draughtsman.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has accounted for the draughtsman. He has not accounted for the accountant yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Clerk of the Privy Council stated the necessity of having a draughtsman who should also be an accountant. A draughtsman is absolutely required to avoid the great delays in consequence of the number of plans that form a portion of the minutes of Council; and we also require a man for keeping the accounts, which the clerk states are accruing there, and ought to be kept separate.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. BLAKE. What are they? There are no accounts in the Privy Council—at least there have not been up to this time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring the hon. gentleman the report.

Mr. BLAKE. The proper plan would be for the Department to send in a plan which could go into the Order in Council, instead of having a different officer appointed for this work.

4. Department of Justice ..... \$16,015.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase is due to the statutory bonus of \$50. Under the Civil Service Act there has been a readjustment of the officials of the different Departments, and the readjustment is the one consented to by the hon. Minister of Justice as the proper theoretical organization for the working of this Department.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is an allowance for the private secretary of \$600. Is that work done by one of the old clerks, or a new hand?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every hon. Minister has a private secretary of his own, whom he takes from the service, or outside of it. When in the service he receives this amount in addition to his ordinary salary.

5. Department of Justice, Penitentiaries Branch..... \$5,450.00

Mr. BLAKE. The Inspector of Penitentiaries, when this office was established, was appointed with a statutory salary of \$2,000. There have been at least two increases, and I find now a further increase of \$50. I observe in the Penitentiary Act, which has lately come down to the House, the statutory provision for the salary is entirely left out, and it is provided in general terms that the salary shall be such as fixed by the Governor in Council, without any limitation whatever. I should like to know the principle on which this third addition is made, and whether it is intended to make this the fixed salary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Inspector is much dissatisfied with his salary, and complains his work is very onerous. He compares it with the salary of Mr. Langmuir, Inspector of Jails and Prisons of Ontario, which is greater, although the work is much less.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He does not do half the work.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman made rather an unfortunate speech for his peace of mind. If the officials learn that their dissatisfaction and grumbling will be an excuse for increasing their salaries, he may expect a good deal of grumbling. I would cheerfully consent to a vote of the House for an advertisement for a satisfied civil servant. I am not going to compare the case of Mr. Langmuir with that of the Inspector of Penitentiaries, because Mr. Langmuir decided to leave his office and take other employment, and I think the office is now divided between two. I do not see that the cases are comparable, because the Inspector in Ontario has a great many important institutions to examine. The lunatic asylums alone contain three times as many souls as the penitentiaries. In any case I am not disposed to accede to the view that what another Government pays is a proper text of the case. It would be dangerous to consent to this increase, for next year the salary would probably be \$2,850, and go on increasing indefinitely in this ratio. We should once for all decide finally what the salary shall be.

8. Department of Interior.....\$103,134.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen will see, with respect to the Department of the Interior, that the Geological Survey branch is added to that Department, but will be supported, as heretofore, out of the general vote for

the survey. The officers of the survey are now specially charged as officers in the Department of the Interior. The business of the Department is enormously increasing, and I do not suppose it can be diminished for some time to come.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have no doubt the labors of the Department of the Interior have increased within the last few years, and one would naturally expect to find a considerable increase in the expenditure of that Department. But I notice here, in connection with the North-West Mounted Police branch of this part of the service, under the Department of the Interior, that there is a considerable increase. I do not understand the necessity for the increase in that particular branch of the service. I notice, also, that there is a new officer appointed in that particular branch. Last year there were three officers, I think, and a chief clerk, and a first and second-class clerk. The chief clerk had \$2,150 a year. This year I observe the hon. gentleman has appointed what is called a comptroller, at a salary of \$3,200, an increase of over \$1,000. I wish to know whether the person who formerly occupied the position of chief clerk is now to occupy the position of comptroller. Has he any additional or other duties to perform as comptroller, that he did not have as chief clerk?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has the sole charge and responsibility of all the disbursements of the Mounted Police force, of all the contracts for supplies, forage, purchase of horses, of uniforms, and furniture of all kinds. It is a most responsible office and a most onerous office. Mr. White was the chief clerk, of first-class standing, in his Department. He would have had a right to claim the highest offices, from his great ability, on the staff. He is specially valuable in this position. He has been obliged to go this year, and the year before, to the North-West to look after a very large expenditure at the outposts, and they are scattered all over that country. He was the chief organizer and officer of that force. He has got the name of comptroller—it is comptroller of Mounted Police force—that is, he keeps the accounts. He has to keep all the correspondence with the Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner, and the different superintendents who are stationed all over the country. He has got a small staff and a great deal of work. He well earns the salary, and we could not keep him unless we gave him that salary. I do not think, at this moment, we could supply his place, and it would be unwise economy if we lost his service.

Mr. CAMERON. No new duties, I understand, have been thrown upon him; but if he discharges the duties the hon. gentleman has mentioned, perhaps it is not too much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is the duty, in addition, between 300 men and 500 men.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the increase in the number of first-class clerks employed in the Department of the Interior?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They arise in the service, they arise from length of service, they arise from the duties being enormously increased. We have to have subdivisions for timber limits, for coal lands, and for mineral lands. There has been a very considerable sub-division in that service, which was small originally. It has more than doubled, and with the great pressure just now it is advisable to have a very full staff of competent officers. I tell the hon. gentleman that we have very great difficulty in keeping our officers. The inducements offered them elsewhere are so great that we have lost some of our best officers, because we would not give them the salary. We have lost Mr. Hamilton, who was at the head of the Land Grant Department. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company offered him a salary twice or three times more than we could afford to give him; and we lost some of our most efficient officers,

whose places it is hard to supply. Mr. Lindsay Russell, as the hon. gentleman opposite knows, complains very much of the impossibility almost of keeping these men, owing to the inducements offered them elsewhere.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice the increase in the expense of first-class clerks is something over \$5,000—\$10,650 last year, \$15,750 this year. I notice the number of second-class clerks is increased from seven to eleven, and the expense from \$9,350 to \$13,800. The number of third-class clerks has increased from eighteen to twenty-nine, and the expense from \$15,950 to \$24,100. It strikes me this is a very large percentage of increase, and must indicate an enormous increase in the business of the Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the third-class clerks, several of them have been continued from year to year as temporary clerks, and have been put on the permanent staff under the reorganization of the Civil Service Act. Their salaries appear here now as having been paid under the old system, either out of contingencies or out of some votes connected with the different branches of the Department. There were seven or eight of them, if not more, that were brought in and made permanent; but that is not an actual increase of the staff, these people having been there before. During the Session, and sometimes before the Session, a very considerable staff of temporary clerks are employed in making returns, and as soon as the work is over they will be got rid of. But the increase is not so large as the hon. gentleman supposes, for that reason.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems that, notwithstanding this removal from one part to another, the contingencies have increased very largely as well. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state whether the Geological Survey Branch, which is now proposed to be appended to his Department and paid separately, whether this statement of salaries is just a statement of the service to be paid out of the other vote, or whether it represents the proposed plan of the service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It represents the proposed plan. Some addition has been made to the salaries on the report of the Director, Professor Selwyn, who also complained of the difficulty of retaining his officers in consequence of the salaries not being adequate. The staff is now making every effort to keep up with the new field opened in the North-West, and especially in the mining regions of the North-West, and I should be very sorry if I should lose any of the men he prizes so much.

Mr. BLAKE. It is now proposed, for the first time, to establish a scale of salaries and regular system for the staff of the Geological Survey, and I think we should have fuller information, so that we may compare the payments made under the former *regime*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring all that information down.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is this vote intended to cover the salaries of officers at headquarters, or the whole staff in connection with the Geological Survey? If it is intended for the clerks here I think it is a large expenditure. The vote proposed is \$60,000, and the clerks, numbering twenty-six, will receive \$31,604. I do not understand that their duties in connection with the Geological Museum and elsewhere are so excessive as to require twenty-six clerks at such large salaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount is for the whole staff, including explorers, field men and scientific men. They had to be brought into some class under the Civil Service Act, and they are placed, according to their relative rank, as chief clerk, and so on.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is unfortunate that it should be so, and the Civil Service Act might be amended in that regard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are merely entered in the Estimates as chief clerks, and so on. But for other purposes they keep their designation of hydrographer, chemist, and so on.

Mr. ROSS. An amount is entered for a librarian. Is it intended to have a Geological library, and place it in charge of an officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has always been an officer having special charge of the books, maps and other literary matter connected with the Geological Survey. The present officer is Dr. Thorburn, who is found to be very valuable, not only as a librarian, but as being able to perform a very valuable function in my opinion, that of being able to explain to visitors the different branches of the museum and the exhibits.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is necessary we should have such an officer. I may say I sympathize with the hon. gentleman in losing so many of his best servants; but I hope he will be able to retain all his colleagues.

Mr. ROSS. Am I to understand that all geological works under the control of the Government will be found in the Geological Museum?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not. The Library Committee of the House of Parliament will see that books of science will be fully represented in our National Library here. The works in the Geological Museum are the working tools of the staff, more than books of public reference.

9. Department of Indian Affairs..... \$31,287.50

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is an increase in this Department of \$6,372 over and above what it cost last year. I notice that the hon. gentleman has added to the salaries in some cases. There is also to be a solicitor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has always been one.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It has not so appeared before. If so, the Estimates are not correct. At all events, it appears for the first time under this head.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Such an officer was paid before, but it did not appear in the Estimates.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Who is the solicitor, and where does he reside?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Deputy Minister of Justice, since 1867, has received \$400 in addition to his salary for acting as solicitor of the Indian Department.

Mr. CAMERON. I also observe there are additions to the staff; there are eight more clerks in the Indian branch than last year, involving considerable additional expense. While I am prepared to admit that the work connected with the Department of the Interior must necessarily have increased for the last few years, and probably will increase, I cannot understand how the cost of running the Indian Department can by any possibility have increased. Have we any more Indians than we had last year? Is a new system inaugurated by which the Indian affairs are managed? What is the real cause of this increase? Altogether it is this year \$6,372.50 over and above last year, when there was an increase of \$4,215 over the year before. The hon. gentleman accounted for it last year, and found it necessary, I think, to apologize or explain to the House the reason why that increase occurred over 1881. I think he mentioned that two officers of the outside service were brought down here—Mr. Plummer, of Toronto, and Mr. Dalton; and their salaries, with the statutory increases, made the difference.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The work of the Department has been increased, strange to say, though the hon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

gentleman cannot understand it. In the first place, there is a great increase in the number of Indians coming in to settle on the reserves, I am glad to say; then, with respect to the officers, it will be found that the difference between eleven and seventeen is caused by the appointment of temporary officers, who were paid out of contingencies, to permanent positions. I will also bring down, on Concurrence, full details of all these matters.

10. Auditor-General's Office ..... \$19,200.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Under the heading of the office of the Auditor-General I see that an additional officer has been appointed, and yet there is a decrease in salaries. Will the hon. Minister explain? This is strange.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What is strange about it?

Mr. ROSS. It is strange because there is an increase of officers and a decrease of salaries.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It so happened that two first-class clerks were superannuated, and we have not filled the vacancies; then two or three—two I think—third-class clerks were promoted to the second class; and, on the whole, I am happy to say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that there is a reduction in the expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there no increase in superannuations?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; because we are paying the parties superannuated. If you charge that against it, there would not be a reduction; but, in the interests of the service, it was found desirable to do so.

11. Department of Finance and Treasury Board. \$58,125.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). So the public purse bleeds to the same extent all the same. In the Department of Finance and Treasury Board—this is more natural—there is an increase of three officers, and quite an increase in salaries, something like \$3,000. This is more in keeping with the eternal fitness of things.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is an increase of three officers, and if we give them but the statutory allowance, \$50, it would amount to that sum; but it has been found that the duties of the deputy-head of the Department are so onerous—a large portion of his time being taken up with correspondence, depriving the country of time which might be devoted more profitably than to writing his own letters, that a clerk has been employed, who acts as a clerk in the Department, and is shorthand-writer for him. Any hon. gentleman who knows anything about that Department, and the labor involved in its correspondence, will quite appreciate the position of the deputy until this assistance was given. Then the officers of the Department are increased in number, as we are continuing to add to the deposits in the savings bank; owing to the increased number of depositors, thousands more accounts, I may say, have been opened. Then there are all these returns; every payment made, and the returns from the officers in the different parts of the Province, have to be sent here, checked and corrected. The increase in this work alone will require, the deputy estimates, probably two officers during the next year besides the additional appointed shorthand-writer; that is the reason for the increase.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman referred to the necessity of the increase, as due to increased labor because of the savings bank. I am somewhat inquisitive to know what the hon. gentleman considers the expense of managing the savings bank; what percentage does the cost of management bear to the deposits.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think about 7 per cent., making the money cost us about 4½ per cent. If my memory serves me, it is a little under 4½ per cent.



Mr. CHARLTON. What is about the average loss to the Government on the interest of deposits received until re-deposited—the Government deposits money with the banks at 4 per cent.; and is there any means of informing us what loss is sustained under this head?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot state the exact loss, but it cannot be very large, for this reason: it is considered necessary, under any circumstances, as near as may be, to have \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 at call in the banks of the country, and, for this reason, the amount of Dominion notes held by the banks to-day, is perhaps \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 in excess of what they are compelled by law to hold. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will see it would be very impolitic, and unwise under any circumstances—and no Government would do otherwise—to have less than \$2,500,000, or something of that kind, at call; and, for various reasons, demands may be made on the Government from day to day. Take, for instance, the Pacific Railway, as it proceeds every twenty miles, \$200,000 are to be paid and \$180,000 or \$190,000 to be paid back on the land grant bonds deposited with them; and, therefore, under any circumstances, for the general safety and credit of the country, and to prevent any possibility of any difficulty, the Government should and must necessarily have \$2,500,000, and, perhaps, \$3,000,000 at call. Then, when we find any money coming in from the savings banks or from any other source, we have arranged with the banks, to take it for from four to six months, just as we find our position likely to be, and as it may be required; and, therefore, we have that sum placed to the credit of the Government, deposited for two, four or six months, or sometimes subject to a notice of thirty days, for which they give us 4 per cent. Of course, there may be some little loss between the transmission, but it cannot be very large under these circumstances.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Are the savings banks managed through the Finance Department?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; but by the Post Office Department.

Mr. BURPEE. You have nothing to do with them?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

12. Department of Inland Revenue ..... \$35,712.50

Mr. LAURIER. In the Department of Inland Revenue, I see that no provision is taken for the salary of the Assistant Commissioner. This office exists by Statute. Is it intended to abolish it? I would suggest it as proper, then, to amend the law creating the Department.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The number of the staff at present is twenty-eight, last year it was twenty-seven. The apparent increase shown in the Estimates is \$1,762.50; but taking into account the Chief Clerk and Assistant Commissioner \$2,400, the real increase is found to be \$4,162.60. Of this, two men have been added to the permanent staff, but who were Commissioners last year, which accounts for \$1,825, one being at \$1,095, and the other \$730. The ordinary increment provided for by the Act of twenty-two officers at \$50 each, amounts to \$1,100. The sum of \$1,247 remaining is accounted for by the reorganizations of the salaries and promotions in the Department.

Mr. LAURIER. I asked the hon. gentleman about the item for Chief Inspector of Standards; I suppose that has to do with the weights and measures. Is this a promotion, or a new appointment?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is a promotion.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain about the supernumerary first and second-class clerks?

Mr. COSTIGAN. According to the Civil Service Act there was a reorganization of the staff of the Department.

These supernumerary clerks were first-class clerks when the reorganization was made, and, of course, we cannot interfere with their salaries or rank. If a vacancy occurred that vacancy would be filled by the appointment of a first-class clerk.

Mr. LAURIER. I find here that, including the first and second-class clerks for this and last year, there is an addition of one clerk.

Mr. BLAKE. The total number of first-class clerks is six, being four first-class clerks, and two supernumerary, while the staff of last year, as the hon. gentleman states, was five first-class clerks; so that while he found, in his theoretical organization, an excess of two first-class clerks, he has actually himself created one first-class clerk. If the theoretical organization required only four first-class clerks, then it is impossible that there should have been more than five on the list looking at last year's work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By the theoretical organization, as now adopted, the number of permanent first-class clerks of the Department will be four instead of five. The number of second-class clerks, under the reorganization, will be seven instead of eight, a reduction in both cases of one. But in the Department there were three who are now supernumerary clerks, two first-class, and one second. These cannot, under the law, be reduced in rank; but when any of the first or second-class clerks disappear one of the supernumeraries will be put on the ordinary permanent list.

Mr. BLAKE. So far as the second-class clerks are concerned the matter is pretty plain. On the theoretical organization of the Department there were eight second-class clerks, and there are on the list to-day seven second-class and one supernumerary second-class clerk; but we are dealing with the first-class clerkships, of whom there were, at the reorganization, five, while on the list to-day there are four first-class clerks and two supernumeraries, which make six, or an excess of one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are only two supernumerary clerks this year; at all events there is one less this year. The hon. gentleman asks me to account for the other; perhaps he will allow us to account for it on Concurrency.

13. Customs Department..... \$32,950.00

Mr. BURPEE. There are a good many changes in the Department, but there is not a very large increase in the amount. There is one first-class clerk less than there was last year; there are three second-class clerks more, and six third-class clerks more, and the six junior second-class clerks are dropped out altogether; and there is one additional clerk, a shorthand-writer. The total increase is \$955; leaving out the shorthand-writer, the increase is \$205. Is that increase made up by the \$50 additions?

Mr. BOWELL. The dropping of the junior second-class clerks is in conformity with the new Civil Service Act; consequently that increases the number of third-class clerks, and some of the others are promoted. The third-class clerk, the shorthand-writer, we propose to give \$750; he is for the assistance of the Commissioner, whose work has become so great that it is almost impossible for him to keep up with it. The reduction of one in the number of first-class clerks arises from the superannuation of one owing to ill-health. The \$205 addition to which the hon. gentleman refers, is due to the \$50 increases, and to an increase given to the Assistant Accountant. Owing to the responsible position he occupies and his efficiency, it is proposed to increase his salary to the maximum amount, so that there will be no increase in his salary in the future. The hon. gentleman will understand that the Estimates for this year are much less than those of 1878. Last year the expenditure was only \$38,000, notwithstanding the enormous

increase of business which has fallen upon the Customs Department, while the expenditure, in 1878, was \$44,600.

Mr. BURPEE. That includes the contingencies.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, in both cases. The estimate for this year is only \$955 more than the expenditure of last year; and if you deduct the statutory increases from that \$955, you will find that the actual increase is only \$25.

Mr. BURPEE. The hon. gentleman knows that we had to pay, in 1878 and previous years, a very large amount on American invoices for advertising the discount. Of course, gold being now at par, that is not necessary. But that added largely at that time to the contingent account.

Mr. BOWELL. That is very true, but the expenditures for salaries alone was \$28,287 in 1878, against \$31,800 last year, notwithstanding the statutory increases.

14. Post Office Department ..... \$141,125.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to know the reason of this large increase. This appears to be a Department remarkable for its advancing expenses. In 1879, it had only ninety-two employes, last year it had 122, and now it is proposed to employ 161 persons. The salaries, in 1879, amounted to \$87,850, last year to \$116,970 and now it is proposed to take \$141,000. The increases are very serious. Perhaps the hon. Postmaster-General will explain them.

Mr. CARLING. A number of the salaries were paid last year out of contingencies, for instance, the eighteen packers, who are now put on the staff; and it has been found that, with the large increase of business in the Department, we require fourteen additional clerks to manage the work of the Department during the present year.

Mr. ROSS. I can understand that there should be an increase in the Savings bank Branch, owing to the large amount of money now being deposited, and perhaps in the Money Order branch; but in the Secretary's office, which I suppose is only for the ordinary business, there is an increase of five second-class clerks, four third-class clerks, and twenty-two packers. Do I understand that the whole of these increases were formerly paid out of contingencies?

Mr. CARLING. Thirty-two were. We have established 161 new post offices during the year; there has been an immense increase of business all over. In connection with that particular Department, the whole number of additional clerks is fourteen over that of last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. The increase of the Secretary's office amounts to 70 per cent. in the number of employes, and 35 per cent. in the expenditure. Do I understand that these clerks were employed in former years, and their salaries not included in the Estimates?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

15. Department of Agriculture..... \$43,065.00

Mr. POPE. This is a very progressive Department. The increase arises, as a general rule, from the employment permanently on the staff of clerks formerly employed temporarily. The statutory increase of \$50 per year, amounts to \$1,035. In the appointments, which were necessary, were repairers, \$1,250; one patent clerk, \$400; there was a German engaged writing German pamphlets and correspondence, who speaks German, French and English, \$780. This German was but temporarily employed, and was paid by the day, and it was thought better he should appear here. In the Archives, it was found absolutely necessary we should have a French clerk, and the man employed was in the service before in the Immigration Department. There is no increase in his pay, although he is put here. This is Mr. Marmette. Mr. Lake, Chief of Statistics, has been for years drawing the same pay as now, \$1,500, but was paid out of

Mr. BOWELL.

contingencies. The promotions under the Civil Service Act, are: Mr. Currier, my Secretary, who gets \$100 a year promotion. Mr. Dion, who was taken from the second-class and made a first-class clerk in charge of the divisions, at an increase of \$100. Mr. Hanwright, who received \$400, receives \$100 more. Mr. McKay is a gentleman of great ability as examiner of patents, a branch which requires great skill. I do not know how we could replace him if he were to leave. He has been offered much more, and I have increased his salary \$450.

Mr. BLAKE. A statistical officer in the Census branch, Mr. Lake, the hon. Minister says was employed for the last ten years, but paid out of contingencies, and is now put on the permanent staff. Have we got to the end of that category?

Mr. POPE. It would be a great mistake to get to the end of the temporary clerks, for in case of pressure of work it is necessary to have their services.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not referring to temporary employment, but to what is really permanent employment, though for years paid out of contingencies. Have we reached the end of these temporary permanent officials?

Mr. POPE. I do not think we have. We have thought proper to keep up the staff, and as the business of the Department increases we give the preference to these temporary men for permanent positions.

16. Department of Marine and Fisheries..... \$35,000.00

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No doubt a great many Departments are very progressive, and have much increase of business; but there are some in which there cannot be much, if any, increase. Take the Department of Marine and Fisheries. To what extent has business increased since last year to necessitate the employment of more men? I would like to understand what justification the Head of the Department has for this increase. I do not think he can be a particularly economical officer, judging by the increase that has taken place in the Department since he entered it. This year the hon. gentleman asks for \$35,000 to run this Department; last year he asked for \$31,020. In 1879, the Department only cost \$25,070, and there were twenty employes to do the work. Last year the hon. gentleman himself was able to manage the Department with twenty-five employes, at an expense of \$31,020. The increase this year, over 1879, is \$5,950. The increase in 1882 over 1878, was \$5,950; the increase in 1883 over 1882, was \$2,980; and the increase in 1883 over 1878-79, was \$9,930, and with an increase of ten more employes. I think it is only fair that we should know why these additions in the service are required.

Mr. McLELAN. I claim that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is a progressive Department. Every year a number of lighthouses are added, and new harbors are opened; and then there has been added to the Department the Signal Service branch of the Public Works. The bounty business has also been thrown upon this Department, which increases its work very much.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who did the Signal Service before last year?

Mr. McLELAN. It was connected with the Public Works Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think so.

Mr. McLELAN. It was transferred during the summer. There is a branch of the Signal Service now connected with the sea coast, with the fisheries, and in connection with shipping. The meteorological service has also extended very largely, involving additional correspondence, as does also the inspection of vessels, steamboats and hulls. I have the same reason to give that my colleagues have given for the

increased number of the staff. They were extras, and I found their services were continuous during the year, and that as they could not be dispensed with it was better to place them on the permanent staff. I expect to require, under this system, only two new officers; the others will be taken from the extra clerks in the office now.

17. Department of Public Works..... \$41,430.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the four first items there is no increase except in the second one, a statutory increase of \$50. In the second-class clerks the number is reduced from three to two. The corresponding branch has increased very much and necessitates more help, not only of copying clerks, but of clerks able to make reports, &c. In the account branch the chief clerk has the statutory increase of \$50. Then a third-class clerk is promoted to a second-class clerkship, and we require an additional officer. The technical branch is composed of the engineers, architects, and the mechanical engineers. The first two officers have the salary they had before. The mechanical engineer had never been put on the permanent list, but as he was an officer permanently necessary, we thought best to put him on the list at a salary of \$2,000. The chief clerk in the engineering branch has his increase of \$50. There are five new officers, three of the second-class and two of the third. These officers are constantly required, and the Government thought best to put them on the permanent list of the Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose there is no use in finding fault on this side of the House, but the hon. gentleman will see that there is an increase of \$10,000 in the expenses of the coming year. That is a most extraordinary expenditure, and one that I cannot understand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The increase is more apparent than real. It is an increase on the permanent staff, but it is not an increase in the number, nor in the expenditure of the Department. These officers have been there for a number of years. Mr. Arnoldi, for example, the mechanical engineer, has been there for a long number of years. He has charge of the heating apparatus, the lighting apparatus, &c., of these buildings, as well as the Ottawa Post Office, the Geological Museum, and the other departments that are not in these buildings. So that, though it is an increase on the permanent staff, it is really not an increase in the number of officers, because they have been at work for years past.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any other person but Mr. Arnoldi, in that position, who has been placed there for the first time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there are other officers that might have been brought in; for example, the Superintendent of Telegraph Lines. The question has not been brought up how far these lines shall be kept in the hands of the Government, and, therefore, we still pay that officer out of the money voted for the telegraph system. But if it is afterwards decided that the Government shall take control of the telegraph lines, then, most likely, the superintendent of that system will have to become a permanent officer and be put on the list. It must grow not only in that direction, but in all directions, and the number of officers must be increased in proportion to the work that is placed on this Department or any other Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The increased expenditure last year was \$3,150; it is now \$5,100.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work was done by officers who are not permanent, and who have been employed for years and years; but as the clerks were

really permanent clerks it was proper they should be placed on the permanent list. It is always painful to find a clerk who does his work well and has the confidence of his chief, to be in the Department as a temporary clerk, and liable to lose his position any day; and if his services are required permanently it is proper for the chiefs to say: "We will place you on the permanent list and give you a chance to rise; and if, after a number of years, you become unfit for work, you will receive a small superannuation allowance."

Mr. MACKENZIE. I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman as to the treatment which should be given to such clerks, but he takes the same amount for contingencies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct. The contingencies must follow the increase of work. If we have more works going on in all sections of the Dominion we must have more contingencies. For example, works are carried on in Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and the North-West. The season is short, and it is hardly possible or feasible to write a letter and wait for an answer before giving every order. Accordingly, we have to send telegrams which cost something, especially to British Columbia, and we have often to pay for long answers, and these amounts are paid out of contingencies. As these works are now more numerous and extend over different portions of the Dominion, a little more money for contingencies is necessary to meet the requirements of the service.

Mr. BLAKE. In 1878, when there was only one Department for Public Works and Railways and Canals, the amount voted for the Department was \$44,676. The expenditure in the Public Works' branch is very near that amount, leaving out the Railways and Canals Department. So it seems exceedingly difficult to reconcile the views of economy which are constantly placed before us with that result. The hon. Minister may say there were a great many persons paid then out of contingencies who are not placed on the permanent staff; but the contingencies for 1878 were only \$1,000 greater than the hon. gentleman's vote for this year, irrespective of the general vote for contingencies. I make this observation because it seems to me to lead to this consideration: The Department was divided at the time when it was the policy of the Administration itself to build the Pacific Railway. That is now under construction under another arrangement, and the principle objects of separating the Department no longer served; and I was about to enquire whether the Government have taken into consideration any proposal for the reconsolidation of those two Departments since their division seems to have been attended with very large additional expenditures.

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

### After Recess.

### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Dominion Railway Trust and Construction Company of Canada, limited.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 88) to unite the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company and the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company into one corporation, under the name of The Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Pacific and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

## SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

17. Department of Public Works.....\$41,430.00

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood that the hon. Minister of Public Works was to explain what are the duties of the three additional second-class clerks, who are added to the engineering branch.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are engineers, connected with both the engineering branch and the architect's branch.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are really assistant architects.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. These officers are doing work that has been going on for the last fifteen years, and they have been made permanent officers. If we find that it is better for the service, as well as for the individual, that a man should be made a permanent officer, we appoint him, although sometimes an officer prefers to remain on the outside service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman would call these officers assistant architects, or something that would indicate their duties, I think it would be better.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The difficulty is this: Very often when we give a title to an officer he is apt to consider himself in a higher position than he really is, and then he and his friends press for more salary for him. I think it would be better for the Head of the Department to be in a position to say that if an officer, by his good conduct and service, earns a title, after a while he should have it. For instance, I might call my hon. friend's attention to Mr. H. F. Perley, who was employed in his time, and is still employed. I had the position of Chief Engineer of the Department to give when the two Departments were divided, and I thought from what I knew and heard of that officer that he deserved to be promoted. I promoted him with the consent of my colleagues; and I must say that the experience I have had of Mr. Perley convinces me that he deserved that promotion. The only regret I had was that I could not ask for an increase of salary for that officer. He does his work with a great deal of zeal, and to the entire satisfaction of the Head of the Department, and I must say that his services are worth more salary than he receives, considering the salaries given to corresponding officers outside the Government. But Mr. Perley saw the difficulties in the way, and he has acquiesced, relying on the future to obtain, if Parliament will grant it, an increase of salary. I am very glad my hon. friend has given me this opportunity to pay that tribute to the Chief Engineer of my Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I quite admit all that the hon. gentleman has said regarding the merits of Mr. Perley; and I also admit that the hon. gentleman, in the matter he has referred to, is able to speak from experience. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that when people accept titles, they are not satisfied until they get something else.

19. Departmental contingencies ..... \$153,950.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Before the item passes, I wish to call the attention of the extraordinary amount of the sum which is spent every year on extra clerks. It has been said over and over again on the Opposition side of the House, that this expenditure would, under the new arrangement of the Civil Service, be done away with; but I notice, from the Public Accounts, that while the fixed charges for regular clerks in the various Departments are increasing, the expenditure for extra clerks, instead of being reduced, is being increased. Last year the expenditure for this service

Mr. BLAKE.

alone was as follows:—For the Privy Council, \$589; for the Department of Justice, \$267; for the Department of Militia, \$1,215; for the Secretary of State's Department, \$1,621; for the Department of the Interior, \$538; for the Indian Department, \$1,378; for the Auditor General's Department, \$1,003; for the Finance Department, \$1,580; for the Inland Revenue Department, \$2,555; for the Post Office Department, \$10,620; for the Department of Agriculture, \$2,346; and for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, \$3,445; in all, \$27,177. The Government can, perhaps, explain what necessity there is for this large extra service, while the service generally is involving a larger expenditure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will compare the Estimates with last year's expenditure, under this head, he will find that we are asking for some \$20,000 less than was expended last year. This is largely the result of the transfer of eighteen or twenty packers in the Post Office Department to the regular list, which enables us to reduce the estimated contingencies about \$13,000. The expenditures last year, under the head of contingencies, was \$23,000 more than the Estimates, and the Estimates this year will be lower than the estimate on account of the increased number of temporary employes in the Department. Hon. members who have visited the Department of Interior, both last Session and this, will be aware that on account of the extended operations in connection with land sales, there must be a large number of persons employed who are not on the regular staff, but are paid a per day rate, and this is charged against contingencies. The amount asked for next year is \$23,000 less than was expended last year, and that has been brought about by the transference of men paid out of contingencies to the permanent staff.

Mr. ROSS. In view of that explanation, it might be supposed that there will be a reduction under the head of contingencies. Yet the hon. Finance Minister is asking \$13,950 more for contingencies next year than for the last year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The expenditure on contingencies will be at least \$15,000 less than was expended last year.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). We have reason, then, to hope that the expenditure for contingencies will be reduced.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It must be largely reduced.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I must congratulate the hon. Minister on the desirable change which has been made by placing temporary employes, whose services were absolutely required, on the regular staff, especially as in many cases they were employed, not so much because their services were absolutely necessary, as because some unfortunate individual wanted temporary employment. I desire to call attention to the large expenditure of the Heads of the various Departments. I do not know the reason for the increase, whether it was on account of the great commotion at the Capital and the hon. Ministers', finding it necessary to travel hither and thither through the Dominion; but I find that the expenditure for travelling expenses was, perhaps, greater than in any previous year. The head of the Privy Council charged \$256; the Minister of Justice, \$535; the Minister of Militia, \$921—I suppose that was in reviewing the troops and seeing that Her Majesty's active Militia were properly caparisoned and doing their work well—Secretary of State, \$1,140; the Minister of the Interior, \$3,005; Minister of Finance \$749; Minister of Customs, \$205; Minister of Inland Revenue, \$125; Minister of Public Works, \$1,677; Postmaster General, \$1,527; Minister of Agriculture, \$127; Minister of Marine,

\$360; making a total of \$11,519. Of course, there was no contingent account of \$167,000 to draw from, and there would be a nice margin left after the hon. gentlemen had spent \$11,500. I hope it may be possible next year for the hon. Ministers to remain in the Capital more constantly and attend to their special duties, without travelling over the country and imposing such a heavy charge on the people.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why is Mr. Schreiber paid as a departmental officer instead of his salary being charged to the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Schreiber was appointed, as the hon. gentleman knows, to the position he now holds previous to the change of Government in 1873.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not to be chief engineer of the Intercolonial.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; to the same office as he now holds. After full investigation, the Government came to the conclusion that the best mode of administering economically the Intercolonial Railway was to have the responsible officer a permanent officer of the Department at headquarters; and having arrived at that conclusion, after an examination and report by an able officer specially sent down, Mr. Schreiber was appointed Chief Engineer of Government Railways in operation, and he has remained a permanent officer of the Department from that time. While he was engaged mainly on the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, I think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did largely employ him after the change of Government. The hon. gentleman very naturally would charge his salary to the construction of the Intercolonial. Mr. Schreiber's salary never was charged to the operation of the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He had nothing to do with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He had nothing to do with the operating of the Intercolonial; but that was the position to which he had been appointed previous to the change of Government, that of chief responsible officer, and that at headquarters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So \$4,000 which should be charged to the working of the Intercolonial is charged to the Department here, making the expenditure on the Intercolonial that much less than it should be. Mr. Brydges was Superintendent of all Government Railways, not as Engineer, but as General Superintendent. Mr. McNabb was Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial in my time, and when the change of Government occurred, Mr. Schreiber was put practically in his place. Mr. McNabb had no successor except Mr. Schreiber.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Archibald is Mr. McNabb's successor, and discharges precisely the duties Mr. McNabb performed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But he was not at first.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Archibald succeeded Mr. McNabb as Engineer of the Intercolonial, and fills the same position that Mr. McNabb filled previously. The hon. gentleman is aware that Mr. Schreiber is Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway as well as of the other Government railways. The chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway was receiving a salary of \$6,000 for that service alone; and Mr. Schreiber has succeeded him, and is only charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway service some \$2,000 for his additional services with relation to that work, in addition to the salary he has as a permanent officer, as Chief Engineer of Government Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, the duties of the Canadian Pacific Railway are very materially changed. There are little or no duties now to perform compared with what was the case when the other engineer was receiving

\$6,000. The surveys were not then completed. Many engineering works were still to be attended to; the plans and bridges and everything of that sort, and the entire work except certain sections given out to the Company for which the Company paid but \$2,000 formerly—now it is very much more than \$6,000; in relation to the work performed I am not complaining of the salary as a whole at all, I know that Mr. Schreiber is an able man. I quite admit that, but I complain of the distribution and mode of payment.

20. Stationery Office for stationery..... \$7,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex.) This is the same vote as last year, I suppose it is an open vote.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

22. Amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner for Canada in London..... \$4,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I will lend all attention to this expenditure. I remember very well that when Sir A. T. Galt was appointed High Commissioner, we were assured that the expenditure would not be very large. However, it has grown to be quite a considerable sum even now. We paid him last year \$10,000; and according to the Auditor-General's report, \$5,085 for expenses connected with his office in England; and \$1,500 for travelling expenses to Manitoba; in all, he drew for one year, \$16,585. The vote just proposed is \$4,000 connected with his office in London. His contingent expenses last year were over \$5,000. Can the hon. Minister of Finance tell us, whether he expects these contingent office expenses to be kept within the \$4,000. I see by an Order in Council he was allowed \$3,500 in lieu of house rent, fuel, light and taxes; and besides, he drew for house rent and repairs last year \$132, for fuel \$45, for gas \$41 and for income-tax \$243.33, besides travelling expenses. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is able to tell us now, whether he is going to confine the High Commissioner within the vote proposed, \$4,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The first vote was sufficient to pay rent. We gave him \$10,000 and fitted up the house and paid rent and other expenses; but we thought that it would be more satisfactory every way to make \$4,000 cover all contingencies—house rent and everything of that kind. It was understood, and so acted upon, that if he had to visit Paris or Madrid, or any other portion of the continent, as High Commissioner of the Dominion, and endeavor to arrange treaties and that kind of thing, the expenses he so incurred would be paid. These are to cover expenses connected with his London residence. I presume that the items the hon. gentleman refers to were probably made in connection with the immigration office—at the Victoria Chambers.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see we are charged £103 stg. for expenses on a mission to Paris connected with the commercial convention negotiations; £9 stg. for expenses to and from Dublin; and £26 stg. for ocean passage to Canada. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what services he rendered the country by these trips? What was the result of his mission to Paris, Dublin or Canada? And what was the public necessity for his trip to Manitoba, for which we are charged \$1,500, which, as I stated before to the House, are charged to Capital Account, and not to ordinary revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With reference to the trip to Dublin, this item may probably be found in the present year; he went there to consult with the authorities on the subject of immigration. He went to Paris in connection with treaty arrangements which have not been as successful as could be desired, but are not yet closed; as to his

visit to the North-West, it was considered of the utmost importance, that the High Commissioner who was in London to forward immigration interests, when parties called on him and made enquiries regarding the country, should be able to speak from his own observation, in addition to the information he possessed from reports, &c.; and, therefore, his expenses in this relation were paid by the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that Sir A. T. Galt is one of the applicants for a colonization grant on plan No. 2, for some fifty townships. I would like to enquire whether it is at all possible that he attended to that business, when he was making this journey, and charging the Government for his expenses?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The circumstances are rather suspicious.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to ask the Premier at what time Sir A. T. Galt's resignation takes effect?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the 1st of June.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who is to be his successor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh!

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman can tell me in confidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that the hon. gentleman and myself took the same oath—that we would not disclose advice given to His Excellency without his permission.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any addition been made to his staff during the last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any officer of any kind been appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; only Mr. Colmer, who has always been there. He was there as secretary for some years previously.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to make any change in connection with the change of office—in the organization of the office? Are other officers to be appointed in connection with the High Commissioner's office?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no such present intention at all. Not a word, not a suggestion of the kind has been made.

23. Post Office and Finance Departments—Contingencies—Amount required to make payment to those officers of the Savings Bank Branch, Post Office and Finance Departments, engaged in balancing and computing interest in Depositors' Accounts, to 30th June, 1883.....\$2,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Returns are sent to the Finance Department from the different agents of the Post Office saving banks quarterly, and upon the receipt of the returns, circulars are at once prepared and sent to every depositor stating what appears at the credit of his account, so that it may be ascertained whether the accounts are correct or not; this must be done within two or three weeks from the date of the returns, and the result is that we have either to employ persons not acquainted with this work or not competent to do it satisfactorily, or employ a portion of the staff extra hours until twelve or one o'clock for about three months during the year. It was considered unfair that these officials should do that extra work without extra pay, and the Government last Session thought that \$1,000 should be placed at its disposal, \$500 to the Post Office, and \$500 to the Finance Department, to remunerate these officials. It was found by the deputy heads of the two Departments that that sum was not adequate, and they proposed another \$1,000 should be

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

added. In no other way can the work be done as economically.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see that Senator Kaulbach was paid \$120 last year out of contingencies for legal services in connection with the savings banks. Is it the intention of the Government to provide for senators in this way?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not aware who was employed. If there is a defaulter in Nova Scotia or any other place the hon. Minister of Justice employs such legal counsel as he thinks proper. I do not know who was employed in this case, whether it was a senator or not.

Mr. ROSS. The item appears on page 15 of the Auditor-General's report:

"The Hon. H. A. M. Kaulbach for legal services, \$120. Mr. Kaulbach is a member of the Senate."

Mr. MACKENZIE. We ought to know whether senators are employed to do professional work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Until I heard Senator Kaulbach's name mentioned, I was not aware he had been employed. I will make enquiries of the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal now made is of a dangerous character. Last year we were told \$1,000 would be sufficient, and that that was the most economical way of doing the work. My impression is the most economical way would be to fix an additional remuneration for those employed to do extra work during a certain period of the year, and not go beyond that. I do not say that the hon. gentleman ought to call in extra hands, nor do I say that these officials should not get extra pay for their extra hours' work, but that extra pay should be settled and not departed from.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says. Some men are quite free and willing to do the extra work they are directed to do. Others are not so free. Therefore, if we can select the men and apportion the increase among them it may be the better course, but we will allow it to stand at present and see how it works.

24. Amount required for salaries of board of examiners and other expenses connected with the Civil Service Act.....\$2,500.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to know to what extent the Government have availed themselves of those who passed these examinations. Six have passed at Halifax, six at St. John, eight at Charlottetown, six at Quebec, twenty-six at Montreal, six at Kingston, forty-six at Toronto, eighteen at London, six at Winnipeg, and three at Victoria, British Columbia—quite a considerable number. On looking at the examination papers they appear to have passed through a severe ordeal. Can the hon. Minister tell us how far these men have been utilized?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Since the Civil Service examinations, whenever we require a clerk we select one from those who have passed. Of course, if we require an official who cannot be found among those, a man of higher position, for instance an accountant, an engineer or a lawyer, or a professional man of any kind, we must go outside the list. But since the list was sent in by the board of examiners we have taken what clerks we required from it. I will bring down a statement giving the hon. gentleman the required information.

Mr. ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman give in more detail the mode in which it is proposed to expend this amount of \$2,500?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The expenditure of the money was fixed by law during last Session, and the notice

I gave the other day is the result of the experience of past years. We found that the Act of last year was too expensive, and that it would be possible to reduce the expense considerably. We now propose to make one of the commissioners secretary to the board, and he is to receive \$1,000 a year for his salary. The two other commissioners are to be paid at the rate of \$5 a day for sixty days in the year. The commissioner who is secretary will be employed a much longer time than the others, and must consequently receive a higher salary. Under this arrangement the salaries will only amount to \$1,600 per year. In the new Bill we ask for power not to be obliged to have examinations at all the places in the Dominion. We may have examinations only at headquarters by giving ordinary notice, and those that want to compete may do so. Examination only takes place at headquarters when promotions are to be made.

Mr. BLAKE. There are three classes of expenditure, the secretary, the commissioners and the local examiners. After the experience of last year, I was anxious to know what proportion of this expenditure—which is not very large, I quite agree—would be devoted to the services of the local examiners, and what to those of the commissioners, and whether he intended this system to be one which should involve the necessity of the attendance of one of the commissioners where there was an examination abroad, or whether that was to be conducted solely by local examiners.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The experience of last year was tentative; moreover, we wished to put the system at once into operation. We sent one of the commissioners to Halifax, one to Toronto, and a third to Montreal. It was to organize the system, and after the experience of one year we think that the commissioners can be sent from headquarters. The secretary may remain here and be at the same time examiner for the city of Ottawa. He has no travelling expenses, and he is paid yearly as an examiner, but he is paid according to the rate fixed by Parliament, at \$1,000 a year. Then, at eight or ten other places where there were local examiners no travelling expenses would have to be paid, and we would pay to those examiners according to the present law \$5 a day for each day of service, the whole time not to exceed sixty days. The experience of last year shows that three or four days will suffice for each commissioner to do the work. If there are ten of them it would amount to \$200 for the local examiners. The hon. gentleman knows that these local examiners have only to see that the examination shall be *bona fide*, that there is no collusion, and that the papers are sent to headquarters without being interfered with. They are sent up here and then the board of examiners meet, and those three commissioners here examine the papers and make their report, and decide which candidates have succeeded in the examination.

25. Administration of Justice.....\$36,700.00

Mr. BLAKE. I observe considerable reduction for the travelling expenses of the stipendiary magistrates. Would the hon. gentleman explain that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will only be two magistrates instead of three. Then the expenses of travelling consequent on railway communication, and the means of communication of every kind, have considerably lessened the expense.

26. Dominion Police.....\$15,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Dominion Police, I believe, is about the same strength as last year, perhaps a few men more. The present Minister of Justice thought it well to improve the corps and organization of the body generally, and to secure that improvement he has had to pay higher salaries.

27. Kingston Penitentiary.....\$112,878.23

In answer to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The details as to the different penitentiaries are given in the tables attached to the item, and, as the hon. gentleman will see, there is a decrease of over \$8,000 in the Kingston Penitentiary, and there is also a decrease in St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the Estimates are supported by such an abundant absence of statement on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The statements are in the Estimates themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. True, but the reasons for the increases are not here or anywhere so far as is apparent to the Committee. It is true that the total vote of Kingston does compare favorably with the vote for last year, but when you consider that Kingston is estimated for no less than 100 convicts less than last year, you perceive why the total vote should not be enhanced but should rather be diminished. Taking the same officers this year who were employed last year and there is an increase on the staff of about eleven per cent. on salaries. You find that there is an increase—contrary to law as the law now stands—in the warden's salary of \$400. I can see no reason for that increase at all. The warden of the penitentiary has supplied for him, at the public expense, a very handsome residence; in fact it was so handsome that after it was built we voted him a considerable sum of money to furnish it, because, as was said, it was impossible to expect a warden with a salary of \$2,600 a year to furnish such a house as that. Then there are also other perquisites in connection with his office, and I can see no reason why contemporaneously with diminished responsibility, with a number of convicts smaller than about one-seventh, or one-fourth less than it once had, with an institution which the hon. Minister described last year as having got to a state of perfection, and consequently running easier—I cannot see why this time should be chosen to increase the salary of the warden. Then we find that the warden's clerk's salary is increased, so is the salary of the steward, the matron, the deputy matron, the hospital overseer, the clerk of works and chief instructor, the stone cutter, the mason, the carpenter, the miller, the quarryman, the foundry man, the baker, the keepers, forty guards, the messenger and the teamsters, or in all an increase of \$4,360 on the salaries of last year. Then with reference to maintenance, I pointed out last year that the maintenance proposed for last year was considerably in excess of the maintenance which had been proposed for the year before *per capita*. Of course, there are many of the expenditures which partake of the nature of fixed charges and which do not vary very much by any increase or diminution to a moderate extent in the number of convicts. But the maintenance of the institution, leaving out these charges, is a reasonable test of economy, or the reverse. I pointed out last year that the expenditure then estimated for maintenance was higher in Kingston than the year before; it was \$70.22 per head, while this year it is \$74.70, an increase of \$4.50 over last year. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. Minister of Justice ought to have supplied his representative in this House with such information as would have enabled him to give explanations upon the subject. With reference to the grist mill it will be remembered that three or four years ago a vote was proposed for the erection of a grist mill in Kingston in connection with Kingston Penitentiary. It was opposed by a good many of us at that time. We thought it was a mistaken vote, that it would not conduce to economy, that in an institution of that kind a steam grist mill should not be erected for the purpose of grinding wheat into flour for the

convicts. On that occasion a practical man, a supporter of the hon. gentleman, who is not now in the House, Mr. Currier, the present Postmaster of this city, expressed his hesitation on the vote in these words:

"I doubt if the construction of this grist mill will tend in that direction. I know something about mills, and I do not think it would be a good investment merely for the purpose of grinding the wheat for feeding the prisoners. As hon. gentlemen will see the difference between the price of wheat and the price of flour is very small, and it might require a large number of convicts to be employed on it—

"Mr. MACKENZIE. You might have to employ a miller.

"Mr. CURRIER. So that the construction of that mill will not tend to reduce the expenses *per capita* of the prisoners. Besides, \$10,000 would be a sum quite inadequate for the construction of a mill of that kind.

"Mr. BLAKE. The amount to be set apart for the mill is \$4,800 only.

"Mr. CURRIER. I do not see how they can build one for \$4,800."

Well, the vote passed and nothing was done, and there being no reappearance of the vote in the Estimates, I asked in 1891 if anything was to be done about it. The reply was:

"Mr. McDONALD (Picton). We did not proceed with it."

This announcement was made, and there was the end of it. Last year there was no statement that the grist mill was to be proceeded with either, and I suppose that there was no intention of going on with it, nor do I know under what vote it has been proceeded with. There is but a trifling allusion to it in the report of the warden, who says something about the grist mill being completed. I have no doubt the result will be increased extravagance, instead of economy. Now, I want to understand out of what vote, and under what circumstances, the grist mill was erected, how it is expected to pay, what is to be the cost of running, fuel, and so forth? What is the scheme for purchasing wheat on the market, and out of what vote the money was obtained for this experiment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the miller, of course he is appointed to run the mill. The report of the Inspector says:

"A grist mill, of sufficient capacity to grind flour for this, as well as for the Penitentiaries of St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester, has been fitted up in one end of the Insane Asylum building. It will go into operation as soon as the steam from the new boiler-house can be introduced to set the machinery in motion. The warden expects that a goodly amount will be saved yearly by manufacturing the supply of flour on the premises."

I believe the Warden has very good judgment on these matters, and he has been very persistent in expressing his belief that a considerable saving would be effected in this way. This was done for the purpose of utilizing a portion of the building which was not wanted for other purposes. There was a stone building built, and all they had to do was to put in the machinery.

Mr. BLAKE. They had just put up the building.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was built as an Insane Asylum, but the whole building was not wanted for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that it is an admirable place for a mill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the addition of \$400 to the warden's salary, I do not think the hon. Minister of Justice would have given that if it were illegal, as the hon. gentleman suggests. I fancy that he satisfied himself that he had a right to recommend the addition of this small sum. It is quite true that the warden has a house, but it is also true that this is the largest penitentiary we have, containing the greatest number of prisoners, and is, I think, managed in the most economical manner; and, I think, as a sort of reward for his being the oldest officer of the kind, and his great efficiency, it is no more than right that he should receive this encouragement for his long, faithful and able management of that institution. The hon. gentleman objects to some small

Mr. BLAKE.

sums which have been added to the salaries of the officers. The warden's clerk gets an advance of \$100 because he is an efficient officer, and has been there for some time. Some of the keepers and other officers receive an addition of \$50 each to their salaries, I suppose, as being in the light of a statutory increase, although they are not, strictly speaking, civil servants, but they are substantially and practically civil servants, and they have got this \$50 increase as it is given to other civil servants. I presume these are the reasons for making these small additions. The \$500 for the miller speaks for itself. The hon. gentleman says the responsibility has diminished. Well, it has diminished this year, I fancy, in consequence of the superabundance of convicts who overflowed from some of the other penitentiaries—from Montreal and from Dorchester—and when transferred temporarily to Kingston. There were 217 released on the expiration of their sentence last year, and in consequence of the prosperity of the country there has been less crime than usual. I will try to get some further information to satisfy the enquiring mind of my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has had grace enough to confess that he has not explained the item. He talks about little increases. These little increases amount to \$4,360 in one year in one institution, or about 11 per cent. He has also laid down the proposition that to persons not in the inside department of the service he is going to apply the \$50 statutory increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, he said that they ought to be put on a fair footing with the others. How high are you going to put a guard? These men have had their salaries fixed for several years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman alluded to the \$50 increase, and if we are to understand that this rule is to be extended, we had better have it regulated in some way. I contend that there is nothing in the condition of the institution or the country to justify these increases. The maximum salary of any warden, under the law, is \$2,600. The hon. gentleman gave no explanation as to the vote out of which the mill was built. It is very important that we should know, after the vote had been taken, and the hon. Minister had declared that it had not been expended, how it is that the mill has been built after all.

28. St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... \$83,546.36

Mr. BLAKE. Here, again, we are face to face with a number of increases. The salaries have been increased at the rate, not of 11 per cent. in this case, but of 6 and 7 per cent., an average of \$2,770 upon the existing salaries, comparing the salaries in force last year with those of the same officials this year, or an increase of \$2,770 on a total of \$36,840. The staff is a large one and always has been, compared with other penitentiaries and compared with the number of convicts. The maintenance has also increased very largely. I pointed out last year that while the maintenance of the penitentiary at Kingston was, on an average of \$70.29 per convict, that of St. Vincent de Paul was \$33.33, or \$13 a head more than at Kingston. But while the cost at Kingston has been increased to \$74.70 per head, that at St. Vincent de Paul has been increased to \$93.80, or \$10 over last year—that is, \$23 over the cost of Kingston last year, or \$18.50 over that of Kingston this year, about 25 per cent. more. It is alleged, therefore, that to maintain a convict at St. Vincent de Paul—not counting the cost of the officials—but simply the cost of maintenance, rations, clothes, fuel, light, and medical attendance, &c., cost one-fourth more than at Kingston, and an aggregate of \$93.80 per head as compared with \$33.33 last year. Some explana-



tion should be given of these things. An attempt has been made to cut down this estimate by omitting another which generally appears and should appear, that of gratuities, for which no vote is taken this year. Something of this kind is always expected to take place, and it is not a reasonable way of forcing a less unfavorable balance to omit a vote which experience indicates to us must be used in the course of the year. Even when that course is taken and the working expenses, as they are called, are attempted to be reduced by a considerable amount, you find the total expenditure nearly the same. Though there is a slight reduction of one-eighth in the number of convicts, 350 as against 400, it does not appear that this any more than Kingston—indeed, I may say with reference to the maintenance, this much less than Kingston—is a satisfactory estimate for the maintenance of this penitentiary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary has always been more expensive, comparatively, than that at Kingston. That, however, to a certain extent, must be the case, because a certain amount of staff and organization must be kept up whether the number of convicts is large or small; that is, in the smaller penitentiaries, there is a greater amount of comparative expenses than in the larger. It is true there has been, in years past, a considerable amount of extravagance, but that is now in the process of being remedied. The new warden, under the new arrangement—he has not been long in office—has caused very considerable improvement and economy. I see, in the Inspector's report, there is a reduction of \$2,025 made in the seven months of his administration, and that great economy is being exercised. The expenditure on food, of course, varies greatly according to current prices, and there may be local circumstances and causes to account for the difference. I can well understand that the price of food and clothing in Manitoba is larger than at Kingston or at St. Vincent de Paul, and in consequence of the rise in the price of wages and the value of labor generally, it was found necessary to increase the salaries of the keepers and guards in order to have good men. Wages have increased all over the country, and the people pressed for increases of salary, which the responsible officers thought it expedient to give them.

Mr. BLAKE. If the result of the successful administration of the last two or three years of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, and that improved condition which the hon. gentleman says now exists, as compared with its previous condition, are to be proved by these Estimates, I am afraid they belie his assertions. If that economy and improved arrangements involve an increase of \$10 per head in the maintenance of the convicts, I would rather have a little extravagance and mismanagement. We find that a certain increase in Kingston has been followed by an increase of more than double the amount in St. Vincent de Paul, on maintenance alone. The hon. gentleman says the smaller the penitentiary the greater the *per capita* cost. I referred to that when I made an estimate of the whole cost, including the cost of the officials; but if it does not apply to the cost of rations, fuel, light, &c., how imperfect an answer that is, is proved by simply referring to the Dorchester Penitentiary, which has 130 convicts, as against 350 in St. Vincent de Paul. Yet the cost there is but \$67.50 per head, as against \$93.10 in the latter, so that the smaller the penitentiary the smaller the cost. In the matter of rations, clothes, &c., in a penitentiary the size of St. Vincent de Paul, there is very little economy *per capita* to be obtained by increasing the number, for 350 or 400 convicts can be maintained, as regards fuel, clothing, lights, medical attendance, &c., as economically *per capita* as if you had 1,000. There is really no explanation why this increase should be so great. It is true the Inspector criticises in a somewhat humorous manner in his report the statement of this Warden,

and administers to him a slight snub with reference to his statement that the expenditure will be greater for 1882-83, owing to the fact that the supplies contracted for are dearer, though awarded to the lowest tendering parties. If that be the case, the price of supplies ought not to raise very much more in the neighborhood of St. Vincent de Paul than in the neighborhood of Kingston, but we find a ratio of increase for the St. Vincent de Paul, more than double per head the increase over Kingston, and that piled up upon a considerable increase over the year before. With reference to the salaries of employes, it must be remembered that they have certain other advantages; several of them have houses at St. Vincent de Paul, and I do not think that even if their present salaries were retained, they could be induced to quit their situations.

29. Dorchester Penitentiary..... \$15,856.00

Mr. BLAKE. In this case also we find an increase in expenditures on the staff. The accountant has an increase of \$100; there is an increase of \$100 for the chaplains, of \$50 for the steward, of \$40 for the hospital keeper, \$150 for the guard shoemaker, \$50 each for three keepers, \$50 each for eighteen guards, \$50 for the messenger, \$600 for the farmer, \$300 for the teamster. In this case also we find the matrons and deputy-matrons reappearing. It was stated last year on Concurrence that the Government would take into consideration a plan for the removal of female prisoners to some other point; Kingston was the point suggested. At that time a matron, receiving a salary of \$500, and a deputy-matron receiving a salary of \$300, each of them enjoying quarters in the prison, with other incidental advantages, were employed to take charge of two other women, convicts. Since that time, I believe, three more have come in, so at the time of the report there were five female convicts. It was deemed absurd to keep up a separate organization for so few convicts, and that as the female convicts of Quebec were sent to Kingston, there was no reason why the female convicts of the Maritime Provinces should not also be sent to Kingston. The Government conceded the view that a change ought to take place. No change, however, has taken place, and I call for explanations on that subject; and I also ask for the reasons why these other increases have been made. I find the rate of maintenance last year to be a little under 67½ cts., and therefore a very low rate relatively to St. Vincent de Paul, and low relatively to Kingston, a rate which evidences how very cheap the Province of New Brunswick is to live in, or how very extravagant the affairs of the other penitentiaries are conducted in this regard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards the small increase of salaries I will be able, on Concurrence, to give fuller information. The hon. gentleman wants the female convicts to be sent away to other penitentiaries; he, however, admits that it is cheaper to maintain convicts at Dorchester than it is at Kingston, therefore, it is economy to keep them at Dorchester. Besides, the number of women convicts will likely increase. These women servants are more valuable at Dorchester than at Kingston; I suppose they do work in the wash-room. However, I will read the report of the Inspector on that subject:

"The Matron states that the conduct of the female prisoners 'has been very satisfactory.' They have been employed at prison house work, making their own clothing and mending for male prisoners. The number has increased from two to five since my last report. This would warrant the Department to continue the female convicts here, as the work they perform is very necessary, and its assessed value makes a favorable offset to the expense of their maintenance. Neither the revenue nor the administration of the penitentiary is in any worse condition now, as regards the female convicts being at Dorchester, than when they were at Halifax and St. John. Then, two matrons and two deputy matrons were employed to look after, during most of the time, from 1872 till 1880, a comparatively smaller number of convicts, than are at the present time taken care of by a Matron and her deputy. When the expense of transfer and the value of the female prisoners' work to Dorchester Penitentiary are taken into account, the gain or advantage

of taking them to Kingston would not amount to much. Later on, it may be advisable to adopt this course; but, just now, there does not appear to be any necessity for a change in existing arrangements."

That is the reason given for retaining them there instead of transferring them elsewhere. As regards the matron and deputy-matron they hold their appointments, and it is not usual, I think, to dismiss people who have served for years without either putting them on either a gratuity or pension, or some means of supporting themselves. The matron, I know, was an old and deserving servant, and I fancy that her training there for so many years has not specially adapted her to employ her services profitably to herself elsewhere. It would be hard to turn her out after having once been appointed. I dare say, when she disappears that one woman will be sufficient to perform the services required.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister has adopted the argument of the Inspector of Penitentiaries, and he has added some arguments of his own. He says, as I have pointed out, that it is cheaper living at Dorchester than at Kingston, therefore, it would be saving expense to keep these five females at Dorchester rather than at Kingston. I pointed out what the expense was at the two places. I pointed out that at Dorchester it was about \$67.50 a year, and at Kingston about \$74.70, by the present estimate, or a difference of \$7 a year in favor of Dorchester. In order that we may secure a saving of \$40 we pay salaries to a matron and deputy-matron, without considering residence and perquisites, and without considering the difficulties and inconveniences occasioned by having a female wing for two or three convicts, thus taking away a large portion of the prison wanted for male convicts; and we thus expend \$800 in order to save \$40.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is the cost of transport.

Mr. BLAKE. But how many female convicts would be sent up each year? If you take the statistics of the country and find how many out of the population of Quebec are sent to St. Vincent de Paul, and then transferred to Kingston; how many come from Ontario, with its 2,000,000 of people—and it must be assumed that the state of morality amongst females is as high in the Maritime Provinces as in the other Provinces—the hon. gentleman must come to the conclusion that there will not be an appreciable number of female convicts to be sent up here. The Inspector says there is no sufficient cause to make this change now, but that hereafter it may be necessary. The mending of the male convicts' clothes will not serve as an excuse for the present state of things. The truth is, it is a mistake. We built Dorchester Penitentiary with a view to economise and have a better system generally adopted, and to suggest, as the Inspector does, that because the state of things is no worse than it was when the old penitentiaries at St. John and Halifax were in operation, when the Provinces were obliged to keep a matron and deputy-matron in each of them, is absurd and is imposing on our intelligence. What we want is a reason why reorganization should not take place.

30. Manitoba Penitentiary..... \$32,233.90

Mr. BLAKE. The boom is here, if it is not anywhere else in Manitoba. There is no doubt whatever that there is a grand swell in the prosperity of this penitentiary. The maintenance last year reached \$111.36 for each convict, for that country is progressive as the hon. Minister of Agriculture says his Department is, and as a consequence the cost this year is to be \$123.97 per head. Is it going to cost so much more to maintain the free men outside of the penitentiary in Manitoba, as it is going to cost for those inside? Is the cost of living increasing there, instead of diminishing? What is the reason we find over \$120 per head as cost of maintenance for a convict in the Manitoba Penitentiary, twice as much as the cost at Dorchester. The chief keeper's salary has been increased by \$100; the guards' salaries are also increased.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; there are two additional guards.

Mr. BLAKE. These guards were paid at a high rate before, and I observe their salaries are the same, but the number is increased. It may be necessary to increase the number of this staff slightly, because I see an increased number of convicts is estimated for, and it is possible two more guards may be required, though I hardly see the necessity for them. It is to be presumed the original difficulty with respect to the imperfection of the walls surrounding the prison have been by this time overcome. I know not how that may be. I desire to know what is the principle on which the maintenance of a convict in the Manitoba Penitentiary reaches nearly \$124; is it the fact that the cost of living is higher this year than last? They do not use any agricultural implements there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume that the estimate of last year was inadequate; hence the necessity for increasing the estimate for this year. I take it that the cost of living varies very much up there, that the cost of clothing, of food and of all appliances has been hitherto much higher than in the older Provinces. I hope we will find in another year that the cost of maintaining the convicts will be very much decreased. At the opening of navigation we will have steamers running to Thunder Bay, and a railway from there to the penitentiary in fact, and supplies will be forwarded at reasonable rates. At all events we will get competition, and the cost of transportation will be materially reduced. The increase in the number of guards is probably owing to the unprotected state of the building. I am not able to say whether any extra wall has yet been built, the lack of which has been assigned as a reason for keeping up a strong body of guards. There was a revolt there not long ago, a very serious one, when the convicts nearly overpowered their keepers, and it is, perhaps, in consequence of that outbreak we propose these two additional guards.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman expects that the cost of living will be very much decreased this year, because, he says, that during the approaching season a railway will be opened from Thunder Bay, and there will be competition. But it is for this very season we are estimating. The railway is to be opened in May, navigation in June, and these estimates are for the financial year, 30th June, 1883, to 30th June, 1884. Therefore, perhaps, the hon. gentleman will reduce the items, as he admits that the cost of living will be decreased with the opening of navigation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The prison authorities, I suppose, estimated on the prices existing at the time the estimate was made, and, perhaps, with reference to the contract of last year. I hope that my anticipations are fulfilled, and that this estimate will be found too large next year, as last year it was too small. It does no harm to have the estimate.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says the estimate is made on present prices. This reminds me of what happened when I occupied that position. I found the estimate very high, and sent to know the reason why. The answer of the officer was that he based the estimates on the expectation that there was about to be an European war, which would raise the prices.

31. British Columbia.....\$21,706.83

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate my hon. friends from that Province on the fact now demonstrated, that it is cheaper to live there, at any rate, than in Manitoba, because maintenance is something under \$90, for the British Columbia Penitentiary, although the number of convicts is slightly less than it is in the Prairie Province; but here I find several increases. For these seventy convicts, of whom, if I rightly

remember—it certainly was so in my own time—a very large proportion were heathen Chinese; their spiritual welfare is to be attended to on a more extended scale, at any rate as far as remuneration is concerned, though hitherto that was not found so necessary. In my time we simply availed ourselves of the services of ministers of religion in that neighborhood, giving them a certain engagement to attend to those who were not Chinese. We could conduct this rather economically; but the hon. gentleman proposes that two chaplains shall receive \$500 each. I would like to know what has rendered this charge necessary. Then there are increases in the salaries of the warden, deputy-warden and chief keeper, each of \$200. The surgeon has an increase of \$100, though I do not see why this should be; and there are two more guards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two chaplains provided for in the Penitentiary Bill—I presume; one Protestant, and one Roman Catholic.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there is any Chinese chaplain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was about to say, I do not know of any Chinese clergyman, or Bonze there; but the salary is the same as in Manitoba, \$500. The fact of the matter is, that we must have in all penitentiaries Catholic and Protestant chaplains.

Mr. BLAKE. We have had them before in the penitentiaries for years. I am not objecting to that; but to the increases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no increase. In British Columbia, the salaries are put on the same basis as in Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. Do you know why? Because there is an increase in Manitoba too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The two chaplains evidently heretofore received \$300 each, and now they get \$500, being put on a par with the chaplains in the other penitentiaries.

Mr. BLAKE. What other?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend brings down two estimates the same evening, and proposes to increase the chaplains' salaries in Manitoba to \$500 each or to \$1,000, and then says, it is reasonable to increase them in British Columbia, because they ought to be on a par with those of Manitoba.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; at the Dorchester Penitentiary the two chaplains get \$550 each, and I am quite surprised that the chaplains in British Columbia have not asked for a corresponding increase. They have to work as hard to save souls as the chaplains in the other penitentiaries—especially as it is part of their duty to try and convert the heathen Chinese. They ought to get a special allowance for that.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a very great difference in their situation. The number of Chinese was very large in proportion in my time. I fancy they were in a considerable majority. I would not be surprised to find that there were not more than twenty or twenty-five of other faiths in the penitentiary, and it is ridiculous to speak of the services of ministers of religion having charge of ten or twelve convicts, compared with chaplains having charge of sixty or seventy convicts. The services rendered are entirely different.

Mr. HOMER. One-third of the whole number are Chinese. I would like to know why the warden of the British Columbia Penitentiary gets only \$1,400, while the Manitoba warden receives \$2,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is another instance of better terms for British Columbia. I will inform the

Minister of Justice of the complaint made, that injustice is done to British Columbia; and I have no doubt, that if he has not the fear of the hon. member from West Durham before his eyes, he will perhaps increase the salary; but after the scathing criticisms passed on the Minister of Justice by the hon. gentleman opposite, I do not know that he will venture to do justice to British Columbia.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The officers in the other penitentiaries are paid higher salaries than is the case in British Columbia; I think myself the living is quite as high in British Columbia as it is in any other part of the Dominion. I think the officers are entitled to be paid at the same rate, and I sincerely trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down there will be an amount placed in them for that purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I rather think that the officers get their rations in the penitentiary.

22. Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate. \$56,733.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why this increase in the expenditure for the Senate? I notice there is a large increase for salaries. The Assistant Clerk of the French Journals, and the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, has an increase of \$100; the Assistant Clerk of Private Bills, and Clerk, \$100; Postmaster, \$200; the Housekeeper, \$200; the Speaker's Messenger, \$100; there is an additional permanent Messenger, \$500, and an increase of \$100 to the House carpenter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that either the Finance Minister or any of us here can control these matters, as they are settled by the Senate Committee on Contingencies. The requirements of that House are communicated to the Minister of Finance, and all he has to do is to put them in the Estimates. He cannot control them or cut them down, and whatever we may think of them here, or any person may think, I do not suppose my hon. friend would want to get up a war between the two Houses by intermeddling with their quiet little additions of \$100 here or \$100 there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand that they pay a higher rate than we do in this end to officers who perform the same functions. Does not the hon. gentleman think that the Government should interfere in such cases? Even their messengers are paid 50 cts. a day more than ours.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has always been the case, and I am sorry that it has been so. The spirit is somewhat the same as that exhibited by an hon. member from any one of the Provinces when he insists that the salaries paid to the officers in that Province shall be the same as those paid to similar officers in the other Provinces. They regard it as a matter of Provincial dignity. I am bound to say that I think the officers of the Senate are fully paid, and more than fully paid, comparing their salaries with our officers, and their work with the duties which our officers perform. But we cannot well help it; I myself think, and I have suggested, that there should be a Joint Committee of both Houses to regulate these matters, and that as much as possible they should be officers of Parliament and not officers of one House or the other. I think considerable economy might be practiced in that way. I suppose the Senate, as an independent branch of the Legislature, prefers to retain the control and management of their own expenses, and I do not see very well how we can interfere, except by an expression of opinions, by the leading hon. members of the House—which, of course, they will read and ponder over—pointing out that while the work is much easier, the salaries are as large or, in some cases, larger. As my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) has pointed out, even the messengers are paid more, and they certainly have not near as much or as hard work to do as

our people have. They do not sit so late, and the messengers, pages—every person connected with the House of Commons is much harder worked, and is obliged to work for longer hours and for a greater number of days in the year during the Session, and after prorogation, than the corresponding officers of the Senate.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has not some control over his colleagues in the Government in the other end, so that he might exercise some control over the salaries which are paid in the Senate. For instance, their Assistant Clerk get, \$2,800; our Assistant, \$2,400. I notice to, that although their hours are so short, their Sergeant-at-Arms gets \$1,200, and the deputy, whose duties were so onerous that his salary had to be increased by \$100, receives \$1,000. The Postmaster, whose duties are not, I should think, very onerous, gets an increase of \$200, and if I am not misinformed he also keeps a small dry goods store in one corner of the Post Office for the accommodation of hon. members of the Senate. The housekeeper, whose duties are not very laborious, one would say, also gets an increase of \$200, and why the Speaker's messenger should receive an addition of \$100 to his salary I cannot see. If I remember rightly the utterances of the present Speaker of the Senate, I should suppose he was an exceedingly economical man. I think he once said that the expenditure of the various Departments of this Government were as much under the control of the Minister as were his household expenses, but here we find the salary of his own messenger increased by \$100. This officer must be under his control to a certain extent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose he is.

Mr. ROSS. He is the Speaker's messenger; there can be no doubt about it. Then the Senators themselves, whose time is not spent very steadily in their Chamber, must have an additional messenger at a salary of \$800. I was inquisitive enough to enquire how hard these Senators have worked during the present Session, and I found that since the House met they have sat thirty-two days. We met on Thursday, February 8th, and the Senate adjourned, after an hour's sitting, to the following Monday, and on that day they sat for three hours. Since the Senate began its duties, their sittings have averaged about one and a-half hours a day. They adjourned over the Ontario Elections—why, I cannot say; and, if I am not mistaken, some of the hon. members of the Senate, during that contest, entered into the political arena. I think one distinguished Senator visited the city of Brantford, and did yeoman service for the Conservative party. I do not know, but, perhaps, he is non-political—perhaps he did not speak in favor of the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature—but he certainly took part in the election. Another Senator visited the county of Huron, and in order to make it convenient for them to go on these political peregrinations the whole business of the Senate must be stopped, forsooth, in order that they might take part in a political contest. After the Elections they came back and worked for fourteen days, then they adjourned over Easter for nearly two weeks; and so exhaustive were their labors during the Ontario Elections that when they met on the 1st of March, after the contest, they remained in Session for exactly ten minutes, no doubt being completely worn out with the duties they were discharging for the people of the country. More than that; I think the present Speaker of the Senate argued in 1878 that Canada should be kept for the Canadians. But, if I am not wrongly informed, that hon. gentleman sat for his portrait, not before a Canadian artist, but before an Old Country artist, and, under the vivid imagination of the painter, the picture assumed such herculean proportions that no place in the corridors or the lobbies of those buildings, or in the Departments, is capacious enough to enable that portrait to be exposed, and it had to be placed in the Speaker's own room. Now, why should we expend

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

\$489 on a portrait which is to be excluded from the vulgar public gaze and to be hidden away in the Speaker's room, where it can be viewed only by those who have the *entree* to his chamber? I would ask further: Why did not that distinguished gentleman engage a Canadian artist, as is done in the case of Speakers' portraits generally? Our ex-Speaker, a most presentable man anywhere, had his portrait painted by a Canadian artist, and it cost \$100 less than the other. The artist was a Canadian artist. That was encouraging a Canadian industry—a very desirable one. But hon. gentlemen opposite, represented by the Speaker of the Senate, and a member of the Government, could not encourage this native industry; he, forsooth, could not submit to this indignity of having his features preserved for posterity by a Canadian artist, but he must seek for a foreigner. Is this fair? I fancy that this and other items which I need not enumerate, account for a portion of this increase. I think we should not only express our dissatisfaction with this particular act of the Speaker of the Senate, but that we should express in the strongest terms our disapprobation of members of the Senate interfering in Provincial Elections. I think it is not their place to do it. In England, the members of the House of Lords do not interfere with the Elections for the Commons. True, this was not for the Commons; but Senators occupy, or claim to occupy, a judicial position, and to be in an atmosphere above that of ordinary party warfare. Now, what will be the effect on the community of these Senators entering the political arena, and giving the weight of their senatorial positions to the statements they make. I think it is entirely wrong, and I for one cannot express too strongly or too plainly my disapprobation of that course, and I hope that that expression, even from so humble a member as myself, will have its weight with the Senate. If they play the part of partisans, and engage in the party struggles of the day, as we know some of them have done, what confidence can we have in their judgment in the Senate? We shall have to regard Senators as marked with the same stripe as members of the Commons; if the Senate is to occupy in the country a non-partisan position we want these Senators to abstain from interfering in the Local Elections, and I hope this expression of opinion will, as I have said, have its due weight.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have rather strayed away from the vote here before the House. This is a vote for the salaries and contingencies of the Senate, and I think if Dr. Playfair had been in your position, Mr. Chairman, he would have called the hon. gentleman to order for straying away so far from the subject before us. I will leave the Senate to read the amusing speech and badinage of the hon. gentleman opposite; but when he speaks of the present Speaker of the Senate, my colleague, the hon. Mr. Macpherson, I am quite satisfied that he is as economically inclined in every possible way as the hon. gentleman opposite. One of the messengers is detailed to attend to the Speaker's room, but the Speaker has no more to do with his salary than with that of any other messenger. It is fixed by the Committee on Contingencies, and if the hon. gentleman had been behind the door when these matters were discussed—I was not there—but I have no doubt he would have heard the Speaker contend for economy, and perhaps speak against some of these increases. I am quite surprised that the hon. gentleman, who is a man of letters, a man of classical knowledge, as he showed the other day, a man trained to the humane arts, should go out of his way to object to any gentleman sitting for his portrait to the portrait painter he fancies. The hon. gentleman's objection is quite in the style of Sam Slick, who said: "I went to Italy and I saw old smoked, dried-up pictures there that were worth five or six thousand dollars; why I can get new ones painted on my clocks, with new paints and new gildings, at five dollars a head." That is just the spirit in which

the hon. gentleman makes these unfair and unworthy remarks.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry that Canadian artists are hardly to be compared to those mechanical artists who painted Sam Slick's clocks, and that this is one native industry that does not receive encouragement from the Administration of the day. The hon. gentleman has raised a serious question. He has not only invited my hon. friend behind the door, but he has brought us all behind the scenes, and he has told us that the extravagance, which he admits prevails in the conduct of affairs in the other branch of the Legislature, is due, in effect, to the Committee on Contingencies, in which, he says, his colleague protested and complained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, he said that if the hon. gentleman had been behind the door, he would have heard the voice of the Speaker of the Senate exclaiming: "Do not add that to the salary of my messenger; remember my speeches throughout the country; remember the pamphlets I have written; remember the attacks I have made on the other side; I beg, I pray of you not to put me in a false position." And then he would have heard the Committee trying to drown the voice of the Speaker, and insisting on the increase which the hon. gentleman does not propose to defend but to laugh through the House. Now, we had a Contingency Committee here, and we abolished it, and appointed a Commission of Internal Economy, who were responsible to the House, and prepared the items with the assistance of the Speaker. Why cannot the hon. gentleman who possesses so much influence in the other Chamber, suggest to the unfortunate Speaker, who is so overborne in this Committee, that his policy cannot prevail in the matter of the Estimates, to introduce into the Senate the reform that was admitted a few years ago here, and have a Commission of Internal Economy to regulate these affairs there, so that Governmental responsibility might be introduced into the Estimates there, as here? It appears to me that the statement that the hon. gentleman has given us of the mode by which, in defiance of the hon. gentleman's colleague, these Estimates are made up, leads inevitably to that conclusion. Now, I am not disposed to blame the Senate very much for the short hours they have occupied this Session. It is well known that their business depends on the assiduity of this House; it is well known that the great bulk of the measures are initiated here, and until they reach the Senate, there is very little for that body to do; it is well known that the hon. gentleman's policy in this House—in this respect progressive, although in other respects we call it retrogressive—has been to postpone to as late a day as possible, the business of this House, and this Session this has been done to a greater extent than before. The conditions to which I have referred render it impossible they should have the late sittings we have. The great portion of their work is condensed into a small space at the end of the Session. It does seem a serious thing that our sessional messengers, who work sixteen hours a day on an average, should receive less than the messengers of the Senate, who have but short hours—ours receiving \$2 per day, and those of the Senate \$2.50 per day. The hon. gentleman this evening defended one extravagance by another. He raises the salary of one chaplain, and then asks if we can be so unreasonable as to require another to take a less sum; yet we find one particular class of officers, who work during long sittings, receiving less than others, who are engaged only during short sittings. This is a small matter, but it pervades, more or less, the whole estimate. I rather prefer to address myself to the question, whether the ordinary economy of the Senate should not be managed by the free action of that Chamber, guided, of course, by those who guide its deliberations ordinarily, on the same principle as

we manage ours. That would be attended with beneficial results, and save the hon. gentleman those painful scenes and unavailing remonstrances to which he has referred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised at the attempts which hon. gentlemen opposite have made to do that which they have never been able to find any of their friends or supporters, either in the press or the other branch of the Legislature, to do. The remark which has just fallen from the hon. gentleman gives us the "true inwardness," if I may venture to use a slang expression, of his attack on the Speaker of the Senate. That hon. gentleman had the misfortune to write a pamphlet which had an important effect at the time the people were suffering from the serious misgovernment of hon. gentlemen opposite. They know that the hon. gentleman occupying the high position of Speaker of the Senate is a man of great ability, who was able to exercise on a very important occasion very patent influence in bringing about a great change in public sentiment which led to the overthrow of the late Government. These hon. gentlemen have had the press in their hands to as great an extent as had Mr. Macpherson. They had their friends and supporters to meet and answer those statements. They had able colleagues in the Senate, when that hon. gentleman took the responsibility of vindicating the opinions he gave utterance to through the press, and they failed to find one prepared to meet the hon. gentleman, either in the press or in the Senate, and discuss that question in such a way as would vindicate their position. It is unworthy of the hon. gentlemen to take an opportunity of making an assault on a gentleman who is not here to answer them. It would have been more becoming on their part, to have endeavored to find some friends of their own, seated in the same branch in the Parliament of the country, face to face with the hon. gentleman, to raise this question. I do not rise for the purpose of drawing attention to that, nor of alluding to the anxiety hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have that the artists of this country should not have an opportunity of having occasionally brought before them the work of artists of the Old Country. I do not think it is any discredit to Canadian artists to say it is quite possible to teach them something in the way of portrait painting, or that it is at all out of the way that they should occasionally study the works of masters in their art, who have enjoyed far greater and wider opportunities than they. Indeed, without any reflection on them, it is not at all to be regretted that an opportunity should be taken of handing down, not only one of the ablest public men of Canada, to posterity, but of handing down the portrait of a gentleman whose physical and personal appearance is such as to be a source of pride to present and future Canadians, who will have an opportunity of looking upon it. I will touch the only important points raised by either of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I mean, first, the point raised by the hon. member for Middlesex, that a Senator is violating his position, is dishonoring the high position he occupies, by entering the political arena and taking part in a General Election. I join issue with the hon. gentleman on this point. There is no man in this country who holds a position so high, in my judgment, save him who is placed in the position of chief executive head of the country, that does not do honor to himself and good to the country by giving the people the benefit of his advice, whether through the press or on the platform, with reference to the administration of public affairs; nor did hon. gentlemen opposite find there was anything derogatory to the character of a Senator in taking part in popular elections when the hon. Mr. Scott, the able leader of the Government in the Senate, went, as is well known, into the popular arena and used all the influence he could exercise in controlling the popular elections. So far from finding fault with him, I say that a Senator, holding strong views on public questions, is bound to use the talents God has given

him in the most open and best way he can to promote what he believes to be good for the country. Is there any man in England who takes a more active public part in influencing public elections than Lord Salisbury, going from one part of the British Islands to another to deal with the public questions of the day in a most vigorous and trenchant manner? In doing so he is no exception. It is well known that the most distinguished peers of the realm are in the habit of taking the most active part in influencing public opinion of their utterances both on the platform and in Parliament. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman had no right to raise that question. The hon. gentleman spoke of adjourning the Senate. It was adjourned for a time without any material hindrance to the progress of public business. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that in the Province of Ontario, his great exemplar, the person whose example he considers more important than any other, adjourned, I believe, the whole Parliament of Ontario for the purpose of taking part in the Dominion Elections of 1874. I think, under these circumstances, it is hardly worth while for the hon. gentleman to have made an onslaught on the Speaker of the Senate, and on the principle of Senators taking part in public elections, when the fact is notorious to the whole country that the hon. gentleman's friends in the Senate have used all the influence and power they possessed in the same direction and in the same way. Now, I want to say one word with reference to the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition as to this reform which he considers it the duty of the Government to bring about. I want to know why the hon. gentleman did not avail himself of the opportunity when he was in great distress, when his great difficulty was his unwillingness to belong to a Reform party who could find nothing to reform. The demand was as great as it is now, the Contingent Committee of the Senate bore as little reverence to the views of the Government of the day as they do now, there was as great a disparity between the salaries of the officers of the Senate down to the messengers, and the officers of this, as there is now; but the hon. gentleman's Government did not commit themselves, great as the necessity was, and did not undertake to put in practice what he now so strongly urges upon this Government to do. I imagine the difficulty would be precisely the same as would have met the hon. gentleman if the Government of my hon. friend who then led the Government, and who did not undertake it simply because he did not wish to bring about any conflict between the two Houses, which, after all, would be comparatively insignificant, if it was going at all to interfere with the harmonious working of the two branches of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. What I suggested to the hon. gentleman was, that in a body over which he had a greater control than he has even of this body, he should use that influence which he had from the fact that he has the political sympathy and support of the vast majority of this body, to introduce a reform in its administration similar to that which he was introducing here. The hon. Minister of Railways asks me why my hon. friend from East York—who never had a majority in the Senate, who never had control of that body, whose difficulty always was that one of the great legislative bodies of this country had been created by his adversaries—why he did not make use of the advantages which he did not possess, to do what I suggested to the hon. gentleman, that, under entirely different circumstances he should do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, if the hon. gentleman opposite did not succeed in his measures, neither did he try. He should have tried. The responsibility of not trying rests upon his Government; and if his measure, through his influence in the Lower House, was carried and presented to the Upper House, and was then thrown out, then the responsibility of throwing it out rested on the Upper House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman suggest that such a measure as that should not have been introduced into the Lower House, but in the Senate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The expenditure of public money is completely in control of this House, as much as it is in the other—there is not the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that such a measure as the one alluded to could only be carried by a Government having control of the Senate. The hon. gentleman himself, and any other hon. member of this House, would have denounced a Government for introducing a measure of that kind without first having it introduced in the Senate. Besides, we have abundant opportunity of knowing that, from the first, there was not a measure passed without evincing the hostility the Senate bore to the Government. It constituted itself into a political convention for the prosecution of Ministers for the time being. It was their entire occupation, for several Sessions, holding Committee meetings, sending abroad documents calculated to deceive, to one of which the hon. Minister of Railways has alluded, a pamphlet full of false statements—and flagrant and fraudulent statements. The hon. gentleman will remember, no doubt, that there was a second pamphlet issued to influence the Ontario Elections, but the people at once said they had had enough of Mr. Macpherson's pamphlets. The former ones were so bad that the last one was never looked at—or, if it was looked at, it was only for the purpose of influencing votes in favor of Mr. Mowat. The issue of the pamphlet had the effect of giving Mr. Mowat a majority he never expected. With regard to the expenditure of the Senate, I think this House has good reason to complain of some of the items, of the enormous amount spent in interior decorations and preparations for dinners, and everything of that kind. There has been nothing of the kind at this end of the House. I was obliged several times, while sitting on that side of the House, to call attention to some items in the Estimates, regarding the Senate expenditure. The hon. gentleman, now, must not be surprised if the items are brought up for discussion, and discussed calmly and carefully, as they have been, I think. The hon. member for West Middlesex, discussed the matter with perfect calmness, and in a very moderate tone. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government admitted that there was cause of complaint, and it is the business of this branch of the Legislature to discuss these matters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; but the hon. gentleman will not move a finger except to condole with his friends, the President of the Council or the Speaker of the Senate—to condole with the latter in his attempts to control the expenditure of the Upper House when he was not able to accomplish it. Now, Sir, we have before us the fact that a body of this Legislature—I admit equal with this in every respect as to its legislative power with regard to matters affecting its own interior economy—is making extravagant expenditures. We must exercise some sort of influence upon that body, and if we find that though our own officers and our own messengers do immensely more work than is done in the Senate, they are paid no more than is paid in the Senate, it follows that either our people are underpaid or theirs are overpaid, and a public remonstrance by the members of this House, whether in conversation this way or otherwise, seems to be an absolute necessity. I think that the right hon. gentleman, controlling as he does such an enormous majority in the Senate, has surely control enough to carry some measure of reform in regard to this expenditure. I feel quite certain that if his own colleagues can do nothing there, if he will apply to such men as Senators Bellerose and Trudel, I have no doubt they will aid him to secure the needed reform. In the meantime, I enter my protest as a

member of this House against the expenditure of the Senate as being entirely beyond what the necessities of the case require.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish also to enter my protest against any hon. member of this House describing an English artist as a foreigner. I was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman from East York describe two or three times over a resident and inhabitant of the Mother Country as a foreigner.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will not discuss the matter with the hon. member; but, speaking of portraits, I desire to make a remark which I omitted. Some time ago, when the Speaker of the Upper House was obliged to retire for a time, it became necessary to go through the form of appointing a Speaker by Commission. A gentleman was appointed *pro tem*, until the presiding Speaker was able to resume his duties, and one of his first acts was to get his portrait painted. I do not think he was long enough in office to get his portrait completed; but it was completed within a year afterwards. This is a matter they have no right to do, surely. I will allow the hon. gentleman to take his portrait away with him if he wishes. There is no reason, because he was favored by being chosen by the Government to act two or three weeks when the Speaker was sick, that he should have his portrait painted. You, Sir, as Chairman of the Committee, will have somewhat of a claim to have your portrait painted, and I dare say it would give just as much satisfaction on the walls as does the mass of rubbish which covers them. I would sell the whole lot for \$5; I would put them anywhere; they are a nuisance, and darken our corridors; and besides, who cares for them? Half of these men who have been Speakers, and have had their portraits painted, were not, in any sense, leading public men; some of them were, no doubt, and some of the portraits are of historical interest, but they are very few indeed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman had not the fear of the hon. member for West Durham before his eyes when he called portraits by Canadian artists rubbish, and declared he would sell them at \$5 apiece. That is his idea of the value of Canadian art and Canadian artists. The hon. member has objected to a gentleman who occupied the position of Speaker for a short time, a venerable Senator whose portrait is valuable from his long experience in public life, and the high position he held in his own Province—having his portrait painted. The hon. gentleman objected to this portrait being painted, because he was so short a time Speaker. We have hanging on our walls the portrait of a Speaker who had no right to be Speaker at all; who had no right to be in this House; and there is a solemn decision that he had no right to be in this House, and no right to be Speaker. But we have got the portrait.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We have the further fact, and the hon. gentleman forgot to mention it, that the gentleman referred to was elected twice, and the hon. gentleman failed to oppose his election. I did not say that, as works of art, these pictures on our walls were rubbish. They may be good works of art for anything I know—I am not a great judge of that kind of art, and they may be excellent specimens of artistic painting—but they are no use hanging round our walls. We may have a high opinion of some pictures, and yet may not desire to have them in our drawing rooms. All I object to is filling up our corridors with portraits of men, year after year, in this way. As to the other portrait referred to, what I objected to was, that we were getting two Speakers' portraits painted for one term, and that is certainly not according to our usual practice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is amusing to see the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) becoming excited at Englishmen being termed foreigners. That same gentleman and all who act with him, are continually speaking of a

large body of English manufacturers under that name, and in endeavoring to exclude their products from this country. And more than that, the supporters and defenders of the Government announced, as their policy, and made it a Statute law of the land, that when the Americans made certain reductions in the Tariff we would make the same reductions, while we made no provision in our law with respect to England which takes all our products free.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has made an explicit statement as to fact. He has said that I am in the habit of describing Englishmen as foreigners. I want to know when I ever described Englishmen as foreigners. I wish him to prove his charge. I have never done so, and it would be impossible for me to do so. So far as the Conservative party is concerned with the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I can only say that nothing ever gave me greater pleasure in my life than to hear the applause which greeted the Finance Minister when he first introduced this policy, and when he declared it protected England as against other countries. The applause which greeted that sentiment from this side of the House, showed whether the statement of the hon. gentleman was true or not. But I can understand very well that the hon. gentleman should feel aggrieved, and should feel sore on this matter of the National Policy, and I know very well that his party treat the people of this country worse than foreigners, for they wish to hand over our manufactures body and bones to foreigners, to the people of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who told you so?

Mr. McNEILL. Their whole policy has been that from first to last. That is the system on which they produced their whole theory of the management of the finances, and their whole system with respect to the policy of this country is one which would hand over the manufacturers of this country to the Americans. It is notorious that our manufactures were being killed out by the Americans before the hon. Finance Minister and the Government came to the rescue, and to-day our manufactures are being built up under that fostering National Policy. Hon. gentlemen are now endeavoring, day by day, and hour by hour, to destroy the policy which has been so beneficial to this country and to every young country which has adopted it. The hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, that it is impossible for any country to prosper in manufacturing to any considerable extent unless it adopts a policy of Protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. It is a very simple thing for some hon. members to laugh. I ask the hon. gentleman to mention the name of any such country.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I beg to ask to what item these observations refer.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the point. The question before the Committee has reference to the expenditure of the Senate.

Mr. McNEILL. The point to which I was addressing myself was the accusation with respect to my calling Englishmen foreigners, and I will now address myself to the point if you say it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is foreign to the discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. This discussion has assumed a rather wide range. The hon. First Minister remarked, some little time ago, with reference to the speech of my hon. friend from West Middlesex, that had he been in England, no doubt Mr. Playfair would have called him to order, but then that gentleman would likely have called the right hon. gentleman to order himself, as well as the hon. Minister of Railways, and the speaker who has just spoken. I may be permitted, as all these hon. gentlemen have taken so much

latitude—though I will not enter into the discussion of the National Policy, as my hon. friend from North Bruce did—to refer to one or two points made by the speakers on the opposite side. I take it that Canadian artists will be very much gratified to learn that the hon. First Minister of this Government compares them to men who daub on pictures as on Sam Slick's clock faces, and with the remarks made here by the hon. Minister of Railways, that it was desirable that in one instance, at least, a portrait should be brought here worthy of being looked at and as something to copy after; and that to bring a portrait from England was a very desirable thing, because Canadian artists were not worthy of the name, by imputation; and that then they would have to look at a copy worthy of being considered as a work of art. Then the hon. member for North Bruce showed a tender conscience about having Englishmen characterized as foreigners. I do not wonder at the tender conscience which he exhibits, for probably he felt a twinge of conscience from the fact that, a few nights ago, he here treated these men as aliens and foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will now come to the question, which we have not been within a gunshot of for some hour or more—the contingencies of the Senate. I would be glad, if permitted, to make a few more remarks, however, in relation to the remarks made by these hon. gentlemen. I wish now to call attention to another item—to the fact that the Senate supply themselves with stationery at an expense of \$5,838 per annum, which amounts to \$71 for each Senator. The charge for the same purpose for the House of Commons is \$9,500, or an expense of some \$30 less per head than for the Senate. Now, I do say that the extravagance manifested by these hon. gentlemen of that Chamber ought to be looked after; and every comparison we make between their expenses and the expenses of the House of Commons is most unfavorable to the Senate. I wish to know if their duties are so much more onerous than ours that they do double the correspondence which we do, and if there is any reason why it should cost the Senators about \$30 per head more for stationery allowance than for the House of Commons. It strikes me that \$71 per head for each Senator is a most extravagant and most unjust expenditure under that head, and I call attention to that matter; also to another matter. Here is a reading room maintained for the Senate, to be paid for from the House of Commons. Why should not these appropriations be put together for a reading room for both Assemblies? We could spend then for this purpose \$3,000 and save \$1,000, and have a reading room better than either one which we have to-day; and I think that this suggestion is worthy of consideration. I do not know, indeed, whether these hon. gentlemen would associate with the hon. members of the House of Commons in a common reading room, but that is the only reason which can be assigned for any other arrangement than having one in place of two. Certainly, the distance to travel is only a few feet more for the members of one or either Chamber, and a \$3,000 appropriation would secure a much better room for both than \$4,000 for two rooms. I think that this suggestion is a very practical one, and that my suggestion as to the stationery allowance business ought to be looked after. It is not quite so bad, however, as it is at Washington, where the members of the House of Representatives vote themselves gold pens, dressing cases, writing desks, and libraries, &c., at an expense of \$500 or \$600; but certainly \$71 per head is too much for an ordinary, reasonable, and economical allowance for stationery; and there is something concealed in that, which ought not to be. I am perfectly well aware, that the House of Commons allowance is an extravagant allowance; I know that we make use of more stationery than is necessary, the

Mr. CHARLTON.

stationery and ink given to each member of the House of Commons furnishes three times the amount of stationery which we require in the course of the year; but a nearly double allowance is certainly an act of great extravagance, as is done in the case of the Senate.

33. House of Commons, salaries per Clerk's Estimate. \$61,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see that there is an increase of \$400 in the salary of the Assistant Clerk of the House of Commons. I think that he was paid \$2,000 last year, and I notice that this year the amount is \$2,400. If I mistake not, the Assistant Clerk who sat at the Table last year, Mr. Leprohon, was superannuated at an allowance of \$1,531, I think. His place is worthily filled, I am happy to say, by a gentleman who receives \$400 more than the gentleman who was superannuated; so we have a superannuation charge of \$1,500 and we are paying an additional charge of \$400 to the salary of the present Assistant Clerk, which makes \$1,900 more for this service—

Mr. BLAKE. Then we are paying Piché's superannuation.

Mr. ROSS—than we were paying last year, and then the old Assistant Clerk, who sat at this Table, also receives a superannuation allowance; hence we have two superannuated Assistant Clerks, drawing between them \$3,000 or \$4,000, and an active Assistant Clerk who does the work for \$2,400. Can we get any explanation for this? If I mistake not, Mr. Leprohon is quite as physically able as he was last year. I have met him frequently since the House met, and conversed with him; he looks quite lively and seems quite able and in the full possession of his faculties. I do not think that the House will cordially approve of the superannuation of an efficient officer, who had been long in the service and filled the position worthily, in order that his position might be given to some other gentleman, no matter what his qualifications are. I await an explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The discussion just now is as to the salaries of the House of Commons, but the hon. gentleman is going into the question of the superannuation of previous officers, a separate matter.

Mr. ROSS. It is a cognate subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will be quite ready to discuss it and bring down the papers connected with the superannuation of Mr. Piché, if this is desired, and of Mr. Leprohon too, when the proper time arrives, but that stands quite apart.

Mr. ROSS. I do not know as to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it is quite apart.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You cannot discuss this question without discussing those two cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, you can. The hon. gentleman is quite open to attack the Government for the superannuation of these two officers, and censure it if he thinks proper. They are superannuated and are no longer officers of this House; that is done, and we must take the censure, if we are censurable for the removal of these officers, on the proper course being taken, and the proper notice being given. But the question now is as to the salary of the Clerk Assistant. Mr. Leprohon received \$2,300—\$2,000 as clerk assistant and \$300 as secretary to the Speaker. His successor was appointed first at \$2,000, but it was thought by the Committee on Internal Economy that considering the important duties he had to perform, he should receive \$2,400. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the Senate he will find that the clerk assistant there, with half the work, gets \$2,800.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There is no economy in the arrangement, because the assistant sergeant-at-arms gets



\$300 as secretary to the Speaker, so that the Speaker has his secretary all the same. It seems that it was convenient that the Government should advance the salary of the assistant clerk to \$2,400, and thus make ample provision for him, while the salary of another official was advanced by making him secretary to the Speaker. With regard to the question of the superannuation of Mr. Leprohon, I think it is germane to the question before the House. If there is a grievance, if he has been superannuated to make room for another, that question ought to be discussed and a reason given for it. We know that a certain gentleman did act as Assistant Clerk, and that we never heard any objection as to his efficiency; we see another gentleman at the Table, and we have a right to ask why this departure? What explanation has the hon. gentleman to give for the superannuation of that officer? Was it made with the view of preparing the way for another, or is it justifiable on its merits? If it is justifiable on its merits, then I should suppose that the superannuated officer would have shown some signs of bodily infirmity or unfitness for service. This question of superannuation is becoming a serious one, and I say that the House is bound to examine critically every single case of the kind. I call attention to this matter incidentally at present, but I shall take the opportunity of asking the hon. gentleman for explanations later on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What I stated was that I could not be expected to be drawn into a discussion of this question, which is not germane to the question of whether the Assistant Clerk is receiving too large a salary in getting \$2,400. The hon. gentleman said he wished to discuss this question of superannuation, and I can only tell him that we are ready to discuss it at the proper time. Since I spoke before, my hon. friend beside me has placed in my hands the following letter, dated 1st May, 1882:

"To the Hon. the Commissioners of the Internal Economy of the House of Commons.

"GENTLEMEN,—I beg leave to state that I was advised by my medical attendant to cease all official business and mental occupation and to travel, in order to restore my impaired health, my decreased strength and nervous system, which are seriously affected by a long official life of nearly 40 years in the service of the Legislative Assembly since the union of the two Canadas, and in the service of the House of Commons since the confederation of the several Provinces.

"Under these circumstances, I beg leave to ask the Hon. Commissioners that they may be pleased to recommend my superannuation to the Government.

"I have the honour to be, &c.,

"J. P. LEPROHON,

"Assistant Clerk of the House of Commons."

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that the condition of things which is evidenced by the various entries on the Public Accounts as to the Assistant Clerkship is an unfit subject for comment on the occasion of this vote. As an hon. member has pointed out we have on our books the names of three persons who have filled that office, Mr. Piché, Mr. Leprohon and the present Assistant Clerk. This Government appointed Mr. Leprohon. I forget whether they appointed Mr. Piché, but they appointed Mr. Leprohon, having full experience and knowledge of his fitness for the office. He was in the office for a short time, and I am sorry to learn from the letter which the hon. gentleman has read, that his health failed him, though he certainly did not exhibit, up to the latest period at which he was present at the Table, any failure of his powers, or that he was less fit for the office at the close of his official career than at the commencement. Now, we find that the Government, in making the new appointment, has practically increased the salary very considerably, and that the salary which was paid to Mr. Leprohon, for the combined offices which he filled, was less than that which is now paid for the one officer, while at the same time there has been a charge of some \$1,800 on account of the superannuation of the late Clerk Assistant.

We are sometimes told that though superannuation may cost more, still there is a certain saving, because the new salary is reduced, but in this case the public charge has been increased, first by the superannuation, and secondly by the increased charge consequent upon the superannuation. I think some reasonable explanation of that increased charge should be made.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. First Minister is not very consistent in his remarks. He began by stating that he was prepared to give explanations upon the question of superannuation, but upon that point he has given none. Then he said he was prepared to discuss whether the salary paid the present Clerk Assistant, was a proper one or not, but upon that point he has only given one explanation—if it can be called so—and that was, that the present officer was doing less work than formerly.

36. Publishing Debates..... \$20,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. That is the old estimate, I believe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it anticipated that that sum will be adequate?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that there is a supplementary estimate of \$5,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Might I enquire as to whether there is any intention of increasing the strength of the English reporting force? Provision has already been made, I believe, for an addition to the strength of the French reporting staff. Has any provision been made, or is any intended to be made, for increasing the strength of the English-speaking reporting staff?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not on the Committee; perhaps the hon. member for West Middlesex will answer the question.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The matter was brought before the Committee at its last meeting, but no decision was arrived at. It is now under consideration. I might say, however, that we have increased the French reporting force by the addition of one French reporter. We hope that by that means the French members of this House, who use their own language in discussion, will be more fully and more satisfactorily reported than they have been before. We propose also to make a change in the system of translating the Debates from English into French, and *vice versa*. The intention is to appoint a staff of translators, and we hope to utilize on the French staff the additional French reporter when his services are not required in the Chamber. These are all the changes we have made, with the exception of one other. It has been decided that members of this House, instead of receiving, as now, two copies each of the bound volumes, should receive five copies each. Such frequent demands are made upon the Debates Committee for copies of the reports for libraries and for public institutions, as well as by members, that we think the only way in which these demands can be met will be to supply the members with the additional number of copies. By that means our Mechanics' Institutes and other institutions could be supplied with a valuable work of reference, and new members, who, on coming into this House are unable to be supplied from our stock on hand, could perhaps have access to back numbers, and thus overcome the difficulty of supplying themselves with information that seems to be very much in demand.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry to hear that an increase of such a large amount is proposed in the vote for the *Hansard*; but I have always said that so long as the House chose to continue this expenditure, it was essential that, whatever expenditure was necessary, in order that there might be an effective and accurate report of the Debates, must be voted;

and I have to repeat the observation I made last Session, that my belief is that the English-speaking staff is not adequate in point of strength. I do not often look at the Reports of the Debates, although I occasionally do so, and I observe, this Session, what I did last Session, namely, manifest errors, arising, so far as I can judge, from the fact that the writing out of the reports, in the first instance, must be done with very great rapidity, and mechanically. I observe most amusing instances of words, similar in the writing, in long-hand, and similar in sound, being substituted for those used. As I have said, I very seldom look at any of the reports, and least often of all to those of my own speeches; it is too trying to my patience; but my attention was called by an hon. member the other day, to a report of my speech, in which it was said: "Lawyers have said this, and priests have said this." "Surely you did not say priests have said it," said he? I could hardly remember what I did say, but I recollected it was "jurists." And still absurd misstatements are constantly made. So, again, with reference to the punctuation—sentences are almost knocked into pi, if even these sentences were spoken. I believe all these things are due, not to the want of skill or knowledge, or diligence, or the part of the reporters, so far as I can judge from the work presented, but to the simple circumstance that unless we have an adequate staff, you impose too much labor upon that staff, and press it too hard. Now, I have more than once expressed my doubt as to the expediency, on the whole, of keeping up the Official Debates. I am more and more confirmed in the opinion that it protracts the Session; that it induces a great many men to speak rather for the *Hansard* than for the House; and that the main object of a deliberative assembly, in which it ought to be the height of every man's ambition who addresses it to maintain the attention of his audience, instead of speaking to the reporters, is not accomplished. But while I hold that opinion, and am prepared to carry it into action, I still maintain that we owe it to ourselves, and to the country, that so long as we decide to keep up the report of the debates, we should have the strength necessary to give us a fair and accurate report; and I believe that with one more reporter, in addition to those of the excellent quality we have now on the staff—I have not observed it, but it appears to me to be equal to the former quality—the opportunity of extension would be greater, the weariness of hand, and eye, and mind, would not be so great, and the whole work would probably be accomplished in a manner creditable to us, and to them, which I do not think now to be the case, so far as I can see, for lack of an efficient officer.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated \$4,000 or \$5,000 had been asked for the current year, and a like sum for next year, and I presume that it is to cover the cost of the additional numbers of *Hansard*; so that it will amount to about \$10,000. As an illustration of what the hon. gentleman has just said, that while the reports as a whole are very accurate, still, from the pressure of the work and other causes, mistakes do occur. I may mention one that created some little excitement lately. An hon. member asked me a question with reference to the duty on jellies and jams, and I was made to say in *Hansard* that there was a duty of 5 cts. a lb. on hams, I had telegrams from everywhere in the country asking if this was correct.

Mr. CHARLTON. The additional vote for the *Hansard* is not exclusively for the three additional numbers to each member. There has been already an additional French reporter appointed, and there is a scheme, as the hon. member for West Middlesex has stated, for having the translating done by a staff. With reference to the question whether the English staff is sufficiently strong, that has engaged the attention of the Committee, and the Committee are at a loss whether to arrive at the conclusion that another

Mr. BLAKE.

reporter is necessary, or whether a change should be made in one or two members of the staff. But it is impossible to have reports taken in the way they are taken here without mistakes occurring similar to that to which the hon. Finance Minister referred when the word "hams" was reported instead of "jams." On the whole the *Hansard* reports are fairly correct. In my speeches I have found, as a rule, two or three takes admirably reported, scarcely calling for any correction; then perhaps one would follow very much involved. If that is the fault of any one or more of the staff, it may be necessary to make a change; but it may be possible that the staff is over-worked, and that all the change required is the addition of another reporter. With reference to the extra numbers of the *Hansard*, some hon. members may be disposed to find fault with that proposal as an excessive allowance. I, for one, have found that requisitions have been made to me for numbers of the *Hansard* for the Mechanics' Institute and other institutions, and I have been very sorry to be unable to comply with their request. In the great majority of cases hon. members could find good use for four extra copies, and if we compare our allowance with that of members of the United States Congress it will be found very moderate. While the new arrangement gives each hon. member five numbers, each member of the United States Senate received twenty-four copies of the *Congressional Record*, so that, on the ground of comparison, we should, even with our additional four numbers, exercise a very fair degree of economy. The complaint that the *Hansard* tends to lengthen the Session is undoubtedly well founded. No doubt, our Session is lengthened by two or three weeks from the fact that the speeches of hon. members are fully reported. Whether this evil is more than counterbalanced by the benefit of having an accurate report of the proceedings of Parliament is fairly open to question, and it may be maintained that it is better to prolong our Session to this extent than have no official report of our proceedings. If we wished to cut down this tendency to lengthen the Session, we might do so by adopting the rule enforced in the United States House of Representatives, where no member is allowed to speak for more than one hour, and when, in certain stages of debate, the duration of the speeches is cut down to five minutes. At the expiration of the allotted period the Speaker brings down his mallet on the marble table, and the member who has the floor is obliged to resume his seat. If we adopted that rule we would get rid of the evil of making unduly long speeches. Hon. members would be more concise in their remarks, and it would be very important that, before abolishing the *Hansard*, for the sake of short Sessions, we should try this system.

Mr. BOWELL. Hon. members could write out their speeches and hand them to the *Hansard*—

Mr. CHARLTON. That would shorten the Session, but would not reduce the volume of the *Hansard*.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what they do in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. And it would be entirely at variance with our traditions. The *Hansard* would not then be a memorandum of the transactions of Parliament.

Mr. BOWELL. And the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is altogether at variance with the spirit of British institutions.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is, perhaps, a great evil that an hon. member should abuse the privilege by using unduly the valuable time of the House. Under ordinary circumstances it would be possible to limit the time, but on occasions such as the presentation of the hon. Finance Minister's financial statement it would be necessary to give more latitude.

Mr. ROYAL. In connection with the Reports of the Debates, I am very glad to hear from the hon. member for Middlesex that it is the intention of the Committee to recommend to the House the propriety of appointing a permanent translating staff. As the translation is made now, a great many errors occur, owing to the rapidity with which it has to be made, and also from the great difficulty of translating correctly English into French. A person must be fully conversant, first with the English language, and more fully still with his own, in order to do the work properly. In many instances the translation is deficient as regards correctness of language, and errors often creep in such as those referred to by the hon. Finance Minister. If this translating staff is to be appointed, I cannot too strongly impress on the minds of the Committee that they should choose first-class men, if not literary men—at least men who are fully conversant with their own language. With regard to errors which take place sometimes in the Reports of our Debates, we must not be too hard on the reporting staff, because we know that in some books we read errors of a similar nature to those referred to by the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. leader of the Opposition, which have crept in and destroyed the whole value of the Debate. It is impossible, owing to the rapidity with which these Debates are printed and distributed, that such errors should not take place. It would be better that we had no translation of the *Hansard* if we have not a first-class one, and it would be so much money thrown away if the translators to be appointed are not first-class men—not men appointed through favor, but through their own merit, experience, and reputation. I believe the step taken by the Committee is a step in the right direction.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I take this opportunity to throw out a suggestion to the Committee with reference to the distribution of the *Hansard* to newspapers. It is true that sometimes rather contradictory statements appear, and it is not to be wondered at. It is rather to be wondered at that, with speeches rapidly delivered and reported, and passing, after being rapidly written out, from the hands of the *Hansard* reporters to those of the printers, mistakes should not oftener happen. The rule is to send the uncorrected sheets to the different newspapers and except when, as in some cases, hon. members previously correct those sheets, the reports in the newspapers do not correspond with the sheets as subsequently revised and corrected. We know how easy it is to drop a figure in taking down a number of figures, making 100,000 in place of 1,000,000 and how mistakes are liable to be made such as that to which the hon. Finance Minister has referred, by substituting "hams" for "jams," making it appear as if the duty on hams had been changed to 5 cts. a lb., and it is only fair to the newspapers that means should be taken to furnish them with the corrected instead of the uncorrected sheets.

Mr. DAWSON. I quite agree with the last speaker that it would be decidedly better that a corrected copy of the *Hansard* should be sent to the newspapers. The first copy leads them into many mistakes, and it is very important that they should have a correct copy of the debates.

Mr. ORTON. The *Hansard* sent to newspapers ought to be provided with an index, and without this it is of very little use to the newspapers.

Mr. CHARLTON. The index is sent to the newspapers with the bound volume.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In reply to the criticisms of the hon. member for West Durham, of the mistakes made by the reporters, I have just to say that one or two of the mistakes in that speech of his own, were not made by the reporters but by the proof-readers. My attention was called to it, and as a member of the Committee, I find in referring to the manuscript that the words were correctly written by

the reporter, but incorrectly revised by the proof-reader. I make this remark in justice to the reporters.

Mr. BAIN. I take leave to dissent from the general current of this *Hansard* discussion. I never had a great worship for the *Hansard* myself, and I sometimes doubt whether those of us who do not make long speeches do not suffer enough in having to listen to them, without being obliged to see them distributed over our ridings afterwards. With reference to the proposal to furnish each member with five copies of the *Hansard*, I confess I have doubts whether it would not be found in practice to lead some of us into difficulty. We are supplied with only one or two copies, we can say to applicants who come to us for a book that is really an expensive book, that we are not furnished with them; but when our constituents come to understand that we are possessed of four or five copies to distribute freely, I am afraid we shall have many applications for a costly book that we will not be able to satisfy. With reference to another matter, I admit there is a great advantage in having distributed through the country speeches that contain matter of general interest to the people, but there is generally sufficient interest taken in that speech by the political friends of the speaker to secure a large distribution of it through the different ridings. Besides, this plan, while costing less would reach a great many more readers. I confess that I have strong objection towards increasing the expenditure on this *Hansard*. I would like, if it could be carried out, something after the fashion suggested in the early part of the evening by the hon. member for West Middlesex, by which a summarized abstract of the principal reports should be published, showing the farmers what was the business of the Departments and the general business of the country. I am satisfied that money spent in this way would do far more good than it will be in supplying each member with several copies of the *Hansard*.

38 Grant to Parliamentary Library... .. \$10,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is practically a vote for \$11,000, \$1,000 of which is wanted for the purchase of some books in the United States with reference to Canadian history.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be a fact that the present appropriation is \$10,000 plus \$1,000 which was added, requiring only \$1,000 more, the Government themselves taking the law books into their hands, as they appear to be doing, it will require only \$1,000 more to carry out the scheme of the Library Committee. I think I may speak for the Library Committee, and I think I may say that we were very anxious that the vote should be specific as to the \$2,000 for the purchase of works relating to America, and then a general grant of \$10,000. The hon. Finance Minister is proposing to give us \$11,000, and what we want is \$12,000, but in a different shape from this.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The vote asked for by the Library Committee was, as the hon. member for West Durham says, only slightly in excess of that asked for in these Estimates, namely, that the vote should be \$10,000 for the ordinary purposes of the Library, supposing that the Government would transfer to the Supreme Court the vote for the Law Library, as is proposed to be done, and that a further sum of \$2,000 a year, for five years, be granted for making a complete collection of books, relating to North America, a subject upon which this Library, of all the libraries in the country, should have a good collection. These are becoming more rare and more valuable, and the need of this further sum was brought with a great deal of force before the Committee by an hon. Senator, who was for many years a very respected and influential member of this House, and who has taken great interest in these matters. The hon. Finance Minister says that this is practically a vote of \$10,000, and we only need \$1,000 more to secure our object.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure the House and the country will find no fault with the appropriation for making our Library more complete. We have the most magnificent building for a Library in the country, and we ought not to hesitate over a slight expenditure that will make our Library a subject of just pride to Canadians. I would be willing to make the appropriation double what it is. I hope that the Government and members of the House will comply with the recommendations of the Library Committee fully and give everything they ask, and that in the way they ask it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that if that were done we would have to take an additional vote for building a new Library. That is the real difficulty. We have not sufficient room, nor any means, without disfiguring this building, of increasing the room for stowing away books, and we shall have some day or other to take up the whole question as to the formation of a National Library, quite distinct from the Parliamentary one, and place it in a separate building. But the vote is a liberal one, and no doubt the Finance Minister will be able to find another thousand dollars.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have a suggestion to make with respect to the want of room. If we were to take this dark chamber and build out a wing where we could have open windows, and be able to breathe the fresh air, and were to turn this Chamber into a Library, we would have plenty of room for books, and even if we were to banish a lot of the old rubbish to make space for works of some value there would be no loss.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Pictures.

Mr. BLAKE. The removal of the books to the Supreme Court, which has already taken place, and the removal of text-books which has yet to take place, will leave room for several thousands of volumes without appropriating the space in the reading room. There is no present pressure, without resorting to the somewhat radical step which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposes, or the removal of any of the books now in the Library, some of which we would be able to do without, and not feel the loss.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I wish to call the attention of the Chairman of the Library Committee to the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. The Sessional Papers should be placed somewhere else than where they are now. I would also suggest, not only their removal at an early day, but that they should be re-lettered. It is a gilt label on a black ground, and it becomes difficult and exceedingly painful to ascertain their titles. In the office of Routine and Records there is a new system of labelling the Sessional Papers, which might be considered by the proper officer having charge of the Sessional Papers. If the hon. Minister of Public Works will have the Sessional Papers placed in the reading room, he will add to the convenience of hon. members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know why the spaces in the reading room have not been used for the purpose indicated. I do not know whether there is some objection on the part of the Librarian to use it, but we could have relieved the Library of several thousand volumes by placing them in the reading room. Of course if the Library officials are afraid that these books might disappear during the recess, or at any other time, it is always easy to place some one to look after them or to put them under lock and key or wire. But certainly that space in the reading room could be used, and by relieving the Library of the books sent to the Supreme Court, a larger space would be provided for new books. I must say, as the First Minister has said, we shall have to look very soon to some other plan to increase the Library, or to have the Library elsewhere.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the question of removal, it is astonishing how much space is occupied by old, worn-out novels, and books of that class, which have afforded, no doubt, abundant amusement to the people of the Capital for many years, but which are not to-day in a condition to appear with credit on the shelves of the Library. If they are worth binding there should be an appropriation to rebind them, but I think the greater portion of them might be stowed away in some dark corner with benefit to the collection. If they could be disposed of for any considerable sum, it should be done, and the funds devoted to works of practical use. There is a question to some which I desire to allude, and it is the publication of many old and valuable maps and manuscripts which I understand exist and are stowed away somewhere about the Library. These documents will be soon, if they are not now, of the greatest value and of the most vital importance in deciding questions of history, boundary and matters of that kind. I think it is too bad that they should only exist in the form of one copy of each, liable to destruction from natural causes or accidents. It would be very well for the Library Committee, between this and next year, to look into the question of publishing a certain number of these documents. A small number might be published each year, sufficient to make their representation certain by having copies distributed among several libraries.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would suggest that this House should unite with the Committee now formed with a view to the publication of the antiquities of America. The Governments of the United States, Brazil, and Mexico, are all interested in the publication of these antiquities, and it will be even a matter of speculation to have all these old books relative to America printed, and I think they would sell well not only in Canada but also in the United States, printed in the cheap form in which publications are printed to-day. I throw out this suggestion because the project is matured and it is easy to carry it to a conclusion. This is the more important from the fact that these old books are rapidly disappearing. By the destruction of the Parliament Building at Quebec the greater part of the Library was burned and some books have been lost forever.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In reply to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey) I may say that the matters mentioned by him have been under consideration by the Library Committee, and it has been determined to place all the rare and valuable works to which he has referred, together with the maps, under special care and keeping, none of them to be allowed to be taken out of the Library, and the greatest possible care to be observed against their loss or mutilation. With respect to the Parliamentary and Sessional Papers, there is to be a complete set made up from the earliest period of the history of Canada and the various Provinces, and these are to be kept as a collection.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt that the precautions are very valuable to save the originals for the present, but I think—of course, I cannot speak from personal knowledge—no doubt there must be a great many, of which more than one copy should be in existence. They would be very interesting; and, as my hon. friend has just said, they would even be bought eagerly by the public. I might refer, by way of illustration, to the publication of the extremely interesting and valuable work, the only work indeed furnishing materials for the early history of Canada, *Les Relations des Jésuites*, which was published in 1858 by order of Parliament; and which has been scattered pretty widely throughout the country, and which is now a work very much sought after by collectors. It is one on which great value is put, and it is extremely interesting, in all that concerns the early history of Canada. I do not suppose that any more such treasures as that exist, because that work is unique of its kind, but there must be a great many works

in the Library, interesting, of the same kind, though not to the same extent; and I think, that no Government should have the slightest objection to concede the request of the Library Committee, if they asked for a considerable sum each year, to publish documents of that kind.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Library Committee to ask for printing of documents.

Mr. CASEY. It will then be a question for the Ministry to consider on their own responsibility.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:05 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 23rd April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 57) further to amend the Acts relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend an Act intituled: An Act to incorporate the Northern, North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, and to change the name of the said Company to the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

### WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.

Mr. BEATY. I move that this House disagree with the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company, and for this reason: I have ascertained that the ground on which the amendments in regard to the fee of 50 cts., which was struck out, was made under the apprehension that the line was in the Province of Manitoba; but I have seen the Senator who was in charge of the Bill in the Senate, and he said, that had it been known that the Bill related to the territory of Assiniboia, it would have been passed there without any objection. I, therefore, move that we disagree.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, according to the Rule, must give the reason for the disagreement in the motion.

Mr. BEATY. I move that this House do disagree with the amendments of the Senate to Bill (No. 48), for the reason that the provisions of the Bill excepted to are within the jurisdiction of Parliament, the line of railway being within the Territory of Assiniboia, and not within the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker: The fact that the hon. gentleman puts in the motion as the reason, is no doubt the fact. This reason is probably a very good one; but I just wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman opposite, and the House generally, to the circumstance, that by the reason proposed we are contumeliously surrendering what we have

been putting in almost every railway charter, whether rightly or wrongly. I think it is very likely that we were wrong in so doing; but we have assumed, as part of our constitutional power, that we had the right to prescribe the mode of conveyance by which land should be parted with, and a registration fee charged; in fact entering into these particulars as to the mode of conveying lands in the exercise of the compulsory or voluntary powers of railway companies. The reason now given to the Senate is a reason which, of course, acknowledges with reference to all railways within any of the Provinces, that we have had no right, and had no right to do that thing. I dare say that this is correct, but it upsets two or three clauses in some hundreds of railway Bills.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not see why, because we did wrong in the past, that we should not do right now.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As, however, this is a change of policy in this respect, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the motion to stand until to-morrow. I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

### BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, this Session, any legislation in response to numerous petitions presented to this House, praying for such legislation as will secure a better observance of the Lord's Day, as regards the running of railway trains, &c.?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce, this Session, any legislation on that subject.

### RECIPROCAL TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND BRAZIL, THE WEST INDIES AND MEXICO.

Mr. FORTIN, in moving for all correspondence and papers relating to the reciprocal trade agreements between the Government of Brazil, the different Governments of the West India Islands, whether British or foreign, and Mexico on the one side, and Canada on the other side. A statement of the Custom duties imposed by these countries on their imports or exports. A statement of the qualities of the different articles, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, exported from Canada to these different countries during the last ten years. A statement of the different articles, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, imported from these countries into Canada. A statement of commercial treaties, if such exists, between any of these countries, British Colonies excluded, and Great Britain, said: I wish to address some remarks to the House on this question, and before doing so I wish to crave the indulgence of this House if I should be somewhat lengthy, and, perhaps, tedious. This question is, I think, one of great importance, as it concerns our trade relations with neighboring States of large extent containing a numerous population, and producing a variety of articles which we consume. Before going to the heart of the question, I shall give some statistics and other information which are necessary to a proper knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the case. I would first refer to the West India Islands. These Islands are composed of the British, Spanish, French, Dutch and Danish West India Islands. The British Islands, which are very important, are composed of Antigua, Bahamas, Dominica, Jamaica, St. Christopher, Montserrat, Nevis, St. Lucia, Barbadoes, Grenada, Trinidad, St. Vincent, Turk's Island and Virgin Islands. Their area is 12,802 square miles; their population, 1,214,417; their revenue, \$7,262,710;

their expenditure, \$7,853,790; their debt, \$1,570,758; their imports from the United Kingdom, \$8,939,329; their imports from other countries, \$18,222,180; and their total imports, \$30,782,840. Their exports to the United Kingdom are \$18,035,410; to other countries, \$12,813,890; total exports, \$31,013,080. Their total trade amounts to \$61,795,920. These figures show that these Islands, though they are small, carry on a large trade with England and other countries, and that it would be worth while for us to extend our trade relations in their direction. It will now be proper to notice the distances of various points from these Islands, and to see especially whether we are nearer to or farther away from them than Liverpool is. The distance from Quebec to St. Thomas is 2,395 miles; from Halifax to St. Thomas, 1,584 miles; from St. John to St. Thomas, 1,616 miles; from Portland to St. Thomas, 1,541 miles; from New York to St. Thomas, 1,425 miles; from Southampton to St. Thomas, 3,622 miles. So that Halifax is nearer to the West Indies than any of those towns except New York, and there is not only a difference of 120 miles between New York and Halifax in that respect. Coming now to the foreign West Indies, we find that the Spanish Islands have a population of 2,250,000; the French Islands, 1,000,000; the Dutch and Danish Islands, 500,000; San Domingo, 700,000; or a total of 4,450,000. If we add to this the population of the British West Indies, which is 1,214,417, we have a total of 5,664,417. Going next to Brazil, we find that it is an immense country—the largest in the world except Russia. It has an area of 3,100,000 square miles; a population of 12,000,000; an army of 20,000 in time of peace, and 60,000 in time of war; a navy of 60 vessels, of which 17 are ironclads; and a naval force of 8,000 men. If we add together the population of the West Indies and the population of Brazil, we have a total population of 17,664,417. It seems to me that it is of great importance to a country like ours, whose population does not amount to 5,000,000, that we should trade with countries whose total population amounts to over 17,000,000. Now, let us see how the distance from Canada to Brazil compares with the distance from Brazil to England, the greatest rival of any country in America for the trade of Brazil. The distance between Liverpool and Rio Janeiro is 5,083 miles, while the distance between Halifax and Rio Janeiro is 4,677 miles, or 406 miles less. The distance from New York to Pernambuco, another town of Brazil, is 3,364 miles, and from Halifax, 3,331 miles, a difference in favor of Halifax of 33 miles. The distance from Quebec to Rio Janeiro is 5,415 miles, and from Montreal, 5,552 miles. Now, I will read a statement of the foreign trade of the Empire of Brazil, by Provinces, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1878. I am obliged to take that year, because I am sorry to say we have nothing in our Library, or in the Departments, to give any information about the trade of that country. Of course, the reason is that we are a colony; we have no consul or agent in Brazil, or in the West Indies, and we are not, consequently, informed as to the state of trade in those countries. The information I have, I have been obliged to obtain from the reports of consuls of the United States. They, of course, look after the interests of their own country. There are English consuls and *chargés d'affaires*, in Brazil; but, although they would defend our interests if they were threatened in any way, these officials would, of course, work for British interests against ours. Now, the imports and exports of Brazil for the year 1877-78, compiled from the Custom House reports of the Empire, were as follows:—

Province.	Imports.	Exports. <sup>1</sup>
Rio de Janeiro.....	\$44,739,649 00	\$46,499,620 50
Pernambuco.....	10,525,202 50	6,825,511 50
Bahia.....	10,245,294 00	8,226,030 00
Rio Grand do Sul.....	4,879,971 00	5,815,251 00
Para.....	4,002,591 00	7,244,127 50

Mr. FORTIN.

Maranhao.....	2,204,166 00	1,351,473 00
San Paulo.....	2,943,274 00	9,956,424 50
Parahiba.....	114,576 00	544,524 50
Ceara.....	1,015,172 00	977,994 00
Alagoas.....	229,174 50	1,854,975 00
Sergipe.....	18,295 50	1,078,540 00
Parana.....	103,489 00	1,068,607 00
Santa Catharina.....	396,965 50	201,206 50
Rio Grande do Norte.....	32,500 00	513,801 00
Espirito Santo.....	11,433 50	411,433 50
Piauhy.....	111,841 50	221,832 50
Amazonas.....	165,133 00	127,381 00
Mato Grosso.....	712,560 00	87,255 50

\$82,251,268 00      \$93,005,989 50

These figures show that there is room for our vessels to enter the ports of Brazil, and for our commercial men to trade there. I will now read a few figures, showing the imports of certain articles into Rio Janeiro in 1881, from a statement prepared, I believe, by the Consul General of Brazil, Mr. Bentley: The importations into Rio Janeiro alone were, of flour, 404,175 barrels; of codfish, 78,332 tubs; of beer, 33,465 cases and 9,442 barrels; of butter, 9,042 barrels and 38,492 cases; of kerosene, 254,055 cases; of lard, 76,171 tubs and 85 cases; of coal, 225,457 tons; of lumber: pine, from the Baltic, 14,545 dozens, from America, 8,168,490 feet; spruce, 13,449,470 feet. Besides these articles there are very large importations of potatoes and onions, cheese, and canned vegetables, fruits, &c.; also cottons and woollens, which almost entirely come from England. If we look into the statistics, we will find that, with the exception of codfish, we supply hardly anything to Brazil. I should explain that the currency of that country is the millreas which is worth about 47 cts. current exchange, but sometimes is worth as low as 37 cts. Before trading with a country, the first thing necessary to know is its Tariff, or the conditions under which trade can be carried on. The Tariff of Brazil may be summarized in the following remarks. The Brazilian Tariff divides the imports into thirty-six classes, under headings which make the study of commerce there somewhat difficult, and which are a source of annoyance to the importers and shippers of manufactured goods, particularly when the article is of a mixed material. I have here a statement of the Customs duties on articles that we ship to Brazil. In 1878, the duty on codfish was 10 reas per kilogramme, with 45 per cent. added; in 1879, that was raised 50 per cent., and, in 1880, it was again increased 50 per cent.; so that the duty on a tub of fish containing 128 lbs. net, the Portuguese quintal, amounts to 1-755 millreas or 86 cts. It takes about 6,000 reas to pay all expenses of transporting the fish from our shores and port dues, or \$2.70, so that a tub of fish from any port in Canada will cost the sender, in freight, shipping, port dues, and Customs dues, \$2.70 delivered in Rio de Janeiro. Now, the duty on flour is about 60 cts. per brl.; the duty on planks, 14x3x9, is \$3.10 per doz.; on Swedish deal and pitch pine, \$18 per doz., 14x3x9; on lumber, 5 cts. per foot; and on butter 10 cts. per lb. The total value of imports into Brazil, for 1877-78, was \$82,251,190, and the total duties on those imports, \$27,199,870, or about 33 per cent. The export duties are also considerable, the total exportation amounting to \$33,000,000, on which were collected \$7,000,000, or 7½ per cent. To these must be added interprovincial duties, \$411,000, and despatching duties, \$62,000, or a total of \$503,237. Let me add that, of the exports of Brazil, coffee is 60 per cent. of the whole; sugar comes next, 11 per cent.; tobacco, raw cotton, &c., comes next. These export and interprovincial duties are not the only expenses our shippers have to pay. I have two disbursement accounts of vessels which sail from Paspébiac to Brazil. In connection with this I may mention that while our vessels have to pay so high in Brazil, Brazilian vessels that come here have almost nothing to pay. The following are the bills. The

following will show the disbursement accounts for expenses in Rio de Janeiro:—

Disbursements of the Barque *Homely*, 229 tons, at Rio de Janeiro, 1880, from Port of Papebiac, Quebec.

	Rs.
To entry at Custom House and Captain of the port .....	20,000
“ Conferring manifest and list of stores .....	10,000
“ Translating do do do .....	15,000
“ Clearance outwards .....	20,000
“ Towing in harbor and to sea .....	100,000
“ Lighterage and towing account, inward cargo .....	155,000
“ British Consul’s account .....	8,000
“ Custom House account, expenses, inwards and outwards .....	168,000
	\$496,000

Or about \$190.

Account of disbursements of Brig *Union* at Rio de Janeiro, 1882, from same Port.

	Rs.
To entry at Custom House .....	40,000
“ Translation of manifest .....	15,000
“ Custom House officers attending discharge, &c .....	16,000
“ Clearing outwards .....	80,000
“ Consulate fees .....	8,300
“ Light dues .....	40,000
	199,300

Or about \$90.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I give these statements to show the Government that the dues are increasing, and that in order to extend our trade in that direction, we must try and get them lowered, especially when we consider the low dues on foreign vessels to this country. But in order to understand what should be done, and to demonstrate the necessity of extending our relations with Brazil and the West Indies, it is my duty to present a full statement of the export trade from Canada to Brazil and the West Indies, and the import trade from Brazil and the West Indies to this country. This statement is taken from the Blue-books, and must, therefore, be correct. I confine myself, of course, to this principle article of trade between the two countries, that is, fish. The following is a table of the exports of dry and salt codfish, giving the number of quintals, and the value:—

To British West Indies :		
From Quebec .....	9,845	\$ 33,937
“ Nova Scotia .....	217,701	932,800
“ Prince Edward Island .....	57	175
Total .....	227,603	\$966,912
To Spanish West Indies :		
From Quebec .....	2,796	\$ 9,438
“ Nova Scotia .....	205,922	819,119
Total .....	208,718	\$828,553
To French West Indies :		
From Nova Scotia .....	28,753	\$115,514
To Danish West Indies :		
From Nova Scotia .....	4,952	\$21,494
To Hayti :		
From Nova Scotia .....	2,578	\$4,611
To British Guiana :		
From Nova Scotia .....	31,902	\$129,162
Total .....	68,185	\$270,781
To Brazil :		
From Quebec .....	74,322	\$343,271
“ Nova Scotia .....	15,732	66,555
Total .....	90,054	\$409,826
Grand total .....	526,380	\$2,205,291

In 1832, the total of the salted cod fish exported from Canada to foreign countries was 872,423 quintals, value, \$3,387,812; in 1831, 843,304 quintals, value, \$164,665; in 1880, 936,606 quintals, value, \$3,561,141. Of pickled mackerel, there were exported to the British West Indies from Nova Scotia, 11,520 brls., value,

\$72,817; to the Spanish West India Island, 4,617 brls., value, \$25,515; to the French West India Islands, 559 brls., value, \$2,654; to the Danish West India Islands, 433 brls., value, \$2,850; to British Guiana, 1,711 brls., value, \$9,909; to Brazil, 89 brls., value, \$775; or a total of 16,929 brls., and a value of \$114,318. Pickled codfish, British West Indies, 1 brl., \$5; to British Guiana, 2 brls., \$6. Pickled herring, to British West Indies, 30,461 brls., \$122,009; to the Spanish West Indies, 3,880 brls., \$15,430; to the French West Indies, 2,375 brls., \$7,844; to the Dutch West Indies, 7.5 brls., \$2,580; to Hayti, 326 brls., \$107; or a total of 27,463 brls., valued at \$147,970. Smoked herring, to British West Indies, 151,148 lbs., \$3,689; to Spanish West Indies, 9,440 lbs., \$248; to French West Indies, 39,860 lbs., \$826; to Dutch West Indies, 13,150 lbs., \$466; British Guiana, 55,254 lbs., \$1,297; to Brazil, 1,900 lbs., \$63; or a total of 270,722 lbs., valued at \$6,583. Other fish, pickled: to British West Indies, 3,820 brls., \$13,290; to Spanish West Indies, 653 brls., \$1,881; to French West Indies, 125 brls., \$462; to Dutch West Indies, 276 brls., \$1,065; to Hayti, 237 brls., \$824; to British Guiana, 75 brls., \$222, or a total of 4,877 brls., valued at \$16,698; to Brazil, 102 brls., \$328. Preserved fish, from Quebec to Brazil, 8,000 lbs., \$830. Fresh oysters, from Nova Scotia to British West Indies, 27 brls., \$8. Oysters, in cans, to British West Indies, from Nova Scotia, 96 lbs., \$9. Lobsters, to British West Indies, from Nova Scotia, 57,938 lbs., \$6,233; to British Guiana, 480 lbs., \$45; to Brazil, 14,532 lbs., \$1,473. Smoked salmon, to British West Indies, 20 lbs., \$6. Canned salmon, to British West Indies, 60 lbs., \$10. Pickled salmon, to British West Indies, 154 brls., \$2,557; to Dutch West Indies, 28 brls., \$535; to British Guiana, 4 brls., \$68. Other fish, pickled, to British West Indies, 19 brls., \$115; to Spanish West Indies, 4 brls., \$51. Fish oil, cod, to British West Indies, 1,272 gallons, \$600. Seal oil, to British West Indies, 396 gallons, \$186. Total value of fish and fish oil exported to West Indies and Brazil, in 1882, \$2,495,141. The total value of the produce of the fisheries exported from Canada, in 1882, was \$7,682,079. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must give the amount of the imports of those countries, in order to see whether our trade with them is advantageous, whether the balance of trade is against us, or in our favor. I will confine myself to the details to the two articles of sugar and molasses, because those are the chief articles which we import from these countries. The quantities and values of sugar and molasses imported into Canada in the fiscal year 1881-82 were as follows:—

Sugar above No. 14 Dutch Standard—

	Lbs.	Value.
From British West Indies .....	213,934	\$ 8,761
“ Spanish West Indies .....	3,133,378	116,749
“ British Guiana .....	1,803	84
“ Brazil .....	1,255	89
	359,360	\$125,683

Sugar equal to No. 9, and not above No. 14 Dutch Standard—

	Lbs.	Value.
From British West Indies .....	18,510,366	\$699,331
“ Spanish West Indies .....	27,085,537	993,829
“ Danish West Indies .....	9,979	349
“ French West Indies .....	186,009	5,500
“ British Guiana .....	264,251	9,215
“ Brazil .....	630,410	21,561
	46,655,552	\$1,729,785

Below No. 9—

	Lbs.	Value.
From British West Indies .....	13,198,814	\$466,457
“ Spanish West Indies .....	14,538,099	545,436
“ French West Indies .....	544,011	18,983
“ Brazil .....	35,295,288	1,085,618
	63,576,212	\$2,118,074

## Melado, &amp;c.—

	Lbs.	Value.
From Brazil.....	289,955	\$8,458
“ Spanish West Indies.....	3,578,247	93,878
	3,868,202	\$102,336

## Molasses for refining—

	Galls.	Value.
From British West Indies.....	18,636	\$4,458
“ Spanish West Indies.....	150,122	35,503
“ British Guiana.....	24,260	5,010
“ Brazil.....	745	37
	193,763	\$45,008

## Molasses not for refining, imported direct from the country of growth—

	Galls.	Value.
From British West Indies.....	2,138,206	\$654,401
“ Spanish West Indies.....	676,223	184,444
“ Danish West Indies.....	814	244
“ British Guiana.....	348,246	105,225
	3,163,489	\$944,314

Grand total..... \$5,065,200

The total value of imports from West Indies and South America in Canada is \$5,497,002, of which, as we see, \$5,065,200 was sugars and molasses; so that it appears that the imports from these countries, excluding sugar and molasses, amount to the value of \$431,802. I have given a statement from the Blue-books, which are correct, of the exports and the imports. Let us place the totals together and see whether the balance of trade is against us, or in our favor. The total imports from these countries amount to \$5,497,002, the exports \$3,936,734, showing an excess of imports over exports, amounting to \$1,560,268; that is to say, that we import goods to the value of upwards of \$1,500,000 more than we export to those countries. Perhaps some persons may say that we cannot make this comparison, because the goods may not be estimated at their cost. But the goods we send there are estimated at the cost in this country, while the goods we import are estimated at the actual cost in the country from which we import them, so that it is fair to contrast the two amounts and draw the conclusion, which is, that the balance of trade is against us to the extent of \$1,560,268. Before leaving the question of the balance of trade, it is proper I should give to the House the amount of the duties collected on the imports from Brazil and the West Indies. The amount of duties collected on the imports from the British West Indies is \$662,514.52; Spanish West Indies, \$943,791.41; French West Indies, \$9,255.05; other West India Islands, \$384.46; South America, \$504,255.74; making a total amount paid for Customs duties on the sugar, molasses, and other articles we import from the West Indies, Brazil, and other parts of South America, \$2,120,199.18. If we add the duty to the value of the goods we import we have a sum of \$7,617,201, while our export value is not quite \$4,000,000, and thus it comes to pass that a comparison shows, first, that we have a balance of trade against us amounting to more than \$1,500,000, and, second, that we pay more than \$2 for every \$1. But I have heard hon. members in this House, and outside of it, and I have also read in books, that balance of trade means nothing. It means nothing, or it means something, according to the way we understand it. If we look at the Blue-books of this country we will find that in some years the balance of trade is in our favor, and in other years it is against us, but it is generally against us; and many people are apt to think that if we go on in that way for many years, and if we do not obtain, as other countries do, money in some other way, we cannot continue to prosper. Those who make little of the balance of trade and who study English trade returns are in the habit of saying: “Look at England, she always imports so many

Mr FORTIN.

millions more than she exports.” But the imports of goods are not the only imports England receives. England is receiving every day millions of money from loans to other countries—the money that they have loaned in the United States, in Canada, the Australian Colonies, in Europe and everywhere. And look again at her immense mercantile navy, which whitens with its sails every sea of the world; it goes into every port, and carries back money from every country to England. Then look at her merchants, who visit every country, make fortunes, and take them back to their native land; and when we add all these results together, we find that the balance of trade is really in favor of England; and that is the reason why England is so rich, and becomes richer every day. But what do we draw from the West Indies otherwise than by the sale of exports there? I do not think that we obtain anything. And what do we draw from Brazil? I do not think anything. Do we receive money from that country? No. So the question which presents itself is a very important one; and I believe that this House and the Government should investigate it, and try to discover the best means of changing this state of things, and make the balance of trade in our favor instead of against us. Now, I brought this matter before the House, because I believe that there is a remedy; but the remedy suggested is not of to-day. It does not come from me. The Government which was at the head of affairs in Canada in 1865, tried to apply a remedy and change this order of things. That Government united with the Governments of the other colonies to send a delegation to Brazil and the West Indies, charged with the mission of studying, on the premises, the best means of extending our trade relations and to render our trade more prosperous than it was then—and still is. Few in or out of this House will, perhaps, remember that fact, because although the delegation, composed of very honorable and clever gentlemen, went to and was well received in those countries, and was fully empowered by the British Government to go on their mission, still it produced no result. As you are aware, the delegation was composed of Messrs. Wm. McDougall, Chairman, Thomas Ryan, W. Duncombe, A. M. Delisle, Jas. McDonald, Isaac Levesconte and W. H. Pope. The four first gentlemen were from Canada, two others from Nova Scotia, and one from Prince Edward Island and one from New Brunswick. Now, these gentlemen had a conference, and they resolved:

“That, in the opinion of this council, it would be highly desirable that representations should be made to Her Majesty's Imperial Government to request that steps be taken to enable the Governments of the Provinces to open communications with the West India Islands, Spain and her Colonies, and New Mexico, for the purpose of ascertaining in what manner the traffic of the Provinces with these countries could be extended and placed on a more advantageous footing.”

These resolutions were approved by Her Majesty's Secretary for the Colonies. On the 28th of October, Sir Edward Cardwell wrote as follows:—

“The Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Officer Administering the Government of Canada.

“Canada, No. 151.

“(Copy)

“DOWNING STREET, 28th October, 1865.

“SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Viscount Monck's despatch of the 22nd September, No. 157, forwarding copies of two approved minutes of the Executive Council of Canada, suggesting that measures should be taken with a view to the extension of the commerce of Canada in the British and Spanish West Indies, in Mexico, Brazil and other places. I request you will assure the Provincial Government that Her Majesty's Government cordially approve the suggestion they have made, and will support it by all the means in their power.

“The scheme is, of course, not applicable to Canada alone, but to the British North American Colonies collectively.

“On that understanding I shall request the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to recommend the object in view at the requisite Foreign Courts, and to introduce to the British Ministers abroad those gentlemen who shall be selected for the mission.”



Sir Emerson Tennent wrote to the Colonial Under-Secretary of State, on the 26th October, 1865, as follows:—

"I am directed by the Lords of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date and of your previous communication and enclosures, relative to the proposal of the Confederate Council of the British North American Colonies to despatch deputations to Washington, to the West Indies, and to various South American Countries, with a view to the improvement and extension of the commercial relations of the British North American possessions with the United States of America and the other countries.

In reply I am directed to request you to state to Mr. Secretary Cardwell that My Lords fully approve of the object which the Confederate Council appears to contemplate, and they are of opinion that Her Majesty's Government should signify its approval of the step about to be taken."

Now, Mr. Hammond wrote to the Under-Secretary of State on the 11th of November, 1865:—

"Having thus obtained grounds for further proceedings, Her Majesty's Government might in the next place consider, in communication with the Lords of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade, how far any proposals might be made to foreign countries in behalf of the Colonies, consistently with the general Treaty engagements of the British Crown; and this point being satisfactorily ascertained, instructions might be framed in this country for Her Majesty's Ministers in the countries in question, and full powers issued to them by Her Majesty, under which they would endeavor to bring into the shape of international engagements such arrangements as might be ultimately considered acceptable, not only to the Colonies themselves, but also to the foreign Powers with whom they were contracted."

I will read the last part—its commencement may be understood—of another document which is extremely important. This is from a letter of Sir A. T. Galt, Minister of Finance, of Canada, who, on the 13th of November, 1865, wrote:—

"It would be improper for the Government to anticipate the action of the Legislature in reference to taxation; but it is necessary that you should be informed that this Government would be prepared to recommend to Parliament the reduction or even the abolition of any Customs duties now levied on the productions of these countries, if corresponding favor were shown to the staples of British North America in their markets."

Now, the delegation went on its mission, was well received, and promised that arrangements would be made in the direction desired, but still nothing was done. For this I will accuse no one. I should rather accuse circumstances. Confederation was accomplished shortly afterwards; and this great event absorbed the minds of all the people of this country. Then by-and-bye came deficits, and when we were having deficits it is hardly necessary for me to say that we could offer no reductions in the Tariff; but, Mr. Speaker, a new era has dawned. We have now large surpluses. We have had a surplus this year, and it looks like as if we were going to have surpluses every year. It seems to me that we cannot employ this surplus to better effect than in trying to extend our trade relations with this country—trying to get a market for all the articles which may now go abroad, and try also to find a market for other articles. I believe that the present is the time to make these endeavours, because we, if we were to say to the Government of Brazil or the Governments of the different West India Islands: "We are empowered by our Government to offer you a reduction of duties," these Governments would believe in our ability to make these arrangements, because we have a large surplus on hand. I will now read to the House a few lines which were written by the respectable and clever Consul of Brazil, Mr. W. D. Bentley:

"Sir Leonard Tilley, in his speech introducing the Budget of the present year, referred to the deputation which waited upon him in reference to some reciprocal arrangement with foreign countries. In 1879, when I was in Brazil, a law was passed at the instance of His Excellency Senhor Sinimbu, the then Prime Minister, by which the Government was authorized to make a reciprocal treaty with other countries. What was chiefly aimed at then, was an agreement with Canada, and therefore I am certain that, though the Government of Senhor Sinimbu has given place to another, yet there will be no difficulty raised on the part of Brazil to make a reciprocal arrangement with Canada, so long as it does not interfere with her existing treaties. Every one knows the enlightened views of His Majesty the Emperor, and how any proposal for the advancement of his country meets with his entire and cordial cooperation. I know he is ably supported by his

Ministers. All are fully alive to the advantages of opening up new commercial relations, and I can guarantee that when the Government of Canada approach that of Brazil, they will find the same desire on their part to bind, commercially, the two countries more closely together."

A few words more about the fishing trade of this country, because, if we are to have a large and prosperous trade with Brazil and these Islands, our fishing industry must be prosperous. As I have stated already, most of our sea fish are exported to foreign countries, and in the markets of Brazil and the West Indies we have to encounter powerful rivals. Norway is one of these. She produced 982,760 quintals of codfish in 1880; 772,420 in 1881; and in 1882, 628,680. These figures include the Finmarken fishery, which, in 1881, was only one-sixth of that of 1880, and one-fifth of that of 1881. The other principal rival is Newfoundland, which produced of dry codfish alone, in 1882, 1,173,510 quintals, valued at \$5,125,275, of which 96,395 quintals went to the British West Indies, and 471,244 to Brazil; or in all, 567,639 quintals, valued at \$2,429,062. Let me add that in those countries which are more maritime than we are, and in which the fisheries are the main element of wealth, they are more looked after and greater care is taken with them than in this country. Let me cite a report of the American consul, Mr. Holt, who has been in Gaspé for ten or twelve years, and who is well posted on the fishing trade. Mr. Holt, in the report which he made to the Government of the United States in 1880, said:

"The cod-fishery continues to be managed and controlled in the old style, but not with the prosperous results now which have attended the fish trade for a hundred years past. Since 1876 the losses have been more general than the profits to the shippers, to the extent that many of them would find their financial standing seriously affected, were it not for their reserves of accumulated gains of previous years.

"This depressing condition and prospect of the Canadian fish trade is attributed to the formidable competition of the Norwegians, who have steadily been inaugurating a system of keeping the markets of the world supplied with their fish, improved in its curing so as to be more adapted to the taste of the consumers in southern latitudes. Prices having declined, in consequence, at the ports of consignment, Canada does not appear to be able to compete profitably with Norway."

With regard to the Norway fisheries, I have had occasion several times to speak and write on that subject, and I think we cannot speak and write too much of it. I remember the time when no fish from Norway appeared on the Brazilian markets, and when the Norwegian codfish were not prepared and cured as the codfish of Gaspé and Halifax. The Norwegian codfish were dried without salt, and, as they would not keep in the warmest climates, none of them were sent to Brazil, or the warmest parts of the West Indies. But Norway, being an independent country, has consuls, the same thing, all over the world. They have a Consul-General at Quebec, with Vice-Consuls in every town of the Dominion; and in every one of the small towns of the United States; in every part of the West Indies and Brazil, and all over the world; and those Consuls are not simply literary men, they are very practical men. They have studied the markets of Brazil, and they found that the codfish from Canada sold for a higher rate and were prepared in a certain way, and their Consuls all over the coast sent reports home to their people instructing them how to cure codfish in the Gaspé and Halifax fashion. For the last ten years these people have had the advantage over us in that market, because their fish are taken three or four months before ours, and are cheaper. Now, let me read a letter which I wrote some time ago to the hon. Minister of Public Works on this very question:

OTTAWA, 31st January, 1881.

"Sir,—I have already had the honor of drawing your attention frequently to the necessity of constructing breakwaters in several of the roadsteads on the coast of Gaspesia, for the purpose of affording our fishermen necessary facilities for the prosecution of their calling—so difficult, so dangerous, and, in general, so unremunerative—with better chances of success, and to enable them to draw from the sea a larger amount, than now, of production for their labor.

"Now, it should not be forgotten that our fishermen are not the only class who will benefit by this increase of wealth, because, just in pro-

portion as the products of our fisheries are augmented, the fishermen being the largest consumers, as a class, of manufactured goods, as well as of foreign produce, from their increased ability to purchase, manufacturers will receive increased orders, and commerce in general will be largely benefited by this state of things, while the Treasury will profit also by the increased amount of Customs duties derived from importation.

"But these are not the only reasons which, at this time, prompt me more than ever, to insist on the necessity of aiding one of our most important industries which furnishes articles for exportation to an amount of more than six million (6,000,000) dollars, and which brings also to our domestic trade and consumption, produce of great value, of which, unfortunately, in this country, there is not generally a correct apprehension.

"Now, this industry is threatened, although not entirely in its very existence, yet to such an extent that if the present state of matters is not changed, instead of being prosperous as in bygone years, until lately, it will become languishing, and eventually fail in furnishing subsistence to those engaged in its prosecution—a class, as shown by vital statistics, increase with a most remarkable rapidity—and the inevitable consequence will be, that our fishermen will have largely to abandon their native shores, and emigrate to foreign countries.

"And whence this threat? From the competition of Norwegian fish—especially codfish—in the foreign markets in which Gaspé fish, until within a few years past, held first place, and had sold with facility and profit.

"The abundance of Norwegian fish for the last few years in these markets, in which, besides, it arrives at an earlier date than Canadian fish,—has caused there an important lowering of prices, so that our codfishery, carried on under the like conditions as heretofore, is not sufficiently productive to yield profits to our fishermen and merchants, at the reduced prices.

"I take the liberty of submitting to you the following extracts from a letter which I received from Mr. Henry N. DeVeulle, agent of the fishing establishment of the firm of Charles Robbins & Co., on the coast of Gaspeia—the following being what he wrote me under date of 6th January, 1881:—

"Next summer we are going to retrench and to try to economise still more than the past season.

"Appertaining to the Percé establishment, we are going to close North Beach and Anse-au-Beaufils.

"When I went to Percé, in 1878, we had 124 boats fishing. Next summer I do not intend having more than sixty or sixty-five; besides this, we will close Anse-au-Basque at Caraqueet. At Caraqueet we will keep only two or three boats, but we will increase slightly at Shippegan and North Shore. As for advances to draftmen, we are doing as usual, but we are reducing dealers a little; as you may well suppose, we will leave off those that remain in debt and keep those that pay.

"Should this coming season's transactions not be an improvement on the past, there is not much doubt that a further reduction will become imperative.

"Did I not tell you in Percé, in 1878, that the Canadian fish merchants were experiencing a competition that would become serious?

"It seems to me that the facts above stated by Mr. De Veulle do not require comment.

"For, on one hand, the codfishery in Norway, aided and encouraged as it has been by all possible means—telegraphs, breakwaters, towboats, &c., &c.—yields products of an extraordinary abundance. And, on the other hand, the fish merchants of that country, enlightened as they have been by those of their counsels who reside in fishing countries, have had for the last few years, their codfish intended for exportation to warm countries cured after the Gaspé method, instead of making it into 'stock-fish' as formerly, and it is that kind of codfish taken in such large quantities, and consequently sold at low prices, which competes so disastrously with the codfish of Canada and Newfoundland in the markets of Brazil, Spain, Portugal and Italy.

"I cannot speak extensively in this letter of the codfisheries of Norway and their immense production, but permit me to say a word of those which are best known—I mean the fisheries of the Lofoten Islands.

"The fishery of the Lofoten Islands—a group on the coast of Norway, 150 miles in extent, lying between 67° and 69° 30' N. latitude—viz.: 1,372 (thirteen hundred and seventy-two) geographical miles further north than Quebec, and 1,200 (twelve hundred) miles further north than the central part of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, yielded 26,500,000 (twenty-six and a half millions) codfish, during the fishing season of 1879, employing 26,556 men. Vessels and fishing-boats employed, 5,222.

"In 1878, for the requirements of that fishery and the fish trade, 41,709 telegraphic dispatches were sent and received at these Lofoten Islands. In 1879, these figures must have been still greater.

"Now, we must acknowledge with regret, that the productions of our fisheries have not augmented for some years past, and in certain parts they have decreased.

"But it would be necessary for our fishermen, in order to compete successfully with the fisheries of other countries, that they should augment the production. But can they do so?

"Yes!

"And how?

"By obtaining more facilities, more encouragement for the different operations, all of them difficult and laborious, which constitute the art of sea fishing.

"And what do they principally require?

"Shelter for their boats.

Mr. FORBES.

"Every one knows that on the coast of Gaspeia there is not a single port, with the exception of Gaspé Basin, which, however, is too far inland to be useful as a fishing harbor.

"Without harbors, without shelter, these fishermen lose one-third of their time.

"At each high wind or tempest, blowing on shore, they are obliged, after having discharged ballast, to haul their boats on shore.

"And when fine weather has returned, they are obliged to launch them.

"And how many boats are either injured or destroyed under these operations, which have often to be performed during one night, when the surf, rolled in by the fury of the gale, threatens destruction alike to the fishermen and their boats? At times, the wind springs up suddenly, and the sea, in consequence, rises with so much rapidity that before the fishermen can come to the rescue, their boats are smashed with the sails and outfits lost.

"In the roadstead of Percé alone, I believe, that within the last ten years, one hundred boats have been lost. Value—\$10,000.

"And when the boats are thus hauled ashore, how many fishing days are lost? For the fishermen have to wait until the return of fine weather, and further until the surf has gone down sufficiently to permit the launching of their boats.

"Often, when they are on the fishing grounds and the catch most abundant, they are seen suddenly to raise anchor and scud for the shore, and by so doing, probably, lose their best day's fishing.

"The reason of this movement is because the weather has become threatening and they fear the approach of a gale from seaward.

"In this case it is imperative that they reach land and have beached their boats before the sea has risen and breakers have formed on the shore; for, if too late in making the land, the attempt to beach is certain death to the men and future misery to their widows and orphans."

Now, Sir, I have given a statement regarding our fishing industry, and the circumstances surrounding it, as I have seen them for the last thirty-two years. My remarks have been, perhaps, too long, but I thought it better to make my statement complete, so that the House, and the Government, and the country, might know what course to take. A deputation visited the Government on this subject a few days ago. We were kindly received by the hon. Minister of Finance. What we recommend is that the Government be authorized, by this House, as the Government of Brazil has by the Parliament of Brazil, to make, during the Recess, any arrangement which they may think in the interest of the country, to extend our trade with Brazil and the West Indies. We pay over \$2,000,000 a year of duty on sugar and molasses, which are articles of food and should not pay duty. But I do not recommend that it should be abolished without getting an equivalent from other countries. Let us do in this case, as independent countries, as England, France, and other countries do. We cannot make treaties, but we can make arrangements; and those countries what do they do? In order to foster their commerce, in order to enrich their merchants, they get their best men to study the question, and the Government, by its diplomacy, does its best, to the extent sometimes to the use of retaliatory threats. What we can do is to offer to reduce, or even abolish the duties on the molasses or sugar of any country which will diminish or abolish the duties on the goods we send it. In doing that, the results would be twofold. We would increase the trade of this country, and we would procure to our people, especially the laborers, and the seafaring classes, an article of food which is not only excellent and savory, but necessary in this cold climate. I thank this House for the *bienveillance* with which they have received my remarks, and apologize for any imperfections of expression, as I would like to have used my own language, but out of deference to the majority of the hon. members of this House, and in order that my remarks might be understood by all, I have spoken in the English language.

Mr. BURNS. The thanks of this House, I think, are due to the hon. member for the vast amount of statistical information he has so intelligently explained to the House. More especially are the thanks of the people of the Lower Provinces due to the hon. member, because they are, perhaps, more than the people of the other Provinces interested in opening out and developing our trade with the countries to

which the hon. gentleman made reference. I know of very few matters that should receive greater consideration from the Government than that of opening up and developing our trade relations with the countries of South America. Considering the large population, and the volume of trade of these countries, more particularly their imports, I think that the Government will be discharging a duty to the country and doing a great amount of good, if they would obtain more means of developing and extending our trade with those countries. It can be said of the West Indies and South America that they are the natural markets of the people of Canada, at all events for the producers of the Lower Provinces. By obtaining those markets we would become more independent of the United States to which we now look largely for a market, more especially for our lumber. As regards the article of fish, there is no country, I believe, which consumes, in proportion to population, more than Brazil, and some of the West India Islands. Anything that can be done to foster the fishing industry of the Lower Provinces would foster the industries and the business of all the other Provinces. In glancing over the statistics of these countries, I find that they import from the United States a great number of articles which we manufacture in Canada. Instead of sending our lumber to the United States as we now do largely, for the purpose of exportation, thence to the West Indies, we would be enabled to trade directly with these countries and get their products in the shape of sugar and molasses in return for our cargoes of lumber, fish, and other articles. I make now more particular reference to the article of raw sugar used in our refineries. As one of the means for obtaining a market for our products with the West Indies and Brazil, it would be necessary to get them to reduce the duties on lumber and fish in return for our reducing or abolishing the duties on sugar and molasses—that is on the raw sugar, not on the refined or partly refined. Reference was made in this House, at a former time, to the advisability of taking off the duties from molasses. As it was said some time ago, so I say now, it may be necessary, and perhaps is necessary, to retain the duty on molasses, in order that we may obtain something in the way of Reciprocity from the countries from which we obtain that article. Besides the West Indies and the Atlantic coast of South America, there is a country which has now been opened up to the world, which has been developed largely by United States capital—I refer to Mexico. There, I think, can be found in the future a large market for our products. We can go to the Central States of South America, we can go to the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and all along the Atlantic coast, where we will find large outlets for our products, either manufactured or natural. Not only should we look to the Atlantic coast, but we should look to the Pacific coast affording a market for our people in British Columbia; and not only should we look to the Pacific ports of South America, in Peru and Chili, but we should also seek to obtain a fair share of the trade with the Hawaiian Islands and the other islands of the Pacific Coast. Now, Sir, I ask that the Government give its attention to this matter so very ably set forth by the hon. member for Gaspe; and I tell them that the people of the Upper Provinces are looking to them to increase the trade we now have with those countries, and not leave that trade so exclusively in the hands of our enterprising neighbors on the other side of the line.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I concur with the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that the House and the country are under an obligation to the hon. member for Gaspe for the full statistical information he has given us with reference to the trade between all parts of the world and the West India Islands and South America, as well as the trade between Canada and those countries. He has brought before us information that, perhaps, few possessed, or that

would have been difficult to obtain in any other way than by his industry and application. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that since the policy adopted by the Government in 1879 for the encouragement of the manufacture of raw sugar and converting it into refined sugar, we have largely increased our trade with the British and foreign West India Islands, and also with South America and the East Indies. With reference to Brazil, under the operation of that Tariff, and by the subsidy that was voted by Parliament of \$50,000 a year for the encouragement of a line of steamers between Canada and Brazil, our trade has largely increased in the last few years. Without that policy there would be no necessity for a line of steamers between here and Brazil, as we should have had nothing to bring back, no raw sugar. She might have taken our lumber, and fish, and some agricultural products, but a steamer would have had no return cargo. Under these circumstances we could not have succeeded in obtaining a line of steamers between Canada and Brazil. The Government have been very anxious to increase our trade with Brazil as well as with the British and foreign West India Islands. We have succeeded to some extent, and still the establishment of that line is in some little uncertainty at the present moment as to its continuance; still, I hope the negotiations that are now going on will lead to the permanent continuance of that line between Canada and Brazil. I hope such will be the case. But we experience a great many difficulties in the introduction of the products of our manufactures into Brazil. There being some 12,000,000 inhabitants residing in that country, they have very strong prejudices, we find, in favor of the manufactures of England, as circumstances have occurred to establish for many years a very extensive trade between Brazil and Great Britain. Take, for instance, agricultural implements. Our American neighbors have for a number of years endeavored to supplant the heavier English agricultural implements, and it appears, from the report of their Consular Agent in that country, that he points out very clearly the difficulties they meet with. They have even there to contend with the products of Great Britain, on account of the prejudices, as they call them, of the people of Brazil. Now, as the products of Canadian agricultural implements and others are very much of the character of those of the United States, we find the same difficulty in inducing the people to accept them because the like prejudices exist with reference to them. However, we are beginning to break that down to some extent. Under the circumstances we have exported very considerably to that country of our agricultural products. We have now satisfied them that the flour of Canada can be sent in there and kept sweet; the impression was that it would sour; but our Canadian manufacturers have proved to them that flour can be kept sweet and healthy, and does not sour; and these prejudices having been broken down, we are finding a market for our Canadian flour, and for various other products. The same may be said with reference to some of the other countries referred to, as, for instance, Cuba and the Spanish East Indian possessions. At present we impose a duty of 30 per cent. on the export duty imposed in Cuba on sugar. Well, we offered, through our representative in London, to admit sugar in Canada without that duty if they would make certain concessions to the products of Canada; and we offered also to pay a subsidy for a steamer plying between Canada and Cuba, and agreeing that that steamer should be under the French flag, if they would give to the products of Canada the advantages of the French flag, which would admit our articles at a very much less duty than if they had been imported in Canadian vessels, or under the British flag. These propositions were declined. I may say to my hon. friend, the mover of this resolution, that one of the difficulties we experience in all our communications, direct or indirect, with reference to this matter, is the difficulty that they have

to give up a portion of their existing revenues. Still there has been manifested in Brazil, as well as in Jamaica and one or two other places, a desire to make some concession; and I had the pleasure of saying to the deputation who waited upon us that we were in accord with them so far as the concession of a certain part of the duty on sugar and molasses, but we thought we were in a position to make a concession to the amount of \$500,000 or \$600,000. If we can obtain concessions from those countries to a like extent, we would be prepared to ask Parliament to give up the revenue to the extent of \$500,000 or so, in order that we may make such arrangements with them as that they may give us a reduction of duties. We thought that, under the circumstances, we could do that, and we hope that such will be the case. I may say to the hon. member that I doubt if it would be proper, notwithstanding he had appealed to us so strongly, to submit to Parliament a proposition asking it to give the Government unlimited authority to do certain things in the shape of Reciprocity. I think it would be more consistent with our duty, and more acceptable to the House, if we were to come to it with arrangements made and ask their confirmation, rather than to ask for general power and authority to be given. I think no time would be lost, because arrangements might be made and submitted to Parliament next Session, and the whole Recess would be occupied before any such arrangements could be finally completed. But we are in perfect unison with the hon. gentleman, and the propositions we have made and the communications which have taken place show that we are prepared almost to remove the duty on molasses altogether. There will be but one objection to removing the duty from molasses entirely, and that objection will be this: that so long as we impose a duty on raw sugar, if molasses were free we would get very little duty out of sugar, because it would be all imported in the form of molasses with a large saccharine percentage; and, therefore, we could not do that very well. But the Government are fully alive to the importance of this question, and are perfectly in accord with the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, anything that will enlarge the market and increase the demand for our fish and lumber in the West Indies, or in Brazil, and will increase, also, the demand for our natural products—because I hold, that while the Maritime Provinces will be very considerably benefited, as the hon. member for Gaspé has pointed out, we propose that the manufacturing and agricultural interests of all parts of Canada shall also be benefited by their products being admitted at a lower rate of duty, if possible—will be heartily supported by the Government. The Government will bring down all the papers, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that any arrangement which the Government will feel justified in making, as one which Parliament could properly sustain, we shall have great pleasure in submitting and asking Parliament to sanction.

Mr. BURNS. Of the grand total of imports into South America, Central America, Mexico and the West Indies, amounting to the value of \$416,215,000, no less than \$93,000,000 worth are imported from the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to ask the hon. Finance Minister whether the offers made to the people of Cuba were made to the authorities of Cuba direct.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire, also, to ask, as it will be impossible to obtain this return before the close of the Session, whether there has been any communication with the Government of Mexico, either directly or indirectly, as that is one of the countries mentioned in the motion of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin).

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With respect to Mexico there has been no communication directly with the authorities,  
Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

and none but verbal communications by a party who has been in Mexico, and his communications were not of an official character. He has addressed a letter or two to me, personally, urging the importance of the subject. I have been in communication with the Governor-General to-day, and copies of the despatches asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition will be laid on the Table, except those with France and Spain, which are not complete; the Colonial Office objecting to communications passing between foreign Governments and our representative, or the Imperial Government, being laid before Parliament until they are complete. All the rest of the correspondence will be laid before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. When?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. To-morrow, I think.

Motion agreed to.

#### BAYFIELD HARBOR.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron), in moving for copies of all reports, plans and surveys made by the Government engineers of Bayfield harbor, in the county of Huron, said: I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the condition of Bayfield Harbor. A sand bank being formed in the mouth of the harbor prevents vessels from entering and deriving any benefit from the works already constructed, until further improvements are made. I also beg leave to call the attention of the Government to the necessity of building a lighthouse at an early date, as vessels driven in there from stress of weather seeking refuge cannot judge the harbor at night. A fine three-masted schooner on attempting to enter the harbor on a dark, stormy night last fall, missed the entrance, and now lies a total wreck three or four rods south of the harbor, which in all likelihood would have been saved if there had been any light to direct her into the harbor. I also beg leave to ask the hon. Minister if it is the intention of the Government to make any improvement in Bayfield Harbor during the coming summer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that when the hon. member has placed the question on the Notice Paper I will be able to answer it; I am not able to do so to-day. There is no objection to the papers being brought down.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I hope the hon. Minister will take into his very serious consideration the subject matter of the motion of the hon. member for South Huron. The hon. Minister knows something of Bayfield Harbor. The question of improvement has been before the House many times. Eight or ten years ago I drew the attention of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was then a member, to the importance of some public money being expended on that harbor, with a view to the protection of the trade of the lakes; and on another occasion I drew his attention to the importance of that harbor, a harbor situated in one of the finest localities of the whole of Western Canada, a harbor which could be made a good commercial harbor at a reasonable expenditure of public money. The hon. gentleman is, perhaps, aware that in 1875 or 1876 a sum of \$15,000 was voted by Parliament for the purpose of improving the harbor. The people of that locality did not occupy exactly the same position as the people of other localities, as they contributed a very large sum themselves to the improvement of the harbor. The township of Stanley, in which the harbor is situated, spent between \$40,000 and \$50,000 on the harbor, while the Government, as I have said, spent \$45,000. Some valuable works were constructed, piers and so forth; but the hon. gentleman is, no doubt, aware that on the east coast of Lake Huron, no matter how good the harbor may be, immense quantities of debris are brought down every spring, and, to a large extent

fill up the outlets of the harbors. It has been so at Goderich, Kincardine, Port Elgin, Bayfield and Port Albert, and dredges are required almost every season for the purpose of removing the *debris*. At Goderich a dredge is required for the purpose of removing the bar formed there during the spring. I specially drew the hon. gentleman's attention to the importance of something being done to this harbor, I think when I spoke the other evening in connection with Port Albert Harbor, which is ten or twelve miles north of Goderich, the hon. Minister was kind enough to say it was one of his pet works, and I was led to believe that it would receive his favorable consideration. I can assure the hon. Minister that Bayfield Harbor is of as much importance as the harbor in my riding; and I hope the hon. gentleman will take both of the works under his charge, that they will both be his pet works, and that he will be able, during this Session of Parliament, to place some amount in the Estimates to carry out the necessary works there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention given to these works by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) will induce me, most likely, to look more favorably on the works to which he has referred. The hon. gentleman has evidently studied the question, and, for my part, whether it is a work in his own county, or in the next county, if it is a public work requiring improvement, I will give it my attention. The fact which the hon. gentleman has stated to the House, that at Kincardine and other harbors on that shore there is every spring a large deposit of sand and other material at the mouth of the harbors, shows it is a difficult question with which we have to deal. I suppose that though we have extended some of these piers, we will always have to have dredges at the mouths of these harbors every year, or every second year, to remove the deposit of the twelve or twenty-four months previous. At Goderich, as the hon. gentleman has just stated, the same difficulty has occurred; but we have tried—although I do not know how far the experiment has yet gone; but we are trying at all events—to avoid that by a catch pier placed farther west, I think, towards Kincardine.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is to the north.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to the northwards, perhaps; and if we succeed in this, it will probably avoid the difficulty against which we have to contend there for a number of years; but eventually it will come again, because we dredge in that direction, and I suppose we will always have to count on a certain expenditure every year in this relation. I shall give my special attention to this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The drift of Goderich Harbor is not now at all where it was. The level was changing, and we had to go in at the mouth of the river proper.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was speaking from the lake. The hon. gentleman remembers that there is a drift coming in from the lake.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From the direction of Kincardine towards Goderich.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was just about to remark that it was where the chief trouble rose. The pier built north of the harbor and south of the river will no doubt obviate some of the difficulty that exists.

Motion agreed to.

#### DUTIES ON AND IMPORTS OF CEREALS.

Mr. GIGAULT moved for a statement showing: 1st. The amount of duties collected, between the 15th March, 1879, and the 1st January, 1883, on the cereals comprised under the head of "Grain and products of grain," in the

Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada; 2nd. The quantity of grain and products of grain imported and entered for consumption in Canada during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the motion be amended, perhaps with the approval of the hon. gentleman who has moved it, in the following sense: Add after the word "Canada," in the first paragraph, "the total quantity of grain and the products of grain imported," and add after the words "1882," at the close of the second paragraph "also a statement of the quantity of grain and the products of grain exported during the same years." The reason for making this proposed change is this: That the mode of entering grain for consumption was very different before and after the imposition of duties on these articles. Before the imposition of the duty on the 15th of March, 1873, all grains were entered for consumption, as will be apparent from the abstract of a table which I have here. For instance, the total imports for 1874—I will only give the round numbers—were valued at \$15,482,000, while the total amount entered for consumption was \$15,432,000. For 1875, the total amount entered was \$12,389,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$12,389,000. In 1876, the total amount imported was \$11,094,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$11,094,000. For 1877, the total amount imported was \$13,795,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$13,795,000. For 1878, the total amount imported was \$13,444,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$13,444,000. For 1879, up to the 15th of March, the total amount imported was \$9,756,000, and the total amount entered for consumption was \$9,756,000, showing that the imports for consumption were regularly the total imports. However, when the duty was imposed the mode of making these entries changed. I find that for the balance of the year 1879, from the 15th of March to the 30th of June, the total entries were \$1,581,000, and the entries for consumption were \$331,000. For 1880, the total entries were \$12,169,000 and for consumption \$1,804,000. For 1881, the total entries were \$15,059,000, and for consumption \$2,418,000. For 1882, the total entries were \$7,431,000, and for consumption \$2,298,000; so that unless the motion was made in this way, the inference drawn from it would very likely be a misleading one. I notice, in making up these figures, that the imports of grain for consumption have steadily increased since the National Policy has been in force. The imports for consumption were \$331,000 from the 15th of March to the 30th of June, 1879, and the annual imports were \$1,397,000 in 1879. The imports for consumption in 1880, were \$1,804,000; in 1881 they were \$2,418,000, and in 1882 they were \$2,998,000; showing a constant increase in the imports for consumption as shown by the amount upon which duty was actually paid. So far as the imports before that date are concerned, that, of course, will enable us to say what proportion of these imports were actually for consumption; but I find that in the year 1874, out of the total imports 8,611,000 bushels were exported, although entered for consumption. In 1875, out of the total imports, 7,050,000 bushels were exported; in 1876, out of the total imports, 7,139,000 bushels were exported, and in 1877, out of the total imports, 8,547,000 bushels were exported; showing that the reports of the Trade and Navigation Returns are totally unreliable; if we are governed by the amount nominally imported for consumption in our estimate as to the amount actually consumed in the country. By a report, which the hon. Finance Minister was kind enough to hand me during the discussion on the Budget Speech, I find that the export for the year 1878 was valued at \$7,433,000, and for 1879, at \$10,603,000, or nearly the entire amount for 1878, entered for consumption, and the entire amount for the year 1879, entered for consumption.

I find, that the exports for 1880, were valued at \$12,856,000, the whole of which would have been entered for consumption under the previous mode of compiling the figures before the imposition of the duty; and these exports for 1881 were valued at \$7,210,000; and for 1882, at \$8,179,000—all of which would have been entered at the Custom House for consumption prior to the imposition of the duty in 1879; so I think that in order to have the report give as true an account of the state of the trade as possible, it had better be amended in this respect. I beg to move in amendment:

"That after the word 'Canada' at the end of paragraph 1, the following words be added:—'the total quantities of grain and products of grain imported,'—and at the end of paragraph 2 the following words:—'also Statement of quantity of grain and products of grain exported during the same year.'"

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know whether the mover has any objection to this proposition, but I have not, as it will present the case so far as the real imports we have consumed are concerned. I think it will be found apparent, when the figures come down, that the result, if it is so properly shown, will be that we have an increased market for our own products under the operation of the Tariff.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES (Translation), in moving for a copy of an Order in Council passed on the 26th July, 1882, confirming a by-law of the Montreal Harbor Commission, said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I wish to draw the attention of the House and of the Government to the fact that according to the by-law passed by the Montreal Harbor Commission, and approved of by a Minute in Council dated 26th July, 1882, the pilots find themselves in a very different position from what they were under the Pilot Act of 1873. If you will glance at that Act you will find that it is entirely different from the by-law passed by the Harbor Commission. If the House will allow me, I will read a part of the request which was presented to the two Ministers of the Crown who received the deputation. I will read that portion which explains the by-law:

"Article 85 is hereby amended in adding to it the following, which hereafter will form part of the said article, and which will read as follows: That is to say, and if such accident consists in the sinking or striking of any ship in charge of a pilot, such pilot will be, *ipso facto*, suspended in the exercise of his functions as pilot until the cause of such accident has been investigated, and until the decision of the Harbor Commissioners has been given, and for such further time as may be determined by the Commissioners in the decision. And in such case the pilot must also surrender his license as pilot to the Harbor Commissioners at the time required by this Article.

"That this new Article, number 142, subjects the pilots to an absolute arbitration, and appears contrary to the Pilotage Law;

"1. As long as this Article continues in force the pilot, immediately after the aforesaid accident, must immediately quit the ship, being, *ipso facto*, suspended in the exercise of his functions. He should not and cannot remain on board of the ship, having no longer any right to remain on board of her.

"2. Provided that this *ipso facto* suspension, until the accident has been investigated to ascertain the cause of it, and that without any delay being assigned, may be perpetual or indefinite, the pilot will be deprived of his right to exercise his business, even if he is not in any manner at fault.

"3. In view of the fact that the deposit of his license, simultaneously with the deposit of his report, which he should make under such circumstances, will be, *ipso facto*, an abdication of his rights as pilot, even should no blame, no judgment, no fault exist.

"4. In view of the fact that the principle contained in this 142nd Article is essentially different from the Pilotage Act of 1873, and to common right, and specially opposed to that contained in clauses 29, 31, and 35 of said Pilotage Act of 1873, which clauses determine on what conditions the pilot retains his commission, how and when he should surrender it, and for what causes he should surrender it.

"That the enforcement of this Article 142 will have for immediate result considerably increase the slowness of navigation.

"In view of the fact that this will have a tendency to paralyze the activity of pilots."

'Thus if it happens that a pilot in charge of a steamer, whether skilfully or otherwise, runs her aground to escape

Mr. CHARLTON.

a greater danger, he is obliged, as soon as the steamer under his control has struck or sunk, to give up his license, to go to Montreal, place that license in the hands of the Harbor Commissioners, awaiting the decision of the Harbor Commissioners, which may remain pending for two, three or four months. There is also another matter which is well understood: that a pilot is very often at the mercy of the crew, which is influenced by the Commissioners. Very often the crew is disposed to give testimony against him. It is often interested in doing so to save either the captain or some member of the crew. Under clause 142 of the by-laws of the Harbor Commission approved by Order in Council of 20th July, 1882, the pilot is entirely at the mercy of the crew and Harbor Commissioners, for as soon as the vessel is sunk he is deprived of his functions and he abandons all rights in the ship which he had charge of. I will observe, *en passant*, Mr. Speaker, not because they are political friends of mine, because I must candidly admit that the pilots voted against me, but I ought to acknowledge that the Corporation of Pilots is composed of perfectly qualified men, and if the Government does not give them the protection to which they are entitled, if the Government yields to the pressure of the upper commerce of Montreal, if they yield to the demands of the Harbor Commissioners, the pilots will be discouraged, insurance companies will be discouraged, and commerce and the general good will suffer. As I just observed, it may probably happen the pilot may skilfully run a vessel aground in order to avoid a greater disaster, but in such case he must surrender his license and be deprived of his vocation. At Quebec the regulations are not the same. According to the Federal Law of 1873 a pilot only forfeits his license after conviction. But to-day, according to the regulation about which I have been speaking, he is considered guilty the moment the vessel strikes either a shoal or sand bar. This is altogether unjust. If I am rightly informed, a deputation waited on the Ministers some time ago, and I believe I may say that they expressed the same views which I enunciate to-day to the hon. gentleman. I think it is entirely unjust to condemn a man before he is tried, and I trust the Government will duly make this Order in Council. As I observed, the object of my demand, has been to draw the attention of the House, and of the Government, to this question, and I think I have said enough to convince them of the justice of the claims of the pilots.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker: In reply to the hon. member, I may say that I have already seen some of the members of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, and that I brought under their attention some of these regulations, and particularly the one to which he refers. I have reason to believe that the Commissioners realize that these regulations must be amended. I give this information to the hon. member, and the hon. member having attained his desired end, I trust that he will withdraw his motion.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES. In view of the explanations given by the hon. Minister of Public Works, I think I should withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

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

#### After Recess.

#### IMMIGRATION INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria), in moving for all correspondence of recent date between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of British Columbia, and all Orders in Council on the subject of immigration into that Province, said: I may say that this matter has already been touched

upon by hon. members from British Columbia; but what I refer to in the motion is a letter addressed to the Government on the subject of immigration into that Province, and an Order in Council which has recently been passed in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

#### PHYSICIANS CERTIFICATES GRANTED UNDER CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. McCRAANEY moved for a return of all certificates granted for liquor under section ninety-nine, clause four, second part of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 by the physicians of the county of Halton, giving the name of each physician, and specifying the number of certificates granted by each, from the 1st of May to the 31st of December, 1882.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I beg leave to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we have no control in this matter whatever. The licenses are granted by the Local Government, and as we cannot insist upon these returns being made, I think it would be unwise in the House to ask for them.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I find that the Act provides that such a return shall be made, and I took it for granted that it is to be made to this Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If under the Act these returns can be made to this House, or to the Government, of course they will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### IMPORTATION OF CHILDREN'S CARRIAGES.

Mr. McCRAANEY moved for a return of the number of children's carriages imported into Canada each and every year, from the 1st of July, 1878, to the 1st of July, 1882, with the amount of duty collected in each year.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down these returns provided we have them in the Department. I am under the impression, however, that they are not kept separately, but are classed with other carriages. I will make enquiry, however, and if there is any such return we will bring it down.

Mr. McCRAANEY. In the Trade and Navigation Returns the aggregates are given. I supposed, however, that there was a detailed statement from which the returns were made, and that the hon. gentleman would bring it down.

Mr. BOWELL. The only way in which it could be obtained, unless it is kept separately in the Department, would be to send to each port in the Dominion for a special return. I scarcely think the hon. gentleman would require that.

Mr. McCRAANEY. My reason for making this motion is that some persons engaged in the business have been writing to me, asking for this return.

Motion agreed to.

#### TIMBER PERMITS.

Mr. McCRAANEY moved for a return showing the names of all persons to whom permits have been granted to make timber, ties, telegraph poles and saw-logs within the district of Rainy Lake and River and Lake of the Woods and tributary streams, said return to show the quantities removed and dues collected on the same, from the 1st day of July, 1880, to the 1st day of July, 1882, and the area of territory granted to each person, and by whom surveyed, with all correspondence in connection therewith. He said: I consider this a very important question—perhaps no more important question can come before this House. It is a well-known fact that the timber of our country is going

away very fast. Largo tracts of country in the North-West are entirely destitute of timber; and the probability is, from the way in which our timber is being cut off, that in a very few years, perhaps not more than twenty, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec will have no more lumber than they will require for their own use. At the present time lumber in the North West is very high, averaging from \$20 to \$40 per thousand, and at the present rate at which timber is being cut off, it is fair to say, at any rate, that the price of lumber will not decrease. Consequently, it becomes an absolute necessity that the timber resources of our country should be husbanded. While in the North-West last summer I made enquiries as to the practice of persons cutting timber in the Rainy Lake and Lake of the Woods district, and I found that a considerable quantity of timber had been destroyed by fire, and that large quantities were being removed by various parties. I was informed also that permits had been given by the Government. You will observe that I only ask for the number of permits; I do not ask for the number of licenses, as that return, I believe, has been asked for already this Session. Since that time, I have received several letters from parties in that section of country, and I will take the liberty of reading a short extract from one I received a short time ago, from a man who can be relied upon, and I have no doubt he states what is true. He says:

"During the summer of 1879 and the following winter but little timber belonging to Ontario was taken, further than what was required for the Pacific Railway, and until the road was in operation there was no means of removing timber and lumber, but in 1881 the timber cutters of the Dominion came in and went for the timber with a will. One man got a permit to make ties, take out telegraph poles, timber and piles. He made no survey of his limits; he selected the best place he could find, and the most convenient, and marked it on the map, and made a tracing which he sent to the land office at Winnipeg, and on this slender title but by no means a precarious one, so long as the Dominion claim the power, and have the will to take the timber from the estate of Ontario, he went to work. Report says an honorable Senator is the godfather of this man in timber iniquity. Another pet of the Dominion Government got a permit as vague and comprehensive as the other—marked it out the same way, and for the last two seasons has been cutting and removing timber on an extensive scale. His godfather is said to be another honorable at Ottawa. There are many minor villains who follow in the wake of these privileged plunderers, and have made a big stake; ties have been removed by the million, and telegraph poles by the hundreds of thousands, as well as square timber, piles and saw-logs. The vultures of the Dominion have a beautiful harvest in the dishonestly acquired property of old Ontario."

Now, Sir, I do not pretend to say that these statements are absolutely correct; all I have to say is this: if these things be so, it is time that the people of this country should know whether proper value has been received for this timber. During the past few months statements have appeared in the newspapers to the effect that the timber of that district is being sold at private sale, and at a very low price, to certain individuals who are favorites of the Government, and that the Dominion is not receiving full value for that timber. In one of our newspapers appeared, not long ago, the following:—

"Sir John Macdonald's Government gave to political friends certain valuable timber limits at the ridiculous price of \$5 per square mile. The friends promptly sold these limits for \$2,000 per square mile! Of such is the Ottawa system; and if our Provincial finances had been administered for ten years by the party that perpetrates such jobs, where, in the name of common sense, would Ontario have stood to-day?"

I find, on calculation, that if it be true that timber limits have been purchased at \$5 per square mile, and resold at \$2,000 per square mile, the profits resulting from this transaction would be 39,900 per cent., which is a pretty good rate of interest. There is no doubt but that the system of selling timber limits by private sale is a great mistake, whatever Government adopts it, and I think it is high time the Government put those limits up to the highest bidder and let every one who has the means and wishes to buy have an opportunity of purchasing. This, besides, will relieve the Government of a certain responsibility and prevent

statements being made that timber limits are given to favorites, and that persons opposed to the Government have no opportunities of purchasing. I trust this return will be brought down before the close of the Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it would have been fairer for the hon. gentleman to have waited until the information was brought down, and not have prejudged the case as he has done. The hon. gentleman has read extracts from newspapers and letters, and wants to prejudice public opinion, before allowing the Government to show how things are and produce all the papers. This is not fair. The hon. gentleman also selects a certain period by which he wants us to be limited, but the hon. gentleman should have asked for more than that. He should have asked for a statement of all the permits that have been granted in that Territory, and licenses, from the beginning until to-day. Let us have the whole statement and see how the case stands, not only under this Government, but under all previous Governments. Let us see whether the policy of this Government has been deficient from that of previous years, whether we have done a thing that is considered wrong, and whether the same thing done under a previous Government is to be considered right. Therefore I would ask that the hon. gentleman will consent—if not, I will propose an amendment—that there be no fixed date for the beginning, but that all the permits and licenses granted in the Territory down to to-day be brought down in a return. That will be a fair thing to all parties.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I have no objection at all to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, nor have I any desire to prejudge this case. All I want is to know the truth.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman should lay that letter on the Table of the House, and say who is the author of it. He has made from it the statement that timber limits have been sold by the Government at \$5 per square mile, and resold at \$2,000 per square mile. The hon. gentleman was not as fair as he might have been, for he did not tell the House the whole facts of the case. The hon. gentleman knows well that one of the conditions on which timber limits are sold, is, that the purchaser shall erect a mill on those limits with a capacity of sawing 25,000 feet of lumber per day, keep that mill running for six months in a year, and pay dues at the rate of 5 per cent. on all timber cut. The hon. gentleman did not state those facts which he must have known before he brought this matter before the House. The hon. gentleman reads to us items of newspapers and extracts from a letter, but I would like to see the hon. gentleman lay that letter on the Table of the House. If he claims it is a private letter, he should not have read it here, and in referring to the case at all he should have stated the whole case, and not have been careful to omit mentioning the conditions upon which licenses are obtained. I hope the hon. gentleman will lay that letter on the Table of the House.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### RODERICK McLENNAN'S CLAIM.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence, papers and Departmental action, with reference to the claim of Roderick McLennan, to section 31, township 21, range 27 west, North-West Territory, said: I make this motion having received a letter from Roderick McLennan saying that he came to that section of the country in March, 1882, with his brothers; that he settled on this section and improved it, at a time when these lands had been on the market a few days and were being sold to *bona fide* settlers for \$1.25 per acre. It was this that induced him to settle on the section, but the sections were withdrawn before he was able to go to the office to secure the one he settled on.

Mr. McCRAVEY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There can be no objection to the motion. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman, when the papers come down, will see that the Government, if they have not already done justice to the settler, is in the course of doing so. We will bring down the papers as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a copy of the contract made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with a Construction Company called "The North American Contracting Company," or by some similar name, for the construction of the railway; a copy of the instrument of incorporation or association of the said Construction Company; and a statement of the names of the shareholders or associates thereof, said: Under the General Railway Act, as amended during the Session the Pacific Railway contract was passed, provision was made for receiving the terms of contracts made by railway companies for construction. Since that time addresses were passed for contracts made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for construction, but none have yet been brought down either in answer to these addresses or as part of the railway returns, although the railway returns require they should be brought down. In the returns which have been brought down up to the 30th June last, that portion which refer to contracts for construction is marked "Contracts to follow," indicating that it is intended at some subsequent term to bring them down. At the time the contract was made, suggestions were made that a contract might possibly be made with the Construction Company, on the same basis, and operating with similar results, as took place with some of the other Pacific Railway companies with whose history we are more or less familiar. For some time past rumors have been appearing in the papers that arrangements had been made in connection with a large emission of capital for the formation of a great Construction Company, which was to build the railway upon terms of receiving a portion of its stock. Amongst other things, rumors have so far taken shape as that lately there has appeared in the public press a direct statement that the negotiations which have been going on for some time are now concluded, and that a company, composed, I think, of strong Montreal capitalists, had been formed which had taken the contract for the whole of the remainder of the Company's line, and that Langdon, Shepherd & Co., who have been building that portion which has been constructed in the western part of the prairie, would take contracts with this new Construction Company. It is, of course, as I have pointed out on the occasion of former motions which have been made to this House, on this subject, of high consequence to us as the subsidizers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as having stipulated that we should limit our right to control the tolls by a limitation of 10 per cent. interest on the capital expenditure—it is, I say, of high interest, to know what contracts these are that are being made. I have already pointed out during this Session that the emission of capital which has taken place, or has been attempted, at the rate of sixty, was the creation of a share capital of ninety or one hundred million dollars, of which sixty or fifty-four million dollars alone was to be received, and that we ran the danger of being asked subsequently to permit dividends to be obtained upon ninety or one hundred millions, of which fifty-four or sixty millions, as the case may be, was for cash only. It is, therefore, important that we should obtain at an early period a copy of this contract. I, therefore, move for a copy of the contract made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with a Construction Company called "The North American Contracting Company," or by some similar name, for the construction of the railway; a



copy of the instrument of incorporation or association of the said Construction Company; and a statement of the names of the shareholders or associates thereof.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways has conferred with the hon. gentleman who has just made this motion, about the difficulty of granting it. The fact is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having given a contract to another company to prosecute a portion of this work, that second company has, of course, given some contracts to different parties, and it would be more than inconvenient that the contract given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the second company should be made known. The hon. gentleman will see at once that it would be very inconvenient, and would necessarily cause trouble in the prosecution of that work, if the terms granted to the other company by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were made known to the sub-contractors of that second company. I think there can be no difficulty arising out of the postponement of such information. The rates are established, I think, from year to year, or at shorter periods, subject to the approval of the Government; therefore, there can be no difficulty in this matter being postponed to another year, when the sub-contracts having been executed, there can be no objection in the contract given by the Canadian Pacific Railway being made public. I, therefore, hope that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman will see the propriety of not insisting upon his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry I am not able to accede to the views of the hon. gentleman. The law, rightly or wrongly, requires that the contracts should be laid before the House; the law does not require this particular contract to be laid before the House at this time, but the law has laid down the proposition that the contracts made by the Company should be laid before the House, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has thought fit to disobey the law in that regard. The hon. gentleman has rightly said that the hon. Minister of Railways gave me private explanations of the causes which induced the Company to disobey the law namely, that it would affect their contract with Langdon, Shepherd & Co., being a contract at schedule prices for the earth work, &c. He told me that it would create some difficulty with the sub-contracts with Langdon, Shepherd & Co. But this contract to which I am now referring—I have only the information in the press to guide me—is a contract of a very different complexion, it is a contract for the construction of the whole of the remainder of the line.

Mr. POPE. From whom?

Mr. BLAKE. The statement in the papers is, that it is a contract for the construction of the whole line unexecuted. I am merely saying what the newspapers say. Of course, I know nothing about it; but the statement is, that it is a contract for the whole of their unexecuted works. I presume it, therefore, to be of the nature of a sub-contract, but I do not know in which case the difficulty that was suggested by the hon. Minister would not arise. But it seems to me, as I thought it right, at an early period of the Session, to bring before the House what seemed to me to be the complications that were about to arise from the circumstance of this stock being issued in the way it has been issued—it seems to me that what has been developed within a few days in the statement which has come to us from abroad, is a further complication and a further step in the same direction. Therefore, I do not feel that I can take the responsibility of withdrawing my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that the Government does not feel that the public interest would be served by bringing the document down and laying it before the country at present. I do not say that after a time it may not be brought down—I think the contrary—but at

present it would not be in favor of the public interest to bring it down, and I would still offer the hon. gentleman the option of withdrawing his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's objection must be attained in some other way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman does not wish to withdraw his motion, of course, I must ask the House to refuse assent to it, because we think, as a Government, that it would not be for the public interest for this to be brought down. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. POPE. I think I may relieve the hon. gentleman from a little misapprehension about this matter. I am quite certain there is no such contract as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, but that the work is left to the same men who had it last year, and I know these parties made a contract to build to the foot of the Rocky Mountains.

Motion negatived.

#### QUEBEC SUBSIDY.

Mr. LAURIER moved for a copy of any representation by either of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec on the subject of an increase of the Provincial subsidy. He said: It is well known that the Quebec Legislature has adopted a memorial to the Dominion Government, representing that the Province should have an increased subsidy. We have not heard anything of this memorial since. Perhaps it has not yet got into the hands of the Government; but if it has been presented to the Government, it should, in the public interest, be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### GEOLOGICAL REPORTS OF THE COUNTIES OF VICTORIA, INVERNESS AND RICHMOND.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Before reading my motion I desire to place before the House a few facts which will show the necessity of publishing the Geological Reports, with maps, of the counties of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond, in the Island of Cape Breton. It is well known that the north-west coast of Cape Breton does not possess any harbors from which the vast mineral resources of that side of the Island can be exported. There are three or four harbors, it is true, but they are bar harbors, which only a small class of vessels can enter, a class of vessels which are not adequate for carrying coal and other minerals, of which there is an abundance on that coast. In the Geological Report for 1877-78 was published the last of four sheets of a map of Cape Breton County, on a scale of one inch to the mile, which is useful and valuable, not only to miners and explorers, but also to all interested in the county of Cape Breton, because it gives, besides the geology of this fine county, more geographical detail than any other map published. In 1877 and 1878, Richmond and that portion of Inverness which lies south of Judique and River Dennis Basin were surveyed with even greater minuteness than the county of Cape Breton; and a report of this work was written, which, however, was kept back until a few particulars could be obtained to make the accompanying maps more complete. This was done, and the maps were ready for the Report of the Geological Survey for 1879-80. Yet, in this report, the maps did not appear, although it contains an account of the work done by geological surveyors in 1877 and 1878. This comparative uselessness and incompleteness of that report, was publicly pointed out in the Cape Breton press, and in the Senate by hon. Senator Bourinot, as reported in *Hansard* of May 12th, 1882. Senator Bourinot, after pointing out the uselessness of the report with no maps accompanying it of the character stated, said:

"I regret very much that this should be so, and I have taken what I consider the best means of attaining the end which these people desire,

and have brought this matter before the House. I have shown these reports, and these facts, when they become known, I trust will produce very good results. There is another point, before I resume my seat, to which I must refer. It is well known to hon. gentlemen present that there has been a syndicate formed in Nova Scotia for the purpose of building a line of railway from the Straits of Canso to the eastern part of that poor Island of Cape Breton, which has not been blessed with railways. Now, with regard to the proposed railway, and also the other railways of the opposite section of the Island of Cape Breton, the great American Short Line Railway, which I had the honor of introducing to this House, I am informed, and I believe it is a fact, that these very lines over which the railways are to run, have already been surveyed under the direction of the Geological Survey. These maps, if published, would they not have been of great service at this juncture when these railways are being constructed? Would they not be of great value? We know they are in existence, but they are completely buried in the archives of the Geological Survey. It may be that they will be published within the next two or three years, after the railway has been, I hope, located, when they will be, to some extent, useless."

A year has elapsed, yet these maps seem to be no nearer the "hands of the engraver" than before, and in the meantime the survey of the remainder of Inverness and Victoria has been finished and is quite ready for publication. The value of a geological report accompanied by the maps of the counties of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond, of which no maps exist, must be very great and needs not to be pointed out, and their immediate importance in view of prospective railway extension into Cape Breton is manifest. These maps should not be published on a smaller scale than the maps of Cape Breton County, to save a few dollars to the Geological Survey; as by reducing the scale the usefulness of the maps would be impaired. My desire in seeking to obtain the publication of these reports and maps, is to let capitalists all over the world know the immense mineral wealth which lies undeveloped on the north-west coast of Cape Breton. Copper mines exist in Inverness. Gold exists in the bed of Middle River, Victoria County, which is evidently washed down the mountains of an unexplored territory in the counties of Victoria and Inverness. It is an unfortunate fact that, in that region, there are large tracts of unexplored land which, it is believed, is of excellent quality and contains immense mineral wealth. Along the coast of Inverness, from Chimney Corner to Long Point, a distance of about fifty miles, there are immense deposits of coal, which cannot be developed without facilities which that county does not yet possess. Besides coal there are iron, gypsum, marble freestone and other mineral wealth, which cannot be exported from that county unless further facilities are afforded. My object in asking for this report is in order that capitalists all over the world may obtain copies of it, and be induced to invest money in developing the enormous resources which lie in that region. With that view, Sir, I move for an Order of the House for copies of the geological reports made by Mr. Hugh Fletcher, of the counties of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond, with the maps accompanying the same.

Motion agreed to.

#### WESTHAVER'S POINT.

Mr. KEEFLE moved for copies of all correspondence, reports and petitions in connection with the erection of a lighthouse at Westhaver's Point, entrance of Hubbard's Cove, in the county of Lunenburg, and all instructions issued to the commander of the steamship *Newfield*, or any other officer of the Government, in reference to the location of said lighthouse, under which he acted on the 10th day of June last, and any report on the same; also, a copy of the agreement for the purchase of the land for said lighthouse entered into on behalf of the Government by C. E. Kaulbach, Esq., M.P., within ten days of the last General Election. He said: Petitions were presented to this House in 1879 for the erection of a lighthouse at Westhaver's Point, in the county of Lunenburg; but nothing more was heard of the matter until the 10th of June, 1882, ten days prior to the last Gen-

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

eral Election, when the steamer *Newfield*, having Mr. Kaulbach, the Conservative candidate, and my opponent, on board, came to anchor off Westhaver's Point. The steamer landed some of her crew, who staked off a site for a lighthouse; and Mr. Kaulbach made a bargain for the land necessary, the price to be paid, I believe, being \$800; but that is the last which, as far as I am aware, was done in the matter. At least, I have examined the Estimates for this year, and I find nothing in them for Nova Scotia for the building of a lighthouse at this point, which would be useful for the fishermen. It certainly looks suspicious that this steamer, so close to the time of the General Election, should come to this place; and that this project, after lingering in abeyance for four years, should be raked up within a few days of the General Election. The fact resulted, however, that where I expected to have a majority, my opponent had quite a majority. Now, I do not wish to say that the Government was in collusion with the action of the steamer and of Mr. Kaulbach in regard to this matter, I would be very sorry to do so; but I, nevertheless, think that the transaction requires a little explanation; and I think it due to myself and to the House, that this explanation should be given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, I am very sorry that we could not hear the hon. gentleman on this side of the House, excepting as to the last sentence or two. I think he said that he had not received several votes which he expected to have at a certain place. I am very sorry for the hon. gentleman, but it is evident he did not require those votes to elect him to this House. I suppose that he now wants a lighthouse to throw a great deal of light over this subject; and though I could not hear the hon. gentleman he may be sure that we will bring down the papers, when I hope he will see that everything is right as far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I understand that the objections raised by the hon. gentleman are these: that the steamer *Newfield* appeared off Westhaver's Point on the 10th of June, a few days prior to the last General Elections; that among the passengers on board of this vessel, a Government steamer, was the Conservative candidate for the county of Lunenburg, who, assisted by the officers of the boat, had a site marked out for a lighthouse; that a bargain was made with the owner of the land for the purchase of the site on behalf of the Government; and as I further understand from the objections of the hon. gentleman, that no provision is this year made in the Estimates for the erection of this lighthouse. While I think that the proper course for the Government to pursue in this matter is to make provision for the erection of a lighthouse—and if the officers of the *Newfield* were the parties who assisted the Conservative candidate for the county, I think that the Government should reprimand them—I do not believe that the Government would allow the officers of this steamer to assist any candidate favorable to themselves in any way like that. I could not fancy such a thing, and I, therefore, trust that the Government will see to it that they make provision in the Estimates for the erection of this lighthouse this year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The House will, perhaps, allow me, in answer to the hon. gentleman, to say this: it is impossible for both of the hon. gentlemen to say that this lighthouse is not to be provided for in the Estimates, because, if I am rightly informed, when the vote is brought down, this is done in one sum, and then the hon. Minister, when the item comes before the House, explains what is to be done with the amount, so that the hon. gentleman can still hope that provision for this lighthouse may be found in the Estimates. I, therefore, hope that he will allow this hope to linger until then, and perhaps he may then be satis-

fied when the propositions of the Government are laid before the House.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 62 of the Estimates, No. 164, he will find that \$40,000 are asked from the House for the completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-horns.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this one among them?

Mr. BOWELL. We will tell you when they come down. Motion agreed to.

#### THE CLAIM OF JAMES DAUPHENÉE.

Mr. KEEFLER moved for copies of all petitions, reports and correspondence in reference to the claim of James Dauphenée, of Bridgewater, in the county of Lunenburg, for payment of claim for refund of expenses incurred by him in discharge of his duties as a Fishery Warden of that county. He said: I may state to the House that James Dauphenée was a Fish Warden in the county, and in the discharge of his duties he brought a number of persons to justice for violation of the Fisheries Act. He incurred a great deal of expense, which has never been refunded to him by the Government. I should like that he would get a measure of justice, either from the Government, or from this House.

Motion agreed to.

#### CHARGES AGAINST MAJOR PETERS.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved for all correspondence, instructions, reports and Orders in Council to date, referring to the charges brought against Major Peters, No. 2 Troop, 1st Regiment Cavalry of London.

Mr. CARON. Hon. gentlemen know that I am always ready to bring down any papers that are asked for, but I consider that in a matter like this it would be unwise to bring down the papers and submit them to the discussion, not only of the House, but of the public, as the efficiency and discipline of the service would be affected.

Motion withdrawn.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of engineer's report of the survey made at Brae, Prince County, Prince Edward Island, during the last summer, with a view to making harbor improvements at that place.—(Mr. Hackett.)

Copy of petition relative to the trade between Canada and the West Indies, and Brazil, signed by the principal fish merchants of the coast of Gaspé and Bay des Chaleurs, and addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance, and of the letter accompanying the said petition.—(Mr. Fortin.)

#### BI-DAILY MAIL SERVICE OF THE GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDERKIN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a bi-daily mail on both lines of the Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway to all the offices at all stations north of Palmerston; if so, when?

Mr. CARLING. It is not at present the intention of the Government to establish a bi-daily mail to the places mentioned.

#### CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL.

Mr. RICHEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 25) to amend the Acts respecting Cruelty to Animals.

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

(In the Committee.)

In the fourth and fifth sub-sections the words "wantonly and maliciously" were added.

In the seventh sub-section the words "whether domestic, tame or wild," were struck out.

On sub-section 8 of section 2,

Mr. LANDERKIN. A great many farmers, in slaughtering their hogs, shoot them. Would they be liable to be imprisoned in the common gaol for three months?

Mr. RICHEY. The plain meaning of the clause is that persons are liable only when the animal is kept as a target for the purpose of being shot at; it does not, of course, affect those who kill animals for the purpose of food. The language that is here is the very language that has already been incorporated in the Acts of the United States with regard to pigeon shooting. At the same time, if it is thought that there is any question with regard to the application of the phraseology I am quite ready to accept amendments to make the meaning more clear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I object to the proviso that all animals found at large, under certain circumstances, may be destroyed at view. It is a dangerous power to vest in the hands of a Justice of the Peace that if he happens to find an animal of any kind at large upon the highway, and in any way injured—it does not say how injured—he may give two men as wise as himself authority to kill that animal without any notice to the owner of it, without calling the owner to show cause why the animal should not be killed, or giving him any notice by which an investigation into the condition of the animal might be held.

Mr. BLAKE. There is another objection which occurs to me. It seems to me that it is entirely beyond our jurisdiction. You are making lawful an Act which is destroying the property of another man, which is interfering with civil rights. My horse is hurt, and because, in the opinion of a magistrate, he is not likely to be useful any longer, you are here proposing that it shall be lawful for the magistrate to kill that horse, and that I shall not have my action. It is a question of civil rights, not at all a question of cruelty to animals.

Mr. RICHEY. The hon. gentleman will see that this proviso is not to the one clause only, but a proviso to the penal clause which covers the whole Act. It protects the magistrate who may be called upon to discharge this duty against the punishments that might flow from his act. I think, however, that full provision is made to cover this case in other Acts upon the Statute-book. I consent to the proviso being struck out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In reference to the shooting of pigeons, does the hon. gentleman propose to strike out that also?

Mr. RICHEY. No; I consider that a very important part of the Bill?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Pigeons are used as an article of food. Many farmers raise pigeons, and before they can be cooked they have to be killed. Does it give them any more pain to be shot at as a target than to have their heads cut off? I cannot see that there is any greater cruelty being practiced to them by being shot at as a target than by being shot at on a fence, or on a barn. You cannot take pigeons in any other way than by shooting them.

Mr. RICHEY. I know the hon. gentleman is of a benevolent nature, and is not very much in the habit of attending pigeon-shooting matches. The Committee have taken evidence upon this point from parties who were inimical to the Bill, rather than favorable to it, and every sportsman conceded the fact that it was a cruel and reprehensible practice. In the greatest sporting country in the world,

England, a Bill for the purpose of preventing pigeon-shooting passed its second reading while the Committee were considering the Bill now before the House. I find, in the language employed by members of the British House of Commons, the justification for the course we are pursuing here. Colonel King-Harman said that if the Bill referred solely to pigeon-shooting it would have his support, because, having been a pigeon-shooter himself, he had given up the sport as cruel and unsportsmanlike. Sir Wm. Harcourt, speaking for himself, and not for the Government, said he was strongly in favor of the Bill. In these matters it was necessary to keep pace with public opinion, and public opinion had made much progress, as was shown by the abolition of bull-baiting, cock-fighting, and other such sports. He believed that the cruelty of pigeon-shooting was proved and acknowledged. Indeed, as carried on it was a public nuisance, and public opinion was fully prepared for the first clause of the Bill. That Bill passed its second reading by 195 to 40 votes. The shooting of game or pigeons, or any animal necessary to kill for the purpose of food, does not come within the intention, scope, or purport of this Bill.

On the interpretation clause,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. How will farmers pluck their geese in the spring without being subject to the penalty provided in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The Finance Minister plucks his geese all the year round.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Finance Minister has mentioned one provision in the Bill which should not be allowed to pass. The plucking of geese is a custom as old as the hills. Geese lose their feathers at a certain time naturally, and farmers' wives pluck them without causing the birds much pain. It will never do to send farmers' wives to jail for three months for this simple act.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the clause should be struck out. There is a practice in Quebec of plucking geese twice a year. The farmers obtain two crops without causing much pain to the birds, and, therefore, this provision should not pass.

Mr. RICHEY. Evidence was taken by the Committee on this point. If the Committee of the Whole is against me on this point I must submit, but I will not be a party to prepare a proviso excluding this act, which I believe to be a cruel practice.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the effect of the evidence? A great many things are customary which are cruel. If the evidence was that this is an inhuman practice, that is one thing; hon. gentlemen, on the other hand, say that geese lose their feathers naturally under any circumstances, and that the practice is humane rather than otherwise.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I object to this clause in the Bill. I am a farmer myself, and I know how the plucking of geese is done. The geese are plucked alive two or three times in the summer. There is a portion of the year when the birds lose their feathers naturally, and farmers find it profitable to pluck them at that time. It is a matter of great profit to farmers, and it would be very unjust to allow this provision of the Bill to pass. They know the right time when geese should be plucked, and no damage is done to the birds.

Mr. HESSON. It is a most absurd proposition to endeavor to prevent farmers from plucking their geese. Farmers know the necessity of doing so, and the practice is followed as a matter of economy as well as prudence.

Mr. RICHEY. That is, because it is done, therefore it must be right; but our contention is that many things are done which are not right, and are cruel in themselves. I find, that in Lincolnshire, fowls are often deprived while alive of their feathers, and sometimes of their quills; and in

Mr. RICHEY.

a case before the court, it was proved that a person with a live fowl in his hands plucked it, holding the bird's head between his knees; the fowl's breast was nearly bare, it fluttered about and seemed to be in agony. The penalty inflicted was £5. A number of other instances are given, in which plucking is carried on because they think that it improves the flesh of the animal, and they consequently pluck them alive before killing them. As to the geese question, I do not know; I suppose the geese may like it; but I do not think, that any other animal would be gratified in having its feathers plucked off while alive. The only way that a reservation might be made in this respect would be by a proviso.

Mr. McMULLEN. The proviso might direct chloroforming.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The words in the thirty-fifth line, "that plucks alive" means stripping alive an animal of its feathers wholly or in part, and the words, "plucks alive" in the second sub-section should be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if the only plucking alive that takes place in the country generally is the plucking of geese at the proper season, and that is the only thing we have to deal with, it may be struck out; but I could have quite understood that it would be lawful under this clause, and with proper care, even to pluck a portion of the feathers off geese while alive, because it says, "whosoever cruelly, wantonly, and unnecessarily," &c. If picking before killing is desired to be prevented, I could understand that this clause could properly remain with a proviso; but if the only thing is the plucking of geese, then, of course, we might strike it out.

Mr. RICHEY. I will defer to what seems to be the feeling of the House.

Mr. KEEFLER. Why did the hon. gentleman forget to introduce a clause with reference to the plunging of lobsters alive into boiling water? This is as strong a case as the plucking of geese while alive.

Mr. RICHEY. It is plain, that this is not a finality, and I will have to bring in another Bill next Session.

Mr. TAYLOR. How does the hon. gentleman interpret "bleeding slowly" in the second sub-section. We export in our section large numbers of fowls to the United States, and the Americans will not purchase our turkeys, &c., and give the highest price for them, unless they are killed by slow bleeding—pierced in the mouth alive with the head on.

Mr. RICHEY. That strikes me as being a very cruel act, and ought to be prevented. These words refer to the opening of a vein, whereby oxen, and particularly calves, are killed, being left to bleed as long as forty-eight hours, in order that the flesh may be whiter and command a higher price.

Mr. BLAKE. How long does it take fowls to die under that operation.

Mr. TAYLOR. From five to ten minutes.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not slow bleeding.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is termed "slow bleeding" in the American circulars?

Bill amended, and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 10:15 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 24th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved, That as the time for the reception of reports of the Committee on Private Bills will expire on Thursday next, the same be extended to the following Tuesday, inclusive, in accordance with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

## CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. ABBOTT moved, That the 51st Rule be suspended in conformity with the report of the Committee on Standing Orders, and that leave be granted to introduce Bill (No. 114) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

Mr. ABBOTT. Considering the lateness of the Session, I hope the Bill will now receive the second reading. The fullest possible opportunity will be given for discussion at subsequent stages.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the objects of the Bill a little more fully, as we know nothing about it.

Mr. ABBOTT. The objects of the Bill are, as stated in the preamble, to authorize this company to lease the lines of the Credit Valley, the Ontario and Quebec, and a certain portion of the Atlantic and North-Western, in so far as that may be necessary to constitute a through line from Montreal and from the south bank of the St. Lawrence at or near Montreal to the western terminus, of the Credit Valley. The intention is simply to pay an annual rental for the lines forever. The lease is to be in perpetuity, and the object of the Bill is obviously, and the idea will present itself to the mind of every hon. gentleman, to secure a through line, and by that means to obtain some portion of the through traffic of Ontario and the western portion of Quebec for the northern route of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to afford some means of sustaining its line north of Lake Superior. The Company fears, from recent events, it may lose the traffic which it might otherwise obtain from Ontario, and from the western portion of Quebec, unless it can retain some kind of control over those railways; and it is for the purpose of enabling the Company to obtain that control that this Bill is introduced, and for no other purpose. That is the simple object of the Bill; the propriety of it is involved in the one proposition to which I have referred. The taking of the second reading of the Bill to-day will make no difference, and will be neither advantageous nor disadvantageous to the discussion of that proposition, as it seems to me.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a question involving a Company in which the Government and the public take great interest, and to which they are large contributors; and in view of the additional powers asked for, the House may not unreasonably ask that the views of the Administration respecting the Bill be placed before the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker: I may say that the proposition was submitted very recently to the Government, and they saw no objection to the proposition as made. It is not a proposition to divert any portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway funds, for the purpose of obtaining the con-

trol of the lines referred to in the Bill, but to enable the Company to lease them so that they shall form a part of their system; and we may fairly assume that before leasing those lines, the Company will satisfy themselves that the terms on which they are enabled to lease them will be such as not to make any change on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but will, as has been stated by the hon. member who introduced the Bill, furnish a basis of traffic by which the line to the north of Lake Superior may be sustained. We consider it of great importance that the North-West should have the advantage of the fullest competition between the great commercial centres of Canada. At present the Canadian Pacific Railway connects the North-West with Brockville and Ottawa, between the intermediate points of Winnipeg and Montreal. By this proposal they will be enabled to secure a connecting line by which they will have the opportunity of giving the people of the North-West an active competition between the great commercial centres of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and other parts of Ontario. So far as the public interests are concerned, we think that they will be promoted rather than hindered in any way by the adoption of the proposal contained in this Bill, to give to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the power to make arrangements for leasing the Credit Valley Railway, and the proposed railway, the Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker: it is not my intention to oppose the second reading of this Bill; but I must say it seems to me that a somewhat inadequate view is taken on this occasion, both by the hon. gentleman who introduced it and by the hon. Minister of Railways, of its possible attempted operations, as contrasted with some declarations which some of us still remember to have heard expressed in this House. It would be useless to conceal, for myself, that there is and has been for some time past a close alliance between the Credit Valley Railway Company and the Canada Southern, and that there have been rumors current in the public press and elsewhere of the action of a great railway capitalist, one of the greatest capitalists of the United States, who is interested in the Canada Southern, in connection with the affairs of the Canadian Pacific. It seems to be immediately on the cards, that arrangements will be made, whereby the Canadian Pacific obtains control of the Ontario and Quebec and the Credit Valley, and that connecting with the Canada Southern, we will soon have another through route *via* Chicago. It was said the Canadian Pacific Railway would have a greater interest in sending traffic by the north shore of Lake Superior than by any other way. I remember the hon. First Minister pointing out what happened when an attempt was made to trouble the course of the Rhine; but, without going into that matter of history, I may say that it is quite possible that the Canadian Pacific may secure connections through Michigan, and by this means form another through route *via* Chicago. Of course, the hon. gentleman may say that this line would be controlled, as far as the legislation of the Government is concerned, by the same persons who control the Pacific Railway, and who have a greater interest in sending traffic by the north shore of Lake Superior than by the other way, and, therefore, depend upon it, they will not; but, at the same time it is very obvious that it is possible—and it will be rendered more possible by the alliance proposed than it would be without that alliance—that it may go by another point. The hon. Minister of Finance some time ago, at the request of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, proposed to hand over \$1,000,000 and take Credit Valley Railway bonds, on a statement of figures which I have been unable yet to understand; but I suppose that we will have further explanations on that subject. It now appears, however, that it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself which is to support the Credit Valley Company; therefore, it is to come out of the Canadian Pacific Railway coffers,

except so far as the traffic arrangements of the Credit Valley satisfy the drain, for the Credit Valley is, of course, the security, and it is quite clear that the security to be given by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Government, in lieu of the \$1,000,000, is the Canadian Pacific, and not the Credit Valley; therefore, that is a portion of the transaction which seems to intimate that the hon. gentleman's view, when he proposed that exchange, was not exactly accurate. I am glad to hear from the hon. Minister of Railways that it is not proposed that any funds of the Canadian Pacific should be absorbed in the construction of these lines, and that it is simply proposed that the rentals shall be paid; but, of course, there is an obligation to pay the rental, which is not of itself an onerous obligation, but it may be an onerous obligation. It has a character dependent entirely on the question of what the traffic resources of the rented lines are, and how far they are adequate to meet the obligation which is incurred. When the Canadian Pacific was incorporated we all supposed it was given all possible powers, and it has been several times pointed out, as a model for universality of power in the case of other corporations, but it was not given the power to lease lines running in this particular direction. Power was given to lease lines, it is true, extending from Callander towards the eastern sea-board, and the Canada and Atlantic was mentioned specifically; other lines in that general direction were mentioned, but this power was given for the purpose—and this purpose was expressed—of completing the through route from the west to the sea-board. Of course, this leasing power is not embraced in that measure—the introduction of this Bill is sufficient proof of that—and the direction of the line with which we are all familiar, is another proof of it. This purpose also was stated recently by Mr. Stephens in a letter published in the papers. He says, having alluded to the political purposes for which the railway was incorporated:—

"It was created for the purpose of opening up the hitherto undeveloped North-Western Territories of the Dominion of Canada, and for carrying the traffic between those Territories and the Atlantic sea-board on the one hand, and the Pacific Ocean on the other, through British territory."

That is a general statement. While I am not opposed to the second reading of the Bill, I think it very possible, both with respect to the Dominion security, and the rental which is to be paid for these two lines—one of which is under construction, and is not advanced so far towards completion as that it may be said to be practically finished; and the other is, as far as I know, not commenced, but is to be acquired in perpetuity—an onerous obligation may thus be imposed upon the railway, and, I think it also possible that a through route to the south *via* Chicago may ultimately be acquired. As I told the hon. gentleman formerly, I am not afraid of a through route *via* Chicago, or Sault Ste. Marie, and less the latter than the former; but I contrast the horror and apprehensions expressed when any other route than that by the North Shore of Lake Superior was mentioned; and the present plan, it seems to me, would open the way to a through route more objectionable, if the Sault Ste. Marie route was objectionable, than that route was.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall this Bill be read the second time.

Mr. RYKERT. I object to the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. RYKERT. I object to the second reading of this Bill. I suppose that I have a perfect right to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. RYKERT. I would like to know if an hon. member objects to the second reading, whether it can be carried in spite of him or not, when no notice is given.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remark.

Mr. RYKERT. I objected to the second reading of the Bill; and, of course, if it can be forced through in spite of my objection I would like to know it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand what the hon. gentleman said. Of course, it could not be carried if the hon. gentleman had objected to the second reading, unless the House agreed that it was a matter of urgency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a matter of urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER. When the hon. gentleman said he objected it was after the second reading was declared carried. When I was putting the motion that the Bill be referred to the Committee then the hon. gentleman said he objected.

Mr. RYKERT. I objected to the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; but on the motion for the reference.

Mr. ABBOTT. I do not think the hon. gentleman objected until the question was put: whether it should be referred to the Committee on Railways? I remarked that particularly.

Mr. RYKERT. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker; I objected immediately.

#### ACCOMMODATION IN THE BUILDINGS—EXCHANGE OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving the adoption of the Sixth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, said: This is the report of the Committee which was presented yesterday. It recommends the printing of a number of papers, but in addition to that recommendation there are two references in connection with it to which I desire to call attention. The first has regard to the want of accommodation in the House for the convenience of hon. members, and, to some extent, the convenience of the work of the House. Mr. Botterell, of the Distribution Office, applied for increased accommodation for the purposes of his office, and a sub-Committee of the Committee on Printing was appointed to see what could be done in that respect. Upon an examination of the rooms in the building, it was found that nothing could be done immediately, but it was also discovered that too great a number of the rooms of the House are occupied by officers of the House, and that to the great inconvenience of members, who really have no retiring rooms into which they can go and do writing or other work of that kind. The suggestion was made—and it is embodied in this report—that you, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the Senate, and the hon. Minister of Public Works, should, during the Recess, make an examination of the rooms, and see whether greater accommodation cannot be afforded to members of the House and to the business of the House. The other recommendation has relation to the exchange of our public documents, and it is embodied in this report simply for the purpose of calling the attention of members of the Local Legislatures, who may be interested in the subject, to the condition of things in respect to the exchange of these documents, so that some of them who have not been receiving them may know the reason why they have not been sent. Last year it was agreed that an exchange should take place of the public documents of this Parliament with the public documents of the various Local Legislatures—that is to say, that members of these Local Legislatures should receive our public documents, and members of Parliament should receive the public documents of the Provincial Legislatures. A circular was issued to each of the Provinces by the Clerk of the Printing Committee during the Recess, but only two of the

Provinces—those, namely, of Ontario and Quebec—have responded; and the recommendation to which I have referred has been embodied in the report, simply for the purpose of informing members of the Local Legislatures of the other Provinces—who have complained that they have not received our documents—why these documents have not been sent to them, so that they may move their own officers to accept the suggestion which was made as to an exchange.

Mr. BLAKE. I cordially concur with the view of the hon. gentleman, that it would be a very great advantage to us if a few more of those rooms which were at our disposal in the earlier years of Confederation, should be restored to us by displacing or putting in some other places the officers who, from time to time, have been permitted to occupy them. I remember that during our earlier Parliaments there were a number of rooms which were available either as small committee-rooms or for the use of members in discharging that portion of their duties which cannot well be performed in this Chamber. But these have gradually been occupied—I do not say improperly, and perhaps there were fewer officers at that time—but I think it would not be unreasonable that accommodation should be found for them in some other places. Amongst the appliances which we require here for the efficient discharge of our duties, I know of nothing that is more lacking than a few rooms in which members can discuss public matters, arrange for the preparation of Bills, and generally perform that portion of our work which cannot conveniently be done in this Chamber, to which, however, many of us are now relegated for that purpose by the lack of accommodation elsewhere.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Translation). I think I can concur with the suggestions of my hon. friend the member from Cardwell (Mr. White). It is evident that the accommodation afforded to members is altogether insufficient. The employes suffer from this state of affairs. There is no doubt that an examination into the distribution of the apartments will induce the Internal Commission of the House to take some measures which, without increasing the expenses of the House, will render the situation much more convenient for us than it is at present. Certain employes have too extensive accommodation, and this should be remedied.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this point that there is a want of accommodation for hon. members who may wish to retire from this Chamber to consult about matters public or otherwise; and I have no doubt that by a rearrangement of the accommodation in the building we would be able to find room enough for all the requirements of the House of Commons, as well as of the Senate, in that respect. Of course, it may be necessary to somewhat curtail the accommodation of some of our officers, at all events while the House is sitting. As to the time when the House is not sitting, of course nobody would complain of their occupying them; but while the House is in Session all available accommodation should be given to members of the House. For my own part, I shall have great pleasure in meeting yourself, Sir, and the hon. Speaker of the Senate, upon this matter after Parliament has prorogued, and I have no doubt we will be able to meet the requirements of the hon. members of the Commons at all events. As for the Senate, I do not know how they fare in that respect.

Mr. ROYAL. I am informed that the members from all the other Provinces have got the use of a room in this building; but that so far Manitoba has taken such a small space in the Confederation, that it is really impossible for the members from that Province to get the use of a room. If that idea is to be acted upon I hope that the rightful claims of Manitoba and the North-West will not be ignored. In fact, if we were to be given accommodation in proportion to our increase, I fear we would soon occupy one-third of this

whole building, but we do not ask for so much space as that. So far, however, it has been impossible for us who represent Manitoba as well as the North-West Territories to a certain extent, to obtain one single room in which we could come to an understanding, or discuss between ourselves any question that refers to Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. BRECKEN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is slightly incorrect. Prince Edward Island has made several applications for a very small room, but in vain; and some hon. members from the other Maritime Provinces are subject to the same inconvenience. I hope that, when the hon. Minister of Public Works takes this matter into consideration, Prince Edward Island will be placed in as favorable a position as the great Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BAKER. As there seems to be a general complaint from the hon. members from the smaller Provinces, I should like the Province of British Columbia not to be forgotten. The hon. members from that Province number as many as those from Prince Edward Island, or Manitoba, and I hope that, when a re-adjustment of the rooms in this Building takes place, the claims of British Columbia will be taken into consideration.

Motion agreed to.

#### DEBATES ON CONFEDERATION.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker: Before the Orders of the Day are discussed, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to what I consider a question of considerable importance, at least for the members of this House. We have a very precious volume which is called "Debates on Confederation." When we have occasion to consult this volume, to study any question, we are obliged to examine it throughout to find anything which may have a bearing on what we wish to study. Under these circumstances, I think the Government would render a great service to the members, and to the public generally, if it would cause to be prepared an analytical index, in order to facilitate our studies on the various subjects which the study of these debates may present.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker: I am not prepared to give an affirmative answer to the hon. member, and yet I should observe that the suggestion which he makes is a very reasonable one. I will speak to my colleagues, and we will see what can be done in the matter.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Translation). Before the Orders of the Day are discussed, I wish to contradict a matter personal to myself, and which is in a report of an interview which took place last Saturday with the Government. Some of the Montreal journals would make it appear that I was one of a deputation which came from Quebec to oppose the action of the Government in taking control of the works to improve the river communication between Quebec and Montreal. As a matter of fact, supposing I was at the Capital on that day, I would have informed myself of the character of that deputation, which apparently was not a representative one, for I note that the three members from Quebec there, who are supposed to represent more immediately the interests of the city, were not members of the deputation, and those who are specially interested in this question, such as the members from Lévis (Mr. Blanchet) and from Montmorency (Mr. Valin) were absent. Now, as to the matter in which I am personally interested, I may observe that, far from approving of the course which it seemed advisable for these gentlemen to adopt, on every occasion when I had an opportunity of expressing my views

to the Government, and especially to the hon. Minister of Public Works, who, I will avail myself of the occasion to remark, has always treated this subject in a correct light, and not whether Quebec or Montreal had more or less interest in the question; but, raising above the local interests under consideration, recognized the paramount duty of considering the great question of deep navigation. I did all in my power to impress on the Government to consider this subject whilst there was time, in order to arrive at a solution of this question, which is becoming more and more important for the commerce of the country.

Mr. FORTIN. Allow me to allude to a remark made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. According to him it is only the people of Montreal who should be interested in the deepening of the St. Lawrence. Allow me to say that the people of the whole country, from Halifax to British Columbia, are interested in that question. The deepening of the St. Lawrence should not be a local work, and should not be a job, as many people seem to think.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is this in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion of the question is hardly in order, unless the hon. gentleman is going to conclude with a motion.

Mr. FORTIN. I am not going to discuss it, Sir, but I wanted to explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

#### BOOMS AND OTHER WORKS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving for the second reading of Bill (No. 96) respecting booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts, or otherwise, said: This Bill is for the purpose of meeting a difficulty that has arisen in the Province of New Brunswick. It has been decided in the Courts of New Brunswick that the power given by the Local Legislature to certain parties for the erection of booms in a certain river was *ultra vires*. This Bill is for the purpose of giving a legal status to the proprietors of those booms, and thus to legalize what has been done; but it will not interfere with the suits now pending. When we come to the different clauses of the Bill I shall explain its details more fully. The reason I bring this matter up immediately is that the rivers in New Brunswick are opening up rapidly, and this Bill, if it is to become law, should be passed without delay, in order that the parties in question may not be disturbed in their possession, and in the collection of their dues.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister has quite correctly stated that this Bill has been suggested because of certain difficulties which have arisen in New Brunswick with regard to the possession of booms in navigable streams. In fact, there was a dispute in the courts, and the matter is now in appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. I believe it was at the instance of members from New Brunswick that the Bill was introduced, a very important one, affecting the great staple industry of the Province. With the general principle of the Bill I am entirely in accord; but there are some features of the Bill to which I would call the hon. Minister's attention. There are two classes of booms in our Province, and possibly in other Provinces—those which existed prior to Confederation, and which were legalized, and a very few booms, the charters of which have expired since Confederation, and which come under this Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When we go into Committee, I intend to move a clause, which will meet the case the hon. gentleman mentions, to the following effect:—

“Nothing herein shall apply to any boom or any such work as aforesaid, constructed under the authority of any Act of the Parliament of Mr. DESJARDINS.

Canada or the Legislature of the late Province of Canada, or the Legislature of any Provinces now forming part of the Dominion of Canada, passed before it became part thereof.”

Mr. WELDON. With regard to litigation, it strikes me that this proviso is very insecurely worded. I assume the intention of the proviso is that, after the litigation is settled, the Governor in Council can authorize the legalizing of a boom or dam, or aboiteau, which has been approved; but, according to the wording of the proviso, it applies only to cases in litigation settled within twelve months, and there might be a difficulty with regard to booms concerning which the litigation was not settled within that time, although the booms might be approved of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I propose to add at the end of the second sub-section these words: “During the said twelve months.”

Mr. WELDON. When the litigation goes beyond twelve months there might be difficulty in legalizing the boom. According to the ninth section the word “aboiteau” includes dykes. Aboiteaus and dykes are very extensive in our Province. In the Bay of Fundy the tide rises very high, in some places thirty feet, in some places sixty or seventy feet, so that on the coasts there are immense tracts of very marshy lands, which if not protected would be covered with water at high tide. At a very early period, even during the French occupation, these tracts were protected from the sea by dykes and aboiteaus, the dykes being built on the shore and the aboiteaus across the creeks and rivers. Dykes do not interfere with navigation at all. On the Annapolis River there are dykes that have been in existence since the French occupation, and the same may be said in regard to many of the aboiteaus, which are mostly placed in streams practically unnavigable. There have been only one or two instances where they could interfere with navigation. Under this Act many small dykes and aboiteaus in different parts of the country might be cut, to the great injury of property, by allowing the sea to overflow marshy lands. The dyke lands throughout the Province are regulated by Commissioners, who are elected by the proprietors of marshes, who possess a common, joint property in the dykes, which no one is allowed to open except under certain regulations. This Bill, in its present shape, would interfere with this system.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to point to the attention of the hon. member and the House, what seems to be an objectionable provision. No doubt a peculiar state of circumstances has arisen which requires exceptional temporary legislation. So far I am quite in accord with the hon. Minister. For a long number of years past, the Provinces have been authorizing certain dealings with rivers navigable in a more or less extended sense of that word, and now it is seriously argued that, so far as such action involves interference with the right of navigation, the Local Government had no right at all to take such action; that consequently the persons who have built these various obstructions are exposed to the ordinary process of law at the suit of those aggrieved, and the obstructions may be destroyed. Now, there are a great number, as I understand, of these constructions, so many that it has ceased to be an individual or minor interest, but it has become a very large one. It would be a misfortune that the question should remain pending in the courts of law from now till next Session of Parliament; but so far as this Bill proposes, during the next twelve months, or for whatever other reasonable period might be assigned, to legalize, so far as the question of navigation is concerned, these erections, I dare say this is a sensible mode of dealing with the matter, making provision for application to the proper authority for their legislation in so far as the question of navigation is concerned. But the right of navigation is a public right enjoyed by the subject, and which the Crown cannot alienate or depart with;



and recognizing that view, it is that hon. Ministers come down and lay a proposition before us to establish a permanent principle that the Crown shall be authorized to deprive the subject of the right of navigation to the extent to which any boom, dam, or aboiteau which the Crown thinks fit to legalize, may deprive them of. No general principle is laid down for action, no proposal is made that there shall be Commissioners to ascertain certain general principles of action, or the extent of the public good that is created by the existence of the dam, aboiteau, or boom, or the extent of the public inconvenience that is created, on the other hand, in the way of obstruction of navigation. Of course, those who are in possession of the boom, aboiteau, or dam, feel that it is very important that they should remain in possession of it, no matter how great the obstruction to navigation, and they will press very strongly upon the Government of the day the propriety of legalizing its maintenance. On the other hand, the public may want to use this stream, or whatever it may be, only occasionally, at rare intervals, and there may be nobody very prominently representing the general public cause. Now, it seems to me that it is a great innovation that Parliament should surrender to the Crown the power, *in perpetuum*, of determining whether the right of navigation is interfered with in any place throughout the Dominion in which the Local Legislature may have authorized the erection of booms, dams, or aboiteaus. I do not think Parliament ought to depart with that power; I think it ought not to depart with that power any more than a Local Legislature should depart with the power of authorizing the erection of dams, booms, or aboiteaus. Now another principle of arbitrary power which is proposed to be taken, and that seems to me wrong in principle, is a power on the part of the Governor in Council, of its own head, without the authority of a court of law at all, to order the destruction of a boom, dyke, or aboiteau. A subject who has erected a boom, dyke, or aboiteau, may contend that he has got a legal right to maintain it, that it does not interfere with navigation, &c.; but you propose, by the fifth section, to authorize the Governor in Council to order it to be torn down, and the rights of the subject may be thus interfered with without any redress whatever. It seems to me that is an entirely indefensible position in point of principle. It seems to me unexampled legislation, so far as I know, that the Crown should have authority, first of all, to say this nuisance interferes with navigation, and having said so should have authority, of its own hand, to order its destruction without determination of a court as to whether the opinion of the officers of the Crown is right or wrong. But with reference to the special section, and those things which are in litigation, I think it is more fit that discussion on them should take place in Committee; but I will merely suggest that the third sub-section as it stands might prove wholly insufficient to do what ought to be done in the case of these companies. It is quite proper, if the action with reference to the boom, dam, or aboiteau, be one of damages for the loss which an individual has obtained from the obstruction, that the Legislature should not interfere in such sort that this extent of damages should not be recovered. But, supposing the procedure is, as it may be, a procedure *in rem*, a procedure in the court to evade it, then that which you would determine to be illegal will, first of all, be torn down under this section, and then afterwards the authority of the Governor in Council will be invoked to say it is legal. It seems to me a distinction ought to be made, because you are going to give the Governor in Council power to declare this erection illegal so far as it interferes with navigation, and you ought not to allow legal proceedings, even though pending, to proceed to their absolute determination. Let the damages be sustained, let the action for damages proceed to the end, but let the erection not be torn down, first of all, at the suit of

the individual, and afterwards set up again in form, though it would not be set up again in substance, by the Order in Council. It would be like:

"Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,  
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall;  
All the King's horses, and all the King's men,  
Cannot set Humpty Dumpty up again."

There is also the difficulty my hon. friend from St. John has referred to with reference to these cases, and there certainly should be an amendment in this regard in the Committee. But these are matters of detail. It is to the principle of the Bill that I object—to these two points: that you are proposing to invest the Crown with an absolute discretion to interfere with the right of a subject to free navigation where it chooses, and that you are proposing further to invest the Crown with the power, wherever it thinks that a particular erection is an obstruction to navigation, to pull it down without that question being tried in courts of law.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. member for St. John, who agrees with the Bill in regard to booms, but who objects to the word "dam" and the word "aboiteau" and the word "dyke," I must say that if the hon. gentleman refers again to the first and second clauses he will find when the Bill refers to booms, dams, and aboiteaus, it is in so far as the same may not interfere with navigation; and if they do not interfere with navigation the Bill will not apply, and, therefore, the objection of the hon. gentleman is not pertinent. But I remember, and I think the hon. gentleman himself will remember, where an aboiteau was in the way of navigation—I cannot just now recollect the place—but we had to build, as a Government, a large aboiteau in either New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, some ten years ago.

Mr. WELDON. That is the one I referred to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember it was a very large and costly work, and I understood at the time, rather a difficult work. It was the first work of the kind that the Department of Public Works ever constructed, and, of course, we had to take information from those who had experience before us. I think the work we constructed was a good one. This Bill will not apply to it. The same with respect to dykes. The hon. gentleman says the dykes will not interfere with navigation. I suppose that will generally be the case, but there may be cases in which such dykes interfere with navigation. The hon. gentleman was speaking of certain portions of the country in the Maritime Provinces where dykes have been built. I saw a number of them when I had the pleasure of visiting the Lower Provinces, and they were constructed with the object of reclaiming drowned lands that were very precious and yielded large crops. But there might be a stream or streams interfered with by dykes, and in that case a dyke might fall under this Bill; but if those dykes do not interfere with navigation, of course the Bill will not apply to them. The same remark applies to dams. A dam will, most likely, instead of interfering with navigation, create navigation. Generally its object is to back the water and create a stretch of navigation which will be a benefit instead of an injury; and, therefore, in that case the Bill would apply, and would apply justly. I do not say that some changes may not be necessary in the Bill, but the principle of the Bill is a good one. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said that Parliament should not give such powers as is mentioned in this Bill to the Executive; that is to say, that the Governor in Council may interfere with these booms, dams, or aboiteaus, as is provided in section 5, which is as follows:—

"Any boom, dam, or aboiteau, within the purview of this Act which is built upon a site not approved by, or which is built in accordance with plans approved by the Governor General in Council, or which, having been so built, is not maintained in accordance with such plans,

may, in so far as the same interferes with navigation, be lawfully removed and destroyed under the authority of an order of the Governor General in Council."

I do not see anything wrong in that clause. Power of the same kind has been given to the Government in respect to other obstacles to navigation. For example, if a vessel is wrecked in a river, and interferes with navigation, and the owners do not remove it, the Government have certain powers under the law, and will use that power in order to remove the obstruction. Under this clause, if the works are not built in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council, they may be removed. If parties in violation of the law, instead of building works according to plans approved by the proper authorities, build dams or booms which interfere with navigation, authority is given to have the same removed. The hon. leader of the Opposition affirms that in such a case appeal should be had to a court, and the authority of a court should be obtained. I do not know whether his experience has been in the direction I am about to indicate, but I know that in very many cases the process of law is very long and tedious, and during all the time navigation will be interfered with, and the public will suffer because this individual has not complied with the provisions of the law, and has obtained a permission under false pretences, because he never intended to build the work under the regulations and plans laid down by the Government. In that case there should be an interference, and prompt interference, in order that navigation will not be obstructed. Then the hon. gentleman has referred to the words "and is not maintained in accordance with such plans." If there is an obstruction, there should be a prompt remedy applied, and that remedy has to be applied by the Governor in Council. If that provision were left out, that would have the effect of entrusting the power to irresponsible persons. I could very well understand the objection of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but it is given to the Governor in Council, that is to say, to the Ministers of the Crown who, every eight or nine months, come back to Parliament and are responsible to the representatives of the people, and, therefore, the guarantee is perfect. The hon. leader of the Opposition, moreover, says this power will be given for all to time come. Such is not the case. If Parliament, at its next Session, should repeal the law, it would have been in force only eight or ten months; but if the law was found to work well, it would be allowed to remain on the Statute-book. I think, under these circumstances, the Bill should be read the second time and should become law.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

**Mr. BLAKE.** Why should it be declared that there shall not be lawful booms unless they have been approved? Are they lawful booms without being approved?

**Mr. MITCHELL.** The cause which led to the introduction of the Bill now under the consideration of the House is simply this: There are a number of booms in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in the hands of a number of parties who were incorporated prior to Confederation. These Acts of incorporation were for terms of eight, ten, fifteen or twenty years, as the case might be. When the Acts expired the Local Legislature renewed them, extending and granting new charters; and their right to do so was never questioned until a recent case came up before the courts, when it was suggested by one of the Judges during the argument of the case, that it was beyond the power of the Local Legislature to grant powers which would in any way interfere with the navigation of rivers. This led to the attention of the different parties interested in booms being drawn to the question. Of course, many

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN,

millions of feet of lumber are coming down the rivers and going into booms, and the suggestion of the Judge was looked upon with alarm by all those companies interfering with navigable rivers. Hence it became necessary to apply to the Dominion Parliament for incorporation. The Government attention having been called to the question, the present Bill was prepared. The hon. member for West Durham asks why these booms should be removed altogether for one year until the companies obtain the sanction of Parliament.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I said nothing of the kind. I was referring to the clause which is now before the Committee, namely the first clause, which speaks of booms, dams, and aboiteaus, hereafter constructed.

**Mr. MITCHELL.** I am so far distant from the hon. gentleman that I can scarcely hear one-half of his remarks. But while I am up, I may just as well explain that the reason for coming here is this: Timber is coming down at this very moment on some of the rivers. None of the booms are legal—if the decision of the court is made as expected—and the object of putting in the clause to which I refer, is this: That it desires, and the object of Parliament is, to give those people whose property is at stake, the right to secure that property for this current year, and to enable them by some speedy way, to come during the year to Parliament, and submit their plans and specifications to the Government and get its sanction, to the legalizing of the boom as it now stands, or direct it to be altered; that is the particular point to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee. The point to which the hon. gentleman referred, relates to the first section, which is as follows:—

"No boom, dam, or aboiteau, hereafter constructed whether under the authority of an Act of a Legislature of a Province of Canada, or under the authority of an Ordinance of the North-West Territories, or of the District of Keewatin or otherwise, shall, so far as the same may interfere with navigation, be a lawful boom, dam, or aboiteau, unless the site thereof has been approved, and unless the boom, dam, or aboiteau, has been built and is maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor General in Council."

By this section it appears to me very clear that hereafter no boom shall be built across a navigable river, until plans and specifications are submitted to the Government for the sanction and approval of the officers of the Government, the object being not to interfere with navigation materially, or for the plans to be altered in such a way that they will not so interfere materially.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I receive with great respect the hon. gentleman's explanation of the object of the specifications in the first clause, but I was anxious to get an explanation from the hon. Minister who is responsible for the Bill, and is carrying it through Committee. I may explain, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that my difficulty is this: Either booms constructed across navigable rivers under the authority of a Local Legislature, are, so far as they interfere with navigation, lawful, or they are not; that is quite clear—one or the other is the case. If they are legal then why take away the attribute of legality therefrom; but the whole theory of the Bill is that they are not lawful. You then proceed to say, that they shall not be lawful unless the plans are submitted to the Governor in Council and approved. I maintain that the Bill proceeds on the theory that they are not lawful, and there is no necessity, or propriety, in the declaration of their being not lawful unless the plans have been approved and legalized. You may provide for their being made lawful by plans approved by the Governor in Council, according to which they are made; but you do not require to and ought not to declare, that they shall be unlawful otherwise, for the law directs and makes them unlawful otherwise so far as they interfere with navigation. The general proposition on which the whole legislation proceeds is that the Local Legislature does not warrant interference with navigation; and, therefore, if they

interfere with navigation, they are to that extent unlawful; therefore you do not want to declare, that they are unlawful, but to obtain machinery by which, it being admitted that they are unlawful, they shall be made lawful.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was glad to explain to the hon. gentleman how I understood this first clause when my hon. friend rose, and, of course, I, knowing the interest which he takes in all matters of that kind, would not interfere with what he had to say. The object of the section is this: We start from this point—the Local Legislature has not authority. That is the point. Then we say that the boom, dam, or aboiteau, which will be constructed henceforth to be legal must be built after the site has been approved by the Governor in Council, and be built and maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council. That is the object.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend will permit me to point out that the second clause accomplishes everything, and I would suggest that the Bill begin with the second clause.

Mr. BURNS. It may be well to state, as bearing on the first section, that it only takes the place and carries out the provisions of the Local Act, because this establishes that booms in New Brunswick shall be so constructed as to admit the possibility of admitting the passage of vessels, and not to interfere with navigation. A clause of that kind is placed in every Act of incorporation, respecting dams, passed in New Brunswick.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the first clause evidently has for its object the prevention of the building of booms, dams, and aboiteaus, unless the site is selected by the Governor in Council, and the plans are approved by the Governor General in Council. It is to prevent any boom, dam, or aboiteau, being built unless this is done. Then the second clause proceeds to say that any boom, dam, and aboiteau, that may be constructed henceforth, or constructed heretofore, will be an illegal boom, dam, or aboiteau, if these conditions had not been complied with. I think that this is the distinction which the Bill wishes to make: First, to prevent these being built unless the site is so-and-so; and, second, those that are built will be illegal if not built in accordance with the provisions of the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. If that be the object, the proper course is to provide that any boom, dam, or aboiteau, should be constructed that would interfere with navigation, &c., if you want to prevent the construction of a dam &c., that would interfere with navigation; but what you say is, no boom, &c., constructed hereafter shall be a lawful dam, &c.; while what you ought to say is, that no boom, &c., shall be constructed under authority that shall interfere with navigation.

Mr. WELDON. That would be a more direct mode of expressing it. As far as regards the word "boom," &c., in that section, they may be very well left in, because, if any boom, &c., is built hereafter interfering with navigation, then the Government might interfere.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to one point. Why does he want to prevent only booms being constructed? I called his attention to a harbor in my county, St. Jean Port Joli, where the Local Government granted a patent for a water lot between high and low water mark, which patent interferes directly with navigation. The Board of Quebec Harbor Commissioners say, that if the wharf projected is constructed according to the patent, it will completely obstruct that harbor; and I think that the Government ought also to provide for this kind of impediment in navigation. This is a very important harbor for the locality. The patent that has been granted is illegal, in my opinion. Still the courts of law decided that it was valid, though a subsequent decision of the Supreme Court declares the contrary; but the obstruction is to be made. I

may say that this concession was granted when the hon. member for Gaspé was at the head of the Crown Lands Department in Quebec. While we are upon this question of navigation, which is connected with fisheries, I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fisheries at St. Jean Port Joli, Rivière Ouelle. The hon. Minister of Marine, because he says the Government have not granted licenses—

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will postpone his remarks on this subject to some other time, as it really does not properly come up under this Bill.

Mr. WOOD. There is a great deal of uncertainty in our Province as to the legality of some of these aboiteaus which have been constructed on our rivers. In one case several trials have taken place before the courts, but the juries could not agree, and it was finally referred to arbitration. The question before the arbitrators was to whether or not these structures were a benefit to certain lands; but the question of their legality was not settled because they are principally used for the protection and improvement of adjoining lands, and not as a means of navigation. I think, therefore, it would be very satisfactory to the people who live in those sections of the country to have it decided by law whether such structures are authorized or not. With regard to the word "dykes" to which the hon. gentleman refers, they are generally placed on top of the aboiteau, not for the purpose of obstructing the main river, but merely to prevent the tide overflowing when it is exceptionally high.

Mr. WELDON. There is no doubt, as the hon. gentleman says, there has been considerable discussion as to the legality of those aboiteaus, and I should like to see a clause inserted in the Bill declaring that all these aboiteaus heretofore erected shall be legal, but leaving those of the future under the operation of the first clause which requires plans to be filed in order to determine their legality. Many of these structures do not interfere to any serious extent with the navigation of the small rivers and streams upon which they are placed—to nothing like an extent commensurate with the advantage to the land which is secured by their construction. There are some streams in Albert and Westmoreland counties where they, the aboiteau, is the main road, and the streams upon which they are placed could not be practically used for purposes of navigation even if they were removed. In one sense, these dykes and aboiteaus are private, but in another they are public, and by the law of New Brunswick these marsh lands are set off in districts. The proprietors of these districts elect Commissioners, who regulate these dams and aboiteaus, and other matters of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to meet the views of hon. gentlemen I would suggest that the clause be amended in this way. In the fifth line of the first clause strike out the words "shall so far as the same may" and substitute "so as to," and in the following line insert the word "shall" before the word "be."

On section 5,

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain my objection in giving power to the Governor in Council to interfere with navigation in this way; and I must say, with reference to the hon. gentleman's argument that there is power given already to the Governor in Council to remove a wreck from a harbor, in case the owner neglects to remove it, that it seems to me the analogy does not hold. A vessel may be wrecked in a harbor or river, and the owner may be away, and not comply with his duty; but it is one thing to permit the Government to do that which the owner ought to do and would do for the protection of his own property if he were there, and it is quite another thing to permit the Crown, of its own mere motion, to destroy an existing property.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case it would be better to leave the matter under the general law and strike the clauses out altogether.

On section 10,

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). It has occurred to me that, though a dam, aboiteau, or boom, might not be an obstruction to navigation when erected, circumstances might afterwards arise that would become an obstruction, and would need to be removed. I do not see any provision in this Bill to meet a case of that kind. The place where you use a boom at present might be wanted for wharf purposes, or railway termination, or something of that kind, and I see no proviso by which that construction might be removed. It seems to me that the Governor in Council should have the power of removing those obstructions when the public interest requires it, which they had the power of authorizing when the public interest required it.

Mr. BLAKE. The law will remove them then.

Progress reported.

#### INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain proposed resolution (April 12th) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon. gentleman estimate will be the fiscal result of the changes proposed in the resolution as regards the Excise duties on tobacco and cigars.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The difference between the present duty, and the proposed duty, it is estimated, will cause a reduction in the amount of duty collected to the extent of \$800,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister give the Committee some further details as to how the loss is made up.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount collected altogether is nearly \$2,000,000, and the reduction will be eight-twentieths of the whole. For every one cent reduction in duty, there is a loss of about \$100,000. That is the basis of the calculation.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no calculation of increased consumption in consequence of the decrease in the duty.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. There may be some, but it is doubtful. Such increased consumption will probably take place in home produced tobacco, on which the duty has been reduced from 10 cts. to 2 cts.

Mr. BLAKE. What revenue will be derived from the duty of 2 cts.?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That we can hardly say, for the whole amount of the duty collected on home grown tobacco last year amounted only to \$18,000, and we can only take that as a basis.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman estimated a revenue from Excise from all sources of \$5,400,000, and the actual revenue last year was \$5,390,000, which is very nearly the same.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But this year there is a considerable increase. There was a reduction, however, no doubt. The difference, if my memory serves me, between the estimate for Excise next year, compared with what we expect this year, was about \$400,000 and \$500,000, because we will probably lose \$300,000 this year by the fact of it not being put into the market. That is not knowing that

Mr. BLAKE.

this was to take place, and it was not taken out for consumption, and the difference between what would have been received next year under the old Tariff and the present would make about \$800,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that the loss, irrespective of this question, is anticipated to be \$800,000. Will this be the permanent range of loss?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I see. Then the hon. gentleman told us there was about \$1,250,000 of relief from taxation altogether, and I am unable to make these figures just now given us chime in with them. I do not know where the \$450,000 are, if we only get \$800,000 of relief from tobacco.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; as far as the alterations are made in connection with this, it will be about \$1,050,000 or \$1,100,000. Some hon. member—I think the hon. member for Brant—asked me, when we were passing the Free List, what was the loss on the Free List, and I said, \$80,000 or \$90,000. The balance is in the reduction of duties where decreases have taken place, and the articles are not placed on the Free List. The whole amount is something over \$200,000—say \$250,000, which makes \$1,050,000 if this reduction is \$800,000.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the whole sum, including the Free List?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And the hon. gentleman expects a reduction of about \$110,000 in other items, exclusive of this \$100,000?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; to the extent of \$160,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is making no alterations, on the other hand, for increases?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. We do not expect to get any increases from the changes made in the Tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. From none of them?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not quite understand this \$800,000 loss to the revenue. I think that the hon. gentleman is rather mistaken there. He has overlooked the matter of cigars. Of course, there is not a proportionate decrease in cigars compared with tobacco. I would judge that the proportion would not be over—and I do not know whether it would be—one-fourth or not.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The duty is reduced from July next, from 40 cts. to 30 cts., and this will probably lead to a reduction of about 25 per cent., so it is pretty much the same proportion. There is not much difference between the proportion of decrease in cigars and tobacco, though the former is a little less perhaps. The receipts were \$1,000,000 on the average under the present Tariff; take off eight-twentieths from that, and you have \$800,000 in round numbers.

Mr. PATERSON. We must have been expecting large sums in some way, to bring up the revenue to the same amount which we have had.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. If the hon. gentleman will look, he will find that there has been a large increase from Excise this year.

Mr. PATERSON. And you are basing your calculations on the increase of next year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; but of this year. My calculations are based on the revenue which we have had this year, and are likely to receive from tobacco, and I take off eight-twentieths from that. There has been a considerable increase this year from all sources of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon. gentleman think will be the expense of collecting the 2 cts. duty on home-grown tobacco?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. member will find that, under this arrangement—it will be stated before we get through—that the machinery will be simplified, and there will not be so much expense connected with it. In fact, I may say to the hon. member that, if it had not been that the Department desired to keep control of the question, the duty would have been thrown off altogether. There was considerable inducement to do it; but still it was necessary for the Department to have control of the tobacco, which enters into the manufacture, from our home-grown leaf.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The moment it goes beyond our reach, in the first place we have to see that the manufacturers of foreign leaf do not get possession of and manufacture home-grown. The hon. member will understand that perfectly well. Then there are other reasons. Of course, we are now driven to a certain extent, owing to the large reduction which has taken place in the United States, to take off more duty from tobacco than otherwise we would very likely have proposed, had the former state of things continued. The Department considered the matter, and represented to the Government that it was desirable for certain reasons to lose control of the home-grown leaf.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that for this there are two reasons: First, that unless control of the home-grown is taken, there might be certain improprieties with reference to the manufacturers of tobacco, who might make up their accounts.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We would not have the same control.

Mr. BLAKE. And the second is, that possibly a larger duty might be imposed at some future time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to provide separate licenses entirely for the manufacture of cigars and tobacco, and that their manufacture on the same premises will not be allowed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will be separate licenses.

Mr. PATERSON. And those at present engaged in both lines will have to take out two licenses, and have separate factories in two entirely different buildings?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Resolution reported.

Mr. COSTIGAN introduced Bill (No. 115) to consolidate and amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

Bill read the first time.

#### INSOLVENT CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 103) to amend an Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations, said: This Bill is from the Senate, and it arises out of the Act which it proposes to amend. The reason for this legislation had its origin in a case in Prince Edward Island, when, with respect to the winding-up of a banking institution, it was found that under the existing Act they had no power to effect the objects which were desired to be attained.

Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the Bill.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 5:55 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 25th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific coast of Canada and Asia.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

#### SUPERANNUATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Acts relating to the superannuation of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada, by providing that—

(a.) The Governor in Council may grant to any person having served in an established capacity in the Civil Service for ten years or upwards, and having attained the age of sixty years, or being incapacitated by bodily infirmity from properly performing his duties, a superannuation allowance, calculated on his average yearly salary during the then last three years, and not exceeding the following rates, that is to say:—If he has served for ten years, but less than eleven years, an allowance of ten-fiftieths of such average salary, and if for eleven years and under twelve years an annual allowance of eleven-fiftieths thereof, and in like manner a further addition of one-fiftieth of such average salary for each additional year of service up to thirty-five years, when an annual allowance of thirty-five fiftieths may be granted, but no addition shall be made for any service beyond thirty-five years; if the service has not been continuous, the period or periods during which such service has been interrupted shall not be counted, and the Order in Council made in such case shall be laid before Parliament at its then or then next Session.

(b.) The Governor in Council may, in the case of any person who entered the Civil Service after the age of thirty years, as being possessed of some peculiar professional or other qualifications or attainments required for the office to which he was appointed, and not ordinarily to be acquired in the public service, add to the actual number of years service of such person, such further number not exceeding ten, as may be considered equitable, for reasons stated in the Order of Council made in the case; and such additional number of years shall be taken as part of term of service on which the superannuation allowance of such person shall be computed, the Order in Council in any such case being laid before Parliament, at its then or then next Session.

(c.) Towards making good the superannuation allowances hereinbefore mentioned, an abatement shall be made from the salary of each person in the Civil Service to whom this Act applies, at the rate of 2 per centum per annum on such salary, if it be \$600 or upwards, and of 1½ per centum per annum thereon, if it be less than \$600, and the sum so deducted shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, but such abatement shall be made only during the first thirty-five years of service.

(d.) The full superannuation allowance as aforesaid shall only be granted to persons who have been subject to the said abatement during ten years or upwards; the superannuation allowance of any person who has not paid it, or has paid it for a less period, being subject to a diminution of 1 per centum for every year less than ten during which he has not paid it, except that the superannuation allowance of any person hereafter retiring, shall not be subject to any such diminution by reason of his not having paid the abatement hereinbefore mentioned, during any year or years after his first thirty-five years of service.

(e.) Retirement shall be compulsory on any person to whom the superannuation allowance hereinbefore mentioned shall be offered, and such offer shall not be considered as implying any censure upon the person to whom it is made; nor shall any person be considered as having any absolute right to such allowance, but it shall be granted only in consideration of good and faithful service during the time upon which it is calculated, and nothing herein contained shall be understood as impairing or affecting the right of the Governor to dismiss or remove any person from the Civil Service.

(f.) If the Head of a Department reports with respect to any person employed in his Department, and about to be superannuated, from any cause other than that of ill-health or age, that the service of such person has not been satisfactory, the Governor in Council may grant such person a superannuation allowance being less than that to which he would have otherwise been entitled, as to him may seem fit.

(g.) If any person to whom this Act applies, is constrained from any infirmity of mind or body to quit the Civil Service before the period at which a superannuation allowance might be granted him, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for each year of his service; and if any such person is so constrained to quit the service before such period, by reason of severe bodily injury received without his own fault in the discharge of his public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding three months' pay for every two years' service, or a superannuation allowance not exceeding one-fifth of his average salary during the then last three years.

(h.) If any person to whom this Act applies is removed from office in consequence of the abolition thereof, in order to the improvement of the organization of the Department to which he belongs, or is removed or retired from office to promote efficiency or economy in the Civil Service, the Governor in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service.

(i.) The allowances and gratuities granted under this Act shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

(k.) All superannuation allowances fixed and granted under the Acts hereby repealed are confirmed.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is a consolidation of the Act with some slight amendments with reference to superannuation. The change which is proposed to be made, becomes necessary from the passage of the Civil Service Act of last Session. In the original Act, providing for superannuation, all employes of the Government, either inside or outside were included; but by the Act of last Session, the outside service was confined to Customs, Excise, and Inland Revenue. It is intended by this amendment to extend the superannuation to all the other outside Departments by Order in Council. Hon. gentlemen opposite will recollect that under the old Act, all the prominent officials of the railways were placed on the superannuation list, and so with reference to some of the other Departments. I believe that the Deputy Receiver-General's Department has never been brought under the operation of the Act; but by this change these Departments will be placed in exactly the same position they were in before. These are the principle changes proposed in the shape of amendments to the existing Act.

Mr. BLAKE. The whole question of superannuation necessarily comes up under this Bill; and I had hoped, as the hon. gentleman proposes to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the subject, and to extend the services to which superannuation is to be applied, that he would have given, at an early day, some statement as to the effect of the measure on the service generally, and as to its financial effects. The hon. gentleman acknowledged, at an earlier stage of this Session, that the principle upon which this Government dealt with this question when they originally proposed the Superannuation Act, was a mistaken one; that they forgot that the principle of life insurance was applicable to these cases; and that the reduction to be made in the allowances by the Government was a mistaken reduction. We have found the system continuing year after year, and the discrepancy between the receipts and expenditures increasing year after year, and the gross amount of the expenditure increasing year after year, until we find

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

it difficult to ascertain where it will end; and now we have a vague and indefinite proposal in this Bill, authorizing the Government to determine from time to time, outside of certain classes, whom they will and whom they will not superannuate. My impression is that it would have been more in accordance with proper legislation and a due regard for the rights of Parliament, if the Government had brought down a proposal as to what classes of persons they were about to superannuate. If the Government are not able, after the number of years that this system has been in vogue, to declare what classes of persons ought to be superannuated, and what classes ought not, because the subject is so obscure and so difficult, they ought to be assisted by a discussion in this House. It is impossible now to declare who ought and who ought not to be superannuated; and yet, when a suggestion was made in the other branch of the Legislature by an hon. gentleman who was formerly a member of the Government, the former member for Terrebonne, the hon. Mr. Masson, that information should be brought down on this subject, the hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill there said it was very difficult to do so, and the Bill comes down here in its present state. There is a proposal in this Bill that we should confirm all superannuation allowance heretofore granted. I do not think we should do that. There may be some granted to, or in excess of, the powers granted to the Government. One such case was brought before the attention of Parliament a few years ago by the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Railways. The case was investigated, and it was found that the Government had exceeded their powers, and the matter was rectified. But what is now proposed is to give a wholesale statutory confirmation of all superannuation allowances which have been made, no matter whether they have been in excess of the powers of the Government or not. Perhaps that was not intended; perhaps all that was intended was that these superannuations should stand in as good a position as they were in before the passage of this Bill. But, if that be not intended, I think we may fairly ask what superannuations require statutory confirmation—why and on what ground. For my own part, I am dissatisfied with the working of the superannuation Act. I believe that the results of its working have not been advantageous; and while I am prepared to sustain some means whereby the services of an official, who is no longer competent to discharge his duties, may be dispensed with, I believe the present system is one which it is not in the interest of the country to retain on any ground. The hon. gentleman will see that the charge is very large. If I remember rightly, something like \$120,000 a year is now the difference between the receipts and the expenditures. I know that the report of the Civil Service Commission produces certain figures to show that there is a great saving; but that operation is performed by a sort of legerdemain which I do not think will commend it to the taxpayer. The Commissioners prove that in every case in which there has been economy, this has been either by the abolition of an office, or by the retirement of an official; and they assume that the person who retired would have lived for ever but for the Superannuation Act, or that an office abolished would have been perpetual; and therefore they claim that a large saving has been effected by these means. But we must remember that officers would die, and would be removed, even if there was no Superannuation Act; and therefore this claim of economy is ridiculous. Then there is a mischief in the present operation of this Act. It is supposed to be on the insurance principle, and the premium is no doubt inadequate to have the Act applied to certain persons; but the return I moved for a while ago, which has been brought down in part, is sufficient to show the House that a very large proportion of all the public servants who have been placed under the operation of the Superannuation Act have died in the service, and all those persons of course paid without benefit. They have a chance of living long enough and

becoming infirm enough to get the benefit of the Act, but Providence was too kind to them, and allowed them to die in harness. I think another system different from the present system—it is perhaps premature to state it just now—would do justice to that class of officers and their families, and also to the other class of officers who are about to retire, and would, above and beyond all, do justice to the public, who are no doubt interested in the efficiency of the service. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should have brought these resolutions on to-day, and stated that they would take only a few minutes for discussion. To my mind that opened a very large question—a question of policy of the practical operation of the existing policy which has been on trial for some time, with results, it appears to me, eminently unsatisfactory. At a subsequent stage of the Bill I hope we will receive full explanations of the views which induced the Government, with the experience they have had, to propose, not a change in the Civil Service Act, but an extension of the application of that Act in its present objectionable form.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no intention on the part of the Government to confirm any doubtful cases, but simply to secure to the parties the rights they had under this Act before the amendments were made. The hon. gentleman referred to this being an insurance company, and to the advisability of its being conducted on the same principle.

Mr. BLAKE. Not an insurance company—but the hon. gentleman has stated that the principle of insurance applied to it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not that the principle applied entirely; because it will be borne in mind that, when this Bill was introduced, it was stated distinctly that it was for the purpose of placing the Government in a position to replace, by active, energetic men, those who are worn out in the service, whom the Government would hesitate to dismiss without giving them a retiring allowance. This is the basis on which the Act was introduced, and the men who had been twenty-five years in service, and had reached the age of sixty-five or seventy years, obtained, in many cases, immediate benefit from the operation of the Act. Though, to a certain extent, the Act is on the principle of insurance, it is not based on the general calculations on which insurances are based. At the time the Bill was introduced, it was thought that the amount to be obtained by the Government would be sufficient to pay pensions, without creating any loss to the Treasury; and after the Act had been a few years in operation it was found that the amounts received were in excess, and there was a universal feeling in the House that the amount to be paid by the Civil Service should be reduced. The Government were not quite of that opinion, but still the returns showed as if the Government would be justified in making the reduction, and there was a unanimous feeling, on both sides of the House, in favor of such deduction. Whether the statement of the Commission is correct or not, there are a great many items that do not appear on the credit side of this account, but which go to reduce the amount paid in excess of the amount received. It is quite possible that the calculations of these hon. gentlemen may have been made somewhat erroneously to show there has been a saving in the operation of the Act; but I do know that men are superannuated who have passed their term of usefulness and are replaced by younger and efficient men at lower salaries in many cases. I know that in New Brunswick, three officers of the Customs, with salaries of \$1,000 and \$1,200 per year, have been superannuated and their offices not since filled, thus effecting a saving. When the Bill is taken up for consideration I will be prepared to show—not to the extent, perhaps, the Civil Service Commission has shown—that there is a very large amount saved, and to the credit of this fund, by the superannuation of officers not required, or whose services were not

efficient, and that we have had the benefit of efficient officers at lower salaries.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Will the hon. gentleman give us some idea of the contents of the resolution now proposed, as regards the different Departments?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is to place this matter just about where it was under the old Act, as acted upon by both Governments. Under the Act of last Session we can only apply it to three Departments.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The Bill does not apply to every person who has been in the employ of the Government for ten years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. All those who are employed at a yearly salary as permanent officers of the Government, may, outside of the three Departments I have referred to, be brought in. We did not take all the Departments before, and this will have about the same effect.

Mr. BLAKE. It was in the discretion of the Government whether they will take men in or put them out. There was some question about penitentiary chaplains, when one Government took one view and another Government another. That indicates there is that power on the part of the Government to act as they think proper, and we do not know to what extent the list of those entitled to superannuation may be increased.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government took the power under the Act. They did not take all the employes of the penitentiaries, but only certain employes. The proposition in this is, that by an Order in Council the whole of the employes receiving annual salaries may come under the operation of this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. When we acted before we were acting with reference to a new experiment, and it was a question whether it should apply to the whole service. Rightly or wrongly we gave the Government discretion to decide to what classes it should apply; and to-day the Government ought to be able, after the experience of ten or twelve years, to determine what classes of public employes should be brought within the range of the Superannuation Act and what classes should be left out, and in consolidating and amending the Superannuation Act these classes should be defined.

Resolution to be reported.

#### KING'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) ELECTION.

Mr. BLANCHET moved that the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting the last Elections for the Electoral District of King's County (P.E.I.) be now concurred in.

Mr. HALL. The previous discussion of this case in the House was directed principally to the duties and conduct of the returning officer and the law applicable thereto, but as the Committee of Privileges and Elections to whom the matter was referred has had before it all the evidence, both as to that subject and as tending to show which of the candidates is rightfully and permanently entitled to the seat, it was thought advisable by the Committee that a short abstract of this evidence should be given to the House, in order that hon. members might more easily follow the arguments that will be adduced both in support of and against the Committee's report. As seconding the motion for concurrence, therefore, I take the opportunity of submitting a brief abstract of the testimony which was adduced, and of the legal conclusions that were based thereon. At the last General Dominion Election, of the candidates who presented themselves for the constituency of the Fourth Electoral District of King's County (P.E.I.) were Dr. J. E. Robertson, and A. C. McDonald, Esq., and of the votes that

were tendered at that election, 2,002 were given in favor of Dr. Robertson, and 1,941 in favor of Mr. McDonald. Therefore, Dr. Robertson was elected as the representative of that constituency, unless some disqualification existed which prevented his filling that place, and even then he was entitled to have been returned as the representative of the constituency, and to have taken his seat in this House, unless that disqualification were of such a nature as to make his election void, *ab initio*, and to have the effect of causing the votes that were given for him to be thrown away. That disqualification the Committee believes to have existed, and they base their conclusions on the following facts: In the month of May, prior to the General Dominion Elections, a General Election had taken place throughout the Province of Prince Edward Island for the House of Assembly of that Province. At that election Dr. Robertson had presented himself as the candidate for the same constituency, had taken the oath of qualification necessary under the law of that Province, and had been elected and proclaimed as the duly elected member for that constituency in the *Official Gazette* of that Province. Two Statutes have been passed by this Parliament in reference to the subject of dual representation, one absolutely prohibiting, and another conditionally prohibiting that representation. While a doubt was entertained as to the applicability of one of these Statutes, no doubt whatever was entertained, or maintained, in the Committee, but that under one or the other of them dual representation was prohibited, and therefore that Dr. Robertson, at the time he presented himself as a candidate for election to this House, was disqualified from being a candidate, or from being elected, unless between the time of his election for the Provincial Legislature and his candidature for the Dominion Parliament he had validly effected a resignation. That resignation, it is claimed, was made by him. On the other hand, after the election had taken place, and before the summing up of the votes, a protest was submitted to the returning officer, to the effect that such disqualification still existed, and this was supported by the certificate of the Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, that up to that time, the 26th June, six days after the election, no resignation had been tendered to him on behalf of Dr. Robertson, nor had any communication been presented to him to the effect that such resignation had been given. The returning officer for the Dominion Election had also acted as returning officer in the Provincial Election, and he therefore had personal knowledge that Dr. Robertson had been elected in that constituency, to the General Assembly of Prince Edward Island. It was not, however, upon that authority, but upon the official certificate of the Lieutenant-Governor, that no resignation had been put in, that the returning officer acted in this matter. He did not report, as the Committee believe he was justified in reporting, that Mr. McDonald was duly elected. He made a special return to this House, stating the fact that the largest number of votes was in favor of Dr. Robertson; but that by the certificate and protest which he forwarded with his return, a disqualification existed, which prevented his being entitled to the seat. Now, with reference to this resignation which is pretended to have taken place, it is necessary to state, in the first place, that by the common law, no such resignation as this is allowed. It is considered that when a person presents himself as a candidate for election for a constituency, and is selected by that constituency as its representative, a compact exists between them from which neither can withdraw. The constituency has no right to reconsider its decision, and to dis-elect the member—if I may use that expression—nor, on the other hand, has the member elected a right to resign his seat, and, thereby, to disfranchise the constituency. It is only by a special statutory enactment that such a right exists. In Great Britain no such statutory

Mr. HALL.

provision does exist, and it is very well known that whenever a member of the Imperial Parliament desires to be relieved from the trust thereby imposed upon him, he is obliged to resort to the expedient of accepting the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, or some other office, real or nominal, in the gift of the Crown, and thereby become disqualified under the Act applying to such disqualification. In this Dominion, however, and also in the Provinces composing it, there are statutory provisions with reference to resignation. These enactments are very similar in their form, and it is necessary, of course, that whoever desires to avail himself of them must observe strictly the regulations they impose. In Prince Edward Island we find that there are three methods of resignation. A member may, from his place in the House, announce verbally his intention to resign; the Clerk of the House makes a minute of it in the Journals of the House, and the Speaker at once communicates this declaration to the Lieutenant-Governor, who forthwith issues his writ for a new election; or a member desiring to resign may announce that intention by a written communication addressed to the Speaker of the House, and this communication is at once conveyed by the Speaker to the Lieutenant-Governor, who forthwith issues his writ for a new election; or a member desiring so to resign may communicate his intention in writing to any two members of the House, and these members are required by law, "forthwith"—I use the terms of the Statute—to communicate this intention to the Lieutenant-Governor, who, as in the other cases, issues his writ immediately for a new election. It will be seen that the procedure is similar in all three cases. The declaration of intention must emanate, in the first instance, from the member who wishes to resign; in the second place there must be a record of it, either under his own hand, or in the Journal of the House, and the declaration must in all three cases reach the Lieutenant-Governor in order to be effective. It is clear that that must be the intention, because, as I stated before, in the case of elections, the effect is mutual, so in resignations is the effect two-fold—it not only has the effect of freeing the member from his trust, but it has also the result of disfranchising the constituency. It is, therefore, clear that the intention of all laws upon the subject, is that the Statute which gives to the member the right to resign also provides the machinery under which the constituency shall be relieved from the effect of that resignation. The Statute of Prince Edward Island is clear on this point, and says: "And a member so tendering his resignation shall be held to have vacated his seat and ceased to be a member of the House." It does not state: "A member who has so declared his intention of resigning," but "A member who has so tendered his resignation." Every one will appreciate the distinction between the two. A tender is not effective until it has reached the object of the tender; the declaration of a member of the Local Legislature that he intends to resign, is not such a resignation as he might not withdraw from at any time; and the fact that it has reached the Lieutenant-Governor is what gives effect to the resignation and releases the member from his trust and disfranchises, temporarily, the constituency. There is in the law of Prince Edward Island, a clause which is similar to that contained in the Act of the Dominion Parliament and of other Provincial Legislatures, providing that for a certain specified time after the election takes place no member has a right to avail himself of the privilege in respect to resignation; the delay, as of course hon. gentlemen will understand, is the delay during which an election may be contested. If during that delay, the member might resign, the object of the law would be frustrated, because a member who was conscious that he obtained his election by fraudulent and corrupt practices might free himself from the



consequences which might follow an investigation in the courts, by resigning and becoming again a candidate; whereas if the matter were contested, it might be that he would be disqualified in consequence of his acts. Therefore, during this time, under the law of the Dominion, and specially under the law of Prince Edward Island, a member is absolutely prohibited from effecting his resignation. In Prince Edward Island this delay is stipulated for twenty-one days; not twenty-one days from the time of the election, but from the time when the notice of the election shall have reached the Provincial Secretary. In the case of Dr. Robertson's election to the Local Legislature this notice reached the Provincial Secretary on May 27, and therefore at the time when he presented himself as a candidate on the 13th of June afterwards for election to this House, the twenty-one days had not expired, nor had they expired when the election took place on June 20th. The Committee find, in the first place, that it was impossible for Dr. Robertson to have resigned, within the terms of the law, at the time he presented himself for his election to this House. But in the face of this fact, it is contended, on behalf of Dr. Robertson, that he did resign, and therefore it is necessary to consider the circumstances and procedure under which he professes to have made that resignation. He claims to have used the last of the three methods which the law provides, viz.: by tender of his resignation to two members of the House. It is claimed, on behalf of Dr. Robertson, that this was done in the form of a letter dated June 12th, and delivered on June 13th, the latter date being the day on which the nomination took place. Notwithstanding the provision of the law, that members receiving declarations of another member's wish to resign, must forthwith communicate the same to the Lieutenant-Governor, no communication of any kind reached the Lieutenant-Governor from those two members that Dr. Robertson had resigned or intended to resign until 8th of July afterwards; nearly a month after the date of the letter, and eighteen days after the election had taken place, which this resignation was intended to affect. It has been suggested that it is probable Dr. Robertson did not intend seriously to resign, that he intended to make his resignation in such a form that it might be used or not used according to the result of the Dominion Election; and the very strange, inexcusable and illegal detention of the letter on the part of the two gentlemen to whom he entrusted it, gives ground for very grave suspicion, and this suspicion is further confirmed by the fact that when the letter was finally unearthed, it was discovered to be a letter, not addressed to those two members in their official capacity as members of the House, but simply as individuals, thus furnishing them with the excuse, if their conduct should ever be called in question, that the letter was not addressed to them in any official capacity, but as neighbors and friends, and that they were justified therefore in treating it officially, or not, as they chose. It was not considered necessary by the Committee to give much weight to technicalities of this kind, and I only refer to them incidentally in passing. The Committee arrived at the conclusion—and I have no doubt it will be concurred in almost unanimously by the House—that Dr. Robertson could not, and did not, legally resign his seat in the Local Legislature before or at the time he presented himself for election to this House, and consequently that he was legally disqualified from so presenting himself and from being elected. We then come to the question of the effect of that disqualification. I mentioned at the outset that there were two Statutes in regard to it. Under the Statute which was first passed in 1872 that disqualification was made applicable to members of the Legislature of any Province in which corresponding legislation had taken place; that is, where any Province had passed a law that any member of this House could not be elected to the Provincial Legislature, this

Statute would come in force. The second clause of that Act reads as follows:—

"If any such member of a Provincial Legislature shall, notwithstanding his disqualification as in the preceding section mentioned, receive a majority of votes at any such election, such majority of votes shall be thrown away, and it shall be the duty of the returning officer to return the person having the next greatest number of votes, provided he be otherwise eligible."

If that Statute be in force, all difficulty is removed. It was clear that the returning officer was bound—and if he did not do so, this House is bound—to declare that the votes given for Dr. Robertson were wasted, and that the candidate having the next largest number of votes should be entitled to the seat. It is urged, however, that this law is not in force. It is not contended that it has been formally repealed, but it is contended that it has been repealed by implication. Now, the general principle applicable to the interpretation of Statutes is: that unless they contain within themselves some limitative clause, they remain in force until they are formally and specially repealed by a succeeding Act. As I have said, there is no contention that this Act has been formally repealed by a succeeding Act, nor that it contains within itself any limiting clause; but the contention is that it has been repealed by implication, because a subsequent Act was passed on the same subject. Upon that point I will cite the authority of Dwaris on Statutes, who is recognized as the best authority on the subject. At page 154 of the Library edition, he says:

"Every affirmative Statute is a repeal of a precedent affirmative Statute, where its matter necessarily implies a negative; but only so far as it is clearly and indisputably contradictory and contrary to the former Act, 'in the very matter' (Foster's case); and the repugnancy such that the two Acts cannot be reconciled; for then, *leges posteriores, priores contrarias abrogant*. The leaning of the courts is so strong against repealing the positive provisions of a former Statute by construction, as almost to establish the doctrine of 'No repeal by implication.' It is a general rule that subsequent Statutes, which add accumulative penalties, and institute new methods of proceeding, do not repeal former penalties and methods of proceeding ordained by preceding Statutes, without negative words. Nor hath a latter Act of Parliament ever been construed to repeal a prior Act, unless there be a contrariety or repugnancy in them, or, at least, some notice taken of the former Act, so as to indicate an intention in the lawgiver to repeal it. Neither is a bare recital in a Statute, without a clause of repeal, sufficient to repeal the positive provisions of a former Statute. The law does not favor a repeal by implication, unless the repugnance be quite plain; and such repeal, carrying with it a reflection on the wisdom of former Parliaments, it has ever been confined to repealing as little as possible of the preceding Statutes. Although, then, two Acts of Parliament are seemingly repugnant, yet if there be no clause of *non obstante* in the latter, they shall, if possible, have such construction that the latter may not be a repeal of the former by implication. The same view has been taken where powers under several Acts are such as may well subsist together. A subsequent Act, too, which can be reconciled with a former Act, shall not be a repeal of it, though there be negative words; as the 1st and 2nd Ph., and 11. Ch. 10, that all trials for treason shall be according to the course of the common law, and not otherwise, does not take away 35 H., C. 2, for trial of treason beyond sea."

This illustration is remarkably similar to the case we are now considering, because we have in the latter, first, the positive procedure laid down for the returning officer, who is to disregard the votes given for a person disqualified, and to return the person having the next number of votes, if otherwise eligible; while the Statute of 1873 merely gives a general prohibition against dual representation, without saying anything about the procedure to be adopted by the returning officer. It is the opinion of the Committee, therefore, that this Statute being in force, it was the duty of the returning officer to have disregarded the votes given to Mr. Robertson, and to have returned the person having the next largest number of votes. In the discussion which occurred in this House with reference to the duties of the returning officer, under the Act of 1874, it was strongly urged that his duties were purely ministerial, and not in any respect judicial. I think that reference to that Statute will show that, entirely independent of the discussion upon general principles and exceptional or supposed cases, it

contains within itself evidence that the duties of the returning officer are sometimes both ministerial and judicial. In the first place, it is stated that the returning officer is bound to reject all votes given for a candidate not nominated; in the next place, it is stated in section twenty-five that any candidate nominated may withdraw at any time after the nomination and before the close of the poll, by filing with the returning officer a declaration in writing to that effect signed by himself, and that any votes cast for the candidate so having withdrawn shall be null and void, and it shall be the duty of the returning officer to return as duly elected the candidate so remaining. So that, under the Statute of 1874, the returning officer is bound to ignore the votes—even if they were a majority—given in favor of the candidate who has disqualified himself, precisely as, under the law of 1872, he is required to ignore the votes given for the candidate whom the law has disqualified. There is then the point as to whether the law of 1872, as well as the law of 1873 are applicable to Prince Edward Island, which was not then a portion of the Confederation. I do not think that I need refer further to that subject than to say, that the legislation under which Prince Edward Island was admitted into Confederation—Chap. 40, of the Act of 1873—was upon the terms and conditions that after it should be admitted all laws upon the following subjects then in force in the Dominion should be applicable to Prince Edward Island, namely: "Laws with reference to the Senate and the House of Commons, including procedure therein, and the vacating of the seats of members of the House of Commons, and the filling of vacancies." I think it is plain that all the laws in force in the Dominion at the time when Prince Edward Island was admitted to the Union, on the 1st July, 1873, were applicable to that Province, and in fact this was virtually conceded in the Committee by those who were advocating the case of Mr. Robertson, who admitted that the law of 1873 was in force; and their only contention was, that the law of 1872 was not in force, because it was specially repealed. But if I have established—as it seems to me this authority establishes—that the law of 1872 was in force throughout the Dominion, its application only was reserved until each of the Provinces should pass corresponding legislation, which was the conditions required by it. That corresponding legislation was passed in the case of Prince Edward Island in 1876. The Statute of that year made corresponding legislation, which prevented a member of this House from being eligible as a member of the Local House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island; and that legislation having been adopted, the effect was, in my opinion, and that of the Committee, to bring into force there the Act of 1872, in reference to dual representation, upon which the report of the Committee is based. I do not propose to take up the time of the House by any further explanation of the features of this case. I only undertook to submit the facts of it, and the bare conclusion to which the Committee arrived. The Committee, I am certain, has investigated, patiently, the facts of this case; and I believe that it arrived at an intelligent and conscientious conclusion with reference to them; and sharing in that conclusion and the responsibility of it, I have the honor, Mr. Speaker, to second the motion, that this House do concur in the Committee's report.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sherbrooke, who has just addressed the House, has certainly put forward some of the facts connected with this case; but not all the facts, nor do I think that he has called the attention of the House to the peculiar position of Prince Edward Island, and the law affecting it, as a member of this Confederation; but still the hon. member for Sherbrooke was very anxious to refer to precedents. He called our attention to the manner in which they act in England, and stated that in England no such thing as a resignation obtains by common law, but is a creation of the Statute.

Mr. HALL.

It is so created in the several Provinces of the Dominion with regard to the Local Legislatures, and also in the Dominion with regard to Dominion Elections. Yet, while he is correct in that point, that no such resignation is allowed by the common law, but wholly by Statute, and the mode in which the Parliament of England is created; but he has ignored, and also the Committee, the principle which does exist in Great Britain, and existed there since the days of Wilkes and Luttrell, when the House of Commons seated the minority candidate under circumstances such as this; but the general principle that the majority shall rule is the principle by which members of Parliament there are now returned. That principle is only ignored under certain circumstances, when certain facts exist showing that the majority candidate may be ignored, and the minority candidate returned. The principle laid down with regard to a minority candidate's seat is clear and plain: First, that in case a candidate receives the majority of votes and his election is contested, and it is claimed that the minority candidate should be elected, two things must exist: first, that disqualification exists; and, second, that notice of it has been given to the electors; and not until it is brought home to the electors, that those votes are to be thrown away, or to use the language of Lord Eldon in the first case which came before him: "Their votes are thrown away on a dead man." That notice must be brought home to the electors, and in no case—and I challenge the hon. gentleman and any member of the legal profession to show the contrary since the time alluded to, when Luttrell was seated in the place of Wilkes—a proceeding of which the House was so ashamed afterwards, that it expunged these proceedings from the records—unless the voters have been notified, and notice has been brought home to the voters that they were voting for a minority candidate, this is the only mode in which that election of a majority candidate could be vacated and declared null and void, and the party declared incapable of taking the seat, which is then given to the minority candidate. But what is the position in which it is sought by the motion before the House to seat a man returned by a minority of votes, for the Electoral District of King's County, Prince Edward Island. This man received the minority of the votes, but not the slightest notice was given of his disqualification to any elector in his district, or that he was throwing his vote away on Mr. Robertson. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) says that the resignation was sent to the two members of the House of Assembly by their names, and not by their titles as members; but I fail to see why, if they were members duly elected, a notice such as this provided for in the Statute should not be regarded as an official notice addressed to them as members of the Assembly. I fail to see why, if this notice was sent for the purpose of being acted upon or not, any strength would be added to it by addressing it to these members as members of the House. The hon. gentleman has called attention to the law of Prince Edward Island. He has pointed out that there are three ways in which a member of the House of Assembly can resign, and he has correctly stated them. First, he can either do so by standing up in the House and announcing that he has vacated his seat; or during a Session, or during the interval between two Sessions, he can address a letter to the Speaker of the House announcing his resignation; or he may in the interval between two Sessions, or in case there is no Speaker, address his resignation to two members. The hon. gentleman says that Dr. Robertson could not do so in this case, because twenty-one days had not elapsed from the time he was gazetted as a member of the Local House. I ask the hon. gentleman to look at the law, and he will see that the twelfth and fourteenth sections apply to the two first cases of resignation; but that these sections do not apply to the case in which a member addresses

his resignation to two members of the House of Assembly. Any time between the Sessions of the House, when no Speaker, a member can resign in that way without limitation. On the 12th of June, 1882, Dr. Robertson sent his resignation to two members of the Local Legislature, and he complied with the requirements of the law as stated in the fifteenth section of the Act. What beyond that had he to do? Nothing. His duty was simply to place that resignation in the hands of these gentlemen, and their duty was to forward it to the Lieutenant-Governor. The duty of forwarding it did not devolve upon him. The object of the Act was to prevent disfranchisement, and therefore the law imposed on these two members the duty of forwarding the resignation forthwith to the Lieutenant-Governor. The hon. gentleman has put forward the insinuation that in this case these gentlemen may have acted as they did for a sinister object; but if that hon. gentleman or his friends thought they could prove that why did they not examine and cross-examine Mr. Robertson on that subject when he was in the hands of such able examiners as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron). If they had any doubt as to the *bona fides* of this question why did they refrain from such an examination instead of coming here behind his back and insinuating that it was for sinister purposes. The evidence before the House shows most conclusively that so far as Dr. Robertson is concerned he acted in good faith. It is quite evident that the seven men who signed the papers knew the facts just as well before the 13th of June as afterwards, but they waited to see the result of the Election, and when Dr. Robertson was returned they then made their declaration. How did Dr. Robertson act under the circumstances? Did he not act as any man would who discovered that a trap had been laid for him. On the 29th of June he wrote a letter to the Lieutenant-Governor stating that he had been made aware that a protest was filed against him, and adding the following words:—

"I deem it due to myself to inform your Honor, that I did, the day before nomination day for the Dominion Election, duly resign my seat in the Local Legislature, by delivering my written resignation, in proper form, to Malcolm McFadyen, Esq., and Dr. Peter McLaren, members of the House of Assembly, for the 4th and 3rd Districts of King's County, respectively.

"I presume the reason your Honor has not received notice from them of my resignation has been owing to the almost continuous absence from the Island since then of Mr. McFadyen."

If the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) doubted whether or not that letter was true, why did he not seek to prove it by evidence in the Committee, for since no evidence has been given to weaken that letter, it must stand in support of the good faith of Dr. Robertson. I think, in arguing an important case like this, it is unworthy of any hon. gentleman to put forward such insinuations when the evidence proves it to be utterly unfounded. Another point which has been ignored in the report of the Committee, as well as by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, is the proceedings that were taken by men who were more conversant with the law than we are—I mean the officers of the Crown in Prince Edward Island. On the 12th of June Dr. Robertson performed an act, which, if it had any force at all, was a tender of his resignation as a member of the House. The Statute says that the person so tendering his resignation vacates his seat. I do not want any astute lawyer to construe these words to mean that he must wait until certain acts are done. Is he to remain a member until the two members send the notice to the Lieutenant Governor? The hon. member for Sherbrooke says that must be done. But why not carry the argument further, and say that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery must issue the writ, and the Sheriff must make his return? The law declares plainly that when a man places his resignation in the hands of two members, he tenders his resignation. I am fortified in that position by the opinion given by the law officers of the Crown

on the Island on the subject; and I cite their opinion the more confidently, because they are not in political accord with Dr. Robertson, but with hon. gentlemen opposite. What does Attorney General Sullivan say? On the 3rd of July, on receipt of Dr. Robertson's letter, he writes to Messrs. Malcolm McFadyen, and Peter McLaren, as follows:—

"His Honor the Lieut.-Governor has placed in my hands a communication, dated 29th ultimo, from Mr. James E. Robertson, calling the attention of His Honor to the circumstance that Mr. Robertson 'duly resigned' his 'seat in the Local Legislature' on the 12th of June last 'by delivering' his 'written resignation in proper form to Malcolm McFadyen, Esq., and Dr. Peter McLaren, members of the House of Assembly for the 4th and 3rd Districts of King's County respectively.'

"The law authorizing a member to deliver to two members a declaration of his intention to resign his seat requires that 'such two members upon receiving such declaration shall forthwith notify the Lieutenant-Governor thereof under their hands and seals.'

"His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor has to-day informed me that he has not yet received from you the notification required by law, and I write you to direct your attention to the matter by pointing out to you that it is your duty to comply with the law, otherwise you shall be liable to punishment for its breach."

The breach of duty was not on the part of James Edwin Robertson, but on the part of Messrs. McFadyen and McLaren. Dr. Robertson's duty was done on the 12th of June. So we have this peculiar anomaly—that in Prince Edward Island the law officers of the Crown have declared the seat vacant and have filled it up, and here a majority of men of the same political opinions declare the contrary—in one case, filling up Dr. Robertson's place by a new election, and in the other case giving the seat to the minority candidate of King's County. Now, the hon. member says that by the law of 1872—and the report takes the same position—the returning officer was bound to throw away the votes. It would seem to me, considering the number of returning officers in this country, and the position they occupy, that it would be a terrible thing if our laws were so weak that in a case so complicated as this, in which the members of the legal profession in this House have widely differed, the returning officers should be allowed to decide the law, as the returning officer has done in this case, and thereby disfranchise the people of the district in question. If the candidate has been duly nominated, if the electors have been duly notified and cautioned that if they vote for that candidate, and he is disqualified, their votes are thrown away, then the case can be adjudicated upon in the courts. But with this exception, I can find no case since the days of Wilkes and Luttrell in which the minority candidate has sat in Parliament. The position of the returning officer is, after all, the most important question affecting the House and its members which this case brings up. What I contend is, that by the Act of 1874, the exercise of discretion was entirely taken away from the returning officer, and his duty is simply ministerial—to return the candidate who has received the majority of votes. I think it might be well, however, first to call attention to the relation of Prince Edward Island to this Union. As hon. members are aware, Prince Edward Island was not one of the original members of this Confederation, but provision was made in the British North America Act for the admission of the Island on certain terms. Nearly six years had elapsed after the time of the Union before any attempts were made to carry out the terms upon which that Province should become a part of Confederation. On the 20th of May, 1873, the House of Commons and the Senate of this Dominion passed resolutions as a basis of Union for Prince Edward Island and the Dominion; and on the 28th of May, the two Houses in Prince Edward Island passed an Address to the Crown, praying Her Majesty to consummate the Union on the terms mentioned in those resolutions. Accordingly, on the 26th of June, 1873, the Order in Council was passed making Prince Edward Island part of Canada. Now, great stress has been laid by the hon. member for Sherbrooke

on chap. 40 of the Statutes of 1873, by which he claims that the Acts of 1872-73 are in force in Prince Edward Island. With regard to that, I merely have to say that this Act was passed 23rd May, and before Prince Edward Island came into this Union. Therefore, I say these Statutes are not binding. The people of Prince Edward Island never had a voice or share in making them—never had an opportunity of expressing their approval or otherwise of those laws; and there is no principle by which a law shall be imposed on a people without their consent. I contend, therefore, that so far as the people of Prince Edward Island are concerned, those laws have no binding force. But even assuming these laws to be in force, the law of 1872 was abrogated and repealed by the law of 1874. There is no doubt but that the hon. member for Sherbrooke has, to a certain extent, correctly laid down the law with regard to repealed Statutes, but I think the rules are more explicitly laid down in Hardcastle's "Rules of Statutory Law," which is probably the latest work on the subject, and in which are laid down certain definite rules fortified by authorities. The very first case cited is that referred to by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, and I will read the rule in that case from Hardcastle's work, page 169:

"The second general rule laid down in Dr. Foster's case, 11 Rep. 61, with regard to the effect of a subsequent upon a prior Statute is, that when two Statutes, although both are expressed in affirmative language, are contrary in matter the latter abrogates the former. 'The said rule,' says Lord Coke, 'that *leges posteriores priores abrogant* was well agreed, but as to this purpose *contrarium est multiplex, scil.* if one is an express and material negative, and the last is an express and material affirmative, or if the first affirmative and the latter negative. 2. In matter, although both are affirmative, as by the Statute of 35 Hen. VIII. c. 23, it is enacted that 'if any person being examined before the King's council . . . shall confess any treason . . . he shall be tried in any county where the King pleases, by his commission'; and afterwards another law was made, 1 & 2 P. & M. c. 10, in these words, 'that all trials hereafter to be had for any treason, shall be had according to the course of the common law, and not otherwise'; this latter Act (although the latter words had not been) hath abrogated the former, because they are contrary in matter; but it doth not abrogate the Statute of 35 Hen. VIII. c. 2, of trial of treason beyond the seas, notwithstanding the negative words, because it was not contrary in matter, for that was not triable by the common law.

"This second general rule is often somewhat difficult in its application, because on every occasion when it is proposed to apply the rule the question will arise whether the two Statutes in question are actually or only apparently inconsistent with one another. 'I do not think,' said Grove, J., in *Hill vs. Hall*, L. R. 1 Ex. D. 414, 'that a mere accidental inconsistency between two Statutes amounts to a total repeal of the earlier; such a doctrine might be pushed to a mischievous extent.' 'What words,' said Dr. Lushington in the *India*, 33 L. J. Adm. 193, 'will establish a repeal by implication it is impossible to say from authority or decided cases. If, on the one hand, the general presumption must be against such a repeal on the ground that the intention to repeal, if any had existed, would have been declared in express terms, so, on the other hand, it is not necessary that any express reference be made to the Statute which it is intended to repeal. The prior Statute would, I conceive, be repealed by implication if its provisions were wholly incompatible with a subsequent one; or if the two Statutes together would lead to wholly absurd consequences; or if the entire subject-matter were taken away by the subsequent Statute. Perhaps the most difficult case for consideration is where the subject-matter has been so dealt with in subsequent Statutes that according to all ordinary reasoning, the particular provision in the prior Statutes could not have been intended to subsist, and yet, if it were left subsisting, no palpable absurdity would have been occasioned.' It must therefore always be a question for the court to decide whether this second rule is applicable or not, and in coming to a decision on this point it may be well to bear in mind that (as Lord Langdale, M.R. observed in *Dean of Ely vs. Bliss*, 5 Beav. 374) 'every Act must be considered with reference to the state of the law when it came into operation. Every Act is made either for the purpose of making a change in the law or for the purpose of better declaring the law, and its operation is not to be impeded by the mere fact that it is inconsistent with some previous enactment.'

"For this rule it follows that if one Statute enacts something in general terms, and afterwards another Statute is passed on the same subject, which, although expressed in affirmative language, introduces special conditions or restrictions, the subsequent Statute will usually be considered as repealing by implication the former one. For, as Byres, J., said in *Harcourt vs. Fox*, 1 Shower, 620, 'affirmative Statutes introductive of a new law do imply a negative.' Thus in *Ex parte Carruthers*, 9 East, 44, it appeared that 13 Geo. II. c. 28, s. 5, exempted from the impress service any harpooner or seaman in the Greenland trade, but 26 Geo. III. c. 41, s. 17, enacted that 'no harpooner whose name

Mr. WELDON.

shall be inserted in a list shall be impressed,' and it was held that the subsequent Statute repealed by implication the general provision of the former Statute by requiring something special to be done."

On page 176 he says:

"But if a special enactment, whether it be in a public or private Act, and a subsequent General Act, are absolutely repugnant and inconsistent with one another, the courts have no alternative but to declare the prior enactment repealed by the subsequent General Act. Thus in *Brampton vs. Colchester* 6 E. and B. 246, it was held that the provisions of a Local Act under which certain arrangements had been made for maintaining borough prisoners in county gaols were repealed by the General Prison Act of 5 and 6 Vic. c. 93, s. 18, 'for' said Lord Campbell, C. J., 'I think it was the intention of the Legislature to sweep away all local peculiarities, though sanctioned by Special Acts, and to establish one uniform system except an so far as there are express exceptions. And Wightman, J., added 'it was intended to make one general law superceding all local laws as to prisons and repealing all Local Acts.' And in *Duncan vs. Scottish N. E. Ry.*, L. R. 2, S. A. 20, it was held that the exemption from liability to pay rates which was conferred on the defendant railway company by the Special Acts under which it was made was taken away by the subsequent Poor Law Amendment Act, because, as Lord Westbury said, 'the rule given by this Poor Law Act is wholly inconsistent with the exemption contained in the company's Special Acts.'

These principles we propose to apply to the law of 1872, because that is the law on which the report is made, and it is thoroughly inconsistent with the provisions of the Act of 1874. What was the state of the law in 1872? There was then no general law for the regulation of elections throughout the Dominion, but it was provided by the Election Act that the local laws of the different Provinces should govern elections. In 1874 a change was made, and a uniform law regulating elections generally throughout the Dominion was passed. Before calling the attention of the House to the words of the Act of 1872, referred to by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, I wish to explain the spirit and meaning of the Act of 1874 by comparing it with the corresponding English Act. Our Act of 1874 is based, to a large extent, on the provisions of the Election Act of 1868 in England, and whenever a change takes place we have a fair right to assume that this Parliament, in the exercise of its wisdom, felt that the change was more adapted to our Constitution than the strict following of the provisions of the English Act would be. One important difference was this: that in the English Act the returning officer counts the ballots, and is given certain judicial functions with regard to the question of ballots. It is not on the deputy returning officers, but on the returning officers that are cast the responsibilities with regard to the ballots. Our Legislature, for some particular reason, altered that, and they also altered the arrangements with regard to the nomination. The spirit and meaning of the Act of 1874 was that no discretion should be left to the returning officer after the nomination had been made. It has been strongly urged that under the Act of 1874 the returning officer had judicial functions, and the decision of Chief Justice Wilson in the case of *Bannerman vs. McDougall*, known as the *South Renfrew* case, has been cited in support of that contention. But that judgment was confined strictly to the position of the returning officer at the time of the nomination. All the language of the Chief Justice about the judicial functions of the returning officer applies to him in his capacity of receiving the nomination. The facts of the case were that the returning officer in that case, in the exercise of his discretion, rejected the petitioner's nomination paper on the ground that one of the twenty-five was not qualified, and then returned the respondent as duly elected. On the case coming before Chief Justice Wilson, he put forward that the returning officer has, so far as he is concerned, judicial as well as ministerial powers, and that he would have the right to reject the nomination, as he states there, of a woman or of any other disqualified person. No doubt that is entirely within the purview of the law, and the whole object of the Act of 1874 is to give to the returning officer at the time of the nomination power to reject a person who is not

properly qualified. We find the qualifications set forth in the Act of 1874, and in various other Acts. I would call the attention of the House to the provisions of the Act of 1874. There we find that the returning officer, upon receiving the proclamation, is to publish a notice and to fix the place of nomination, the day being appointed by law. Then, under the eighteenth section, twenty-five electors may nominate a candidate, that candidate should be nominated on a separate nomination paper, &c.; and any votes given at any election for any other candidate than those nominated shall be null and void. Now, that is the direction of the Statute, because the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) referred to the twenty-fifth section as if it passed judicial functions upon the returning officer; but the Statute is express that when a candidate has withdrawn the votes cast for him shall be null and void, leaving the returning officer no discretion whatever and no judicial power. And we find that is the principle laid down by the authorities on the English Act, that in every case where votes are given for a candidate who has not been nominated, or given for a candidate who has withdrawn, as under the twenty-fifth section, such votes are null and void. Then it is provided in the Act that the candidate shall be a natural born subject of Her Majesty, and then the paper is to be attested; and in the twenty-third section it is provided that the returning officer shall accompany his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with a report of his proceedings, and of any nomination papers rejected for non-compliance with the requirements of the Act. I say that is just the principle laid down in the South Renfrew case, that the returning officer has judicial functions only in respect to the nomination, when he has a right to reject a candidate and to exercise his judgment, whether rightly or wrongly, according to the best of his ability; but he can only do that when there is non-compliance with the requirements of the Act. I say that the question of disqualification is a matter for the returning officer only in respect to the nomination, and after once a man is a candidate all further proceedings must be left to the tribunals of the land. Then he holds a court, and having received the nomination papers, in the exercise of his functions, decides whether the nomination papers are right, and he has to see that the candidates are duly nominated before they can receive any votes on the day of election. Now, in reference to withdrawal, it is provided in the 25th section that a candidate may withdraw at any time after his nomination, and even on the day of polling before the close of the poll, and the votes polled for him after that moment cease to be counted—not by the discretion of the returning officer, but by the Act itself. And I say that when the nominations are declared then the judicial function of the returning officer ceases, and we have got to see whether after that his duties are not simply ministerial, and that is the real question before this House. The question is: whether the returning officer can do as he has done in this case, and if it is not a clear violation of the law of 1874? It is not so much the interests of Dr. Robertson that are concerned, but it is the disfranchisement of the electors of that district. It is their rights which have been violated by the returning officer in this case, who has taken upon himself to do what another tribunal only could do. But we want to see what the duty of the returning officer is. He posts up the name of the candidate; he can then no longer reject any candidate after he has once declared him to be nominated; the only way a candidate can be withdrawn from the votes of the electors is by his own voluntary act, expressed in writing to the returning officer. Then he appoints his deputy returning officers. These have their various functions, and we find that in each polling district they are judges who have judicial functions cast upon them. Now, I make a broad distinction between the English Act

and our own. In the English Act this duty devolves on the returning officer, but by our Act all those functions are taken away and given to the deputies. In the fifty-fifth section the distinction between the returning officer and the deputies is very marked. That section reads as follows:—

“Immediately after the close of the poll the deputy returning officer in the presence of the poll clerk and the candidates or their agents, and if the candidates and their agents are absent, then in the presence of such, if any, of them as are present, and of at least three electors, open the ballot box and proceed to count the number of votes given for each candidate. In doing so he shall reject all ballot papers which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officer, all those by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected, and all those upon which there is any writing or mark by which the vote could be identified.

“The other ballot papers being counted and a list of the number of votes given to each candidate, and of the number of rejected ballot papers, all the ballot papers indicating the number of votes given for each candidate respectively shall be put in separate envelopes or parcels, those rejected, those spoiled and those unused shall each be put into a different envelope or parcel, and all these parcels being endorsed so as to indicate their contents, shall be put back into the ballot boxes.

“56. The deputy returning officer shall take a note of any objection made by any candidate, his agent, or any elector present, to any ballot paper found in the ballot box, and shall decide any question arising out of the objection: and the decision of such deputy returning officer shall be final, subject only to reversal on petitions questioning the election or return.”

I want to point out that the decision of the deputy returning officer with respect to the rejection of votes shall be final, subject only to reversal on petition to an election court. The fifty-seventh section says:

“The deputy returning officer shall make out a statement of the accepted ballot papers, of the number of votes given to each candidate, of the rejected ballot papers, of the spoiled and returned ballot papers, and of those unused and returned by him, and he shall make and keep by him a copy of such statement, and enclose in the ballot box the original statement, together with the voters' list, and a certified statement at the foot of each list of the total number of electors who voted on each list, and such other lists and documents as may have been used at such election. The ballot box shall then be locked and sealed, and shall be delivered to the returning officer, or to the election clerk, who shall receive or collect the same.”

There the function of the deputy returning officer is clearly defined. He has not the power to elect a candidate, but in his hands rests the decision as to the question of votes, and it is not to be questioned by the returning officer, but to be questioned only on petition against election returns being heard by the legal tribunals. It is provided, in order to prevent collusion or fraud, that the deputy returning officer shall preserve the original returns and furnish the candidates with a certified copy. With respect to the returning officer, I wish to point out how opposed this Act is to the Act of 1872. The Act of 1874 provides as follows:—

“The returning officer at the place, day and hour appointed by his proclamation, and after having received all the ballot boxes, shall proceed to open them, in the presence of the election clerk, the candidates or their representatives, if present, and of at least two electors, if the candidates or their representatives are not present, and to add together the number of votes given for each candidate, from the statements contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officer.”

The section then declares that the candidate having the majority of votes shall then be declared elected. The provision of the sixtieth section shows there is a marked difference between our Act and the British Act, because the latter says that the returning officer, if a qualified voter, shall give a casting vote, while in our Act it declares that in every case the returning officer shall give the casting vote, so that there shall be no such thing as a double return, and that the candidate elected shall have a majority of votes, and that if either of the candidates is disqualified, or has improperly obtained that majority, the Judges of the land shall decide whether he was properly elected or not, and not the caprice, by whim and ignorance, perhaps, of a returning officer. That is the spirit and meaning of the Act of 1874. The Act of 1878 gave the County Court Judges the revising of the votes, and the returning officer had to give the casting vote in case of a tie then also. I want to turn, for a few

moments, to the Act of 1872, and I call the attention of the House to that Act because it is entirely inconsistent, not only with the spirit, but with the language of the Act of 1874. The Act of 1872 provided:

"1. No person shall be eligible to, or be capable of being nominated to or voted for, or of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, who, on the day of nomination at any election to the House of Commons, is a member of the Legislative Council or Assembly of any Province in which, by law, members of the Senate or House of Commons are rendered incapable of being appointed to, or of sitting or voting in the Legislative Council, or of being elected to, or of sitting and voting in the House of Assembly thereof, or who, on the day of any such nomination is a member of the Legislative Assembly in any Province in which, by law, after the dissolution of the present House of Commons, the sitting or voting as a member of the House of Commons by such member of the Legislative Assembly, will have the effect of voiding his election to the Legislative Assembly thereof and vacating his seat, or of rendering him incapable of sitting or voting in the Legislative Assembly of such Province.

"2. If any such member of a Provincial Legislature shall, notwithstanding his disqualification as in the preceding section mentioned, receive a majority of votes at any such election, such majority of votes shall be thrown away, and it shall be the duty of the returning officer to return the person having the next greatest number of votes, provided he be otherwise eligible."

The second clause gives a judicial function, for it says the returning officer shall return the person having the next greatest number of votes, provided he be otherwise eligible. It points out, in fact, what I know was then the law in New Brunswick, that the returning officer, the Sheriff, had the power to hold a scrutiny before the return of the writ. But when that was taken away, I contend that not only the language, but the spirit of the Act of 1872 was utterly inconsistent with the General Elections Act. The latter Act provided for the withdrawal of election cases, not only from Parliament, but from the returning officers, and to place their decision far above political feeling and party bias, so that the rights of the electors might be as fully protected as civil rights. The Act of 1873, which provides that the election of members of the Legislature who may hereafter be elected members to this House shall not be valid, and that they shall be liable to a penalty, does not touch the question of the returning officers deciding respective votes. In the case of Mitchell, who was disqualified as a felon, the Imperial Parliament did not seat Moore, but on notice being given the Judge at the trial set aside the election of Mitchell, and declared Moore was elected: first, because Mitchell was disqualified; and, second, because this fact was known and notice given to the electors, and therefore they wilfully threw away their votes. But I hold that, under the law, if notice had not been given the Judge would have decided that Mitchell was not duly elected, and that there must be a new election, but not that the minority candidate should be seated. The action now proposed in this House would be a violation of the law of the land if carried out, and an invasion of the rights of the people of Prince Edward Island, and the House should pause before it declared in favor of a principle which, if carried out, must affect the interests of the majority candidate in every case. This is not a case between Dr. Robertson, and Mr. McDonald alone, but it affects the rights of the electors of King's, and deals with the question as to whether the returning officer has done his duty. It has also a bearing on the case of Queen's County. The returning officer returned Mr. Jenkins. The present member (Mr. Brecken) appealed from that decision to the courts, and when the case came finally before the Supreme Court a decision was given in his favor. During that time Queen's County was not disfranchised because Mr. Jenkins occupied the seat until the Supreme Court gave its decision. There we have an example of the manner in which the spirit and meaning of that Act of 1874 had been carried out, for the case had been disposed of by that tribunal, to which all these matters had to be referred, a tribunal which was free from party prejudice and party bias, and its decision would

Mr. WELDON.

be fully acquiesced in, not only by the people of Prince Edward Island, but by the people of the whole Dominion. But as it stands now, here we have a man proposed as the member, by the Committee, and by this resolution, who it is claimed has the majority of the votes of this House, but is in a minority with the electors; and I say in conclusion, that if he has one spark of feeling and honor, and this resolution is carried, the very first moment that he takes his seat, he will rise up and say: I resign the seat at once into the hands of the people. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move in amendment that this motion be not concurred in, but that all the words after "that" be left out, and the following words be inserted:—

In view of the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1874, and the duties of the Returning Officer, as therein defined, and also in view of the fact, elicited from the evidence produced before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, now before the House—it was the duty of the Returning Officer at the last election for the Electoral District of King's County, Prince Edward Island, to declare and return James Edwin Robertson, as one of the members elected at the said election.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have just a word or two to say upon the subject of this motion before it is submitted to the House. This is, of course, an important question; and I may say now, that after having heard the evidence submitted to the Committee on Elections and Privileges, the whole question has assumed a different phase altogether to what it assumed when I formerly discussed this question. Then I proposed to discuss, and only did discuss, this proposition,—as to the duty cast by the Act of 1874 upon the returning officer; and my contention was, that his duties were purely ministerial, and that Dr. Robertson, having the majority of the legal votes, was entitled to be declared returned, and ought so to be declared returned by the returning officer. To the motion I submitted on that occasion an amendment was moved by the hon. First Minister, and upon that amendment coming up before the Committee on Elections and Privileges, of course the whole of the papers and some evidence were submitted to that Committee; and now the matter comes before the House in an entirely different aspect and in an entirely different shape. I have said, Sir, that this is an important question. It is a question that I think we ought to approach with unbiassed and unprejudiced minds.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. I recollect, when I discussed the question before—and I think that the hon. First Minister, at all events, will give me credit when I say so—I did nothing more than submit a calm, dispassionate statement of the facts, as I then understood them, to the House. We were warned, by one or two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that this was a judicial question, that we ought to approach it in a judicial spirit, that we should deal with it in a judicial spirit, and that we ought, so far as possible, to divest our minds of our political leanings and of our political inclinations, and approach the question in the spirit of judges, and solely as if we were judges adjudicating upon this case. Now, Sir, that is the spirit in which we ought to approach it; and I hope, Sir, although I occasionally fight a political battle, both in this House and out of this House, if I know myself I will be enabled to discuss the few propositions which I will submit to this House this evening without any political prejudices, and that I will be enabled to divest my own mind of all political bias, and to deal with this case and to comment on this case as if I did not know to what side of politics either Dr. Robertson or Mr. McDonald belongs; and I hope that every hon. member of the House will approach the consideration of it in the same spirit. I only hope that, in dealing with a question of this kind, a purely judicial question, the result of which must depend almost entirely on the construction of the Statutes of Prince Edward Island, and of our own disqualifying Act, I say I hope

that in discussing this question, every hon. member of the House, both professional and lay, will be enabled to lay aside their party prejudices and approach it in the spirit which I have just indicated; but I fear somewhat, that my hopes will not be realized, because the cheers that greeted my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) when he resumed his seat on that side of the House, and the cheers which greeted my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) when he resumed his seat on this side of the House, do not give me much warrant for the conclusion to which I was trying to bring my own mind. Now, Sir, this is a judicial question; and, of course, it is not to be expected in dealing with this judicial question, and in putting an interpretation upon the Statute law of the Island, and also upon our own disqualifying Acts, that the laymen of the House will, be able to deal with it in the same spirit of intelligence that the lawyers, who are in the habit of dealing with questions of this kind, will be able to deal with this question. I say this without any disrespect to the wisdom, intelligence, and common sense of the laymen, but, of course, they can hardly be expected to bring to the consideration of the discussion of the construction of the Statute law, the same amount of experience and legal knowledge that those who are in the daily habit during a long lifetime of dealing with questions of this kind, will be able to do. Now, Sir, there are three questions which appear to me must necessarily arise in the discussion of this case. We have had the facts before the House in the former discussion, and we had them before the Committee on Elections and Privileges. These facts are now submitted by that Committee to the House, and the conclusions to which that Committee arrived are also before the House. The conclusions that the majority of the Committee arrived at, hon. gentlemen who have taken the trouble to read the report, will find are—first, that Dr. Robertson, on the 13th of June, 1882, was disqualified from being a candidate for this House, the majority of the Committee have so decided; and the majority of the Committee have also decided that Dr. Robertson being disqualified, it was the duty of the returning officer to have declared Mr. McDonald elected, upon the ground that the Act of 1872 was then in force in the Island, that the second section of the Act of 1872 left the returning officer no discretion; and that if that Act were in force in the Island—as the Committee declared it was—in June, 1882, then no discretion was left to the returning officer, he was bound to declare elected the man having the minority of votes, on the principle that the votes cast for the man who had the majority were thrown away, he being disqualified. I may say, Sir, at once, that if I could be convinced in the first place, that Dr. Robertson was then disqualified, or, in other words, that on the 13th of June, 1882, he was what is technically within the meaning of the Statute of the Island and within the meaning of our own disqualifying Act, a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Island—if I could bring my mind to that conclusion, and also to the conclusion that the Act of 1872 was then in force in the Island, I would agree with the report of the majority, and hold that the returning officer should have declared elected the man who received a minority of votes. I say nothing about the policy or impolicy of such a law, because that question is not before us; but I think if it were to come before us again, Parliament would hesitate a good while before it would entrust to any returning officer—either the nominee of the Government or the local officials in the counties who were appointed under the old Act returning officers—such powers as these. For myself, after a careful perusal, examination, and study of the Local Acts and our disqualifying Act, I have not been able to bring my mind to the conclusion that Dr. Robertson was disqualified. Other hon. gentlemen have come to another conclusion than my own, and I

have nothing to say on that point, as they have a right to their opinion. I know that some of these hon. gentlemen came to their conclusion only after grave doubt and hesitation, as they declared so before voting on that question in the Committee. Though I may be dogmatic enough to lay down the proposition that the law is clear on these points, I do not arrogate to myself, or to those who share my views, all the knowledge possessed by members of the legal profession in this House. I am willing to concede to hon. gentlemen the same right which I claim for myself, though their conclusion may be opposed to mine. In order to settle the question of Dr. Robertson's qualification, we require to examine with care the Statutes of the Island and our disqualifying Act. We are now dealing with the matter as if it never had been before the House, and in its present aspect it never has been before the House. With regard to these Statutes I may say that in my short political life, and enjoyed as I have enjoyed a moderate share of professional experience, I never read anything so peculiar and extraordinary in its wording as the Statute of the Island. They seem to have peculiar ways of doing things in the East, which we have not in the West. In Prince Edward Island no man can be nominated as a candidate for election for the Local Legislature without filing a declaration under oath that he is possessed of a certain property qualification. The returning officers hold what is called a court, at which each candidate is bound to make a declaration and give a schedule of the property qualification upon which he claims to be entitled to be put in nomination as a candidate. The property qualification required in that Province is £50 free from all incumbrances, but before he is entitled to his seat and to the rights and privileges of the House he must make another declaration. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the 12th section of the Island Act, they will find that it provides substantially in the language in which I have presented the case to the House. It says:

"At every court to be holden for opening any election as aforesaid, every candidate proposed as aforesaid, if present, shall, before the said court be determined or adjourned, deliver a schedule to the Sheriff containing the particulars of his qualification, according to law, and at the foot thereof shall subscribe and take the following oath before the said Sheriff or presiding officer, who is hereby required to administer the same."

Having so done he is entitled to be put in nomination and to get the votes of the electors, and if he receives a majority of them, to be declared returned by the returning officer. But he must do something else before, by the law of the Island, he can be a member of the Assembly. If hon. gentlemen will refer to section 75, they will find that the wording is still more extraordinary; and I call the special attention of the First Minister to the peculiar wording of this clause:

"LXXV. No person shall be capable of being elected a member for any Town and Royalty or district in this Island, unless he shall, for a period of at least twelve calendar months before the teste of the writ for holding the election at which such person shall claim to be elected, have been in the seizin or possession of a freehold or leasehold estate within this Island, of the value of fifty pounds, over and above all incumbrances, that may affect the same; and shall, before he be presented to take his seat in the House of Assembly, take one of the oaths in the schedule to this Act prescribed for members, relative to a freehold or leasehold estate, as the nature of his qualification may require."

So that, according to that clause, though he may be nominated and elected, he cannot be presented until he again takes the oath of qualification for the second time—he is not entitled to the rights and privileges of a member of the House by simply taking the first oath. Now, that is the contention of the minority of the Committee. Of course the majority take a different view, and I do not mean to say that there is no ground for the argument they advance, or no reason for the conclusion they have arrived at; but my view is that by the 75th section of the Act Dr. Robertson was not a member of the Assembly within the meaning of our disqualification Act

until he took the second oath. Now, assuming that the Act of 1872 was in force, what does the disqualifying Act say? It does not say "elected," but it says "a member of the Assembly." Our contention is that a person must be a member of the Assembly before he becomes disqualified, and in order to be a member of the Assembly he must have taken the second oath. The Act provides:

"No person shall be eligible to, or be capable of being nominated to, or voted for, or of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, who, at the day of the nomination of any election to the House of Commons, is a member of the Legislative Council or Assembly of any Province in which, by law, members of the Senate or House of Commons are rendered incapable of being appointed to, or of sitting or voting in the Legislative Council, or of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House Assembly thereof, or who, on the day of any such nomination, is a member of the Legislative Assembly in any Province in which, by law, after the dissolution of the present House of Commons, the sitting or voting as a member of the House of Commons by such member of the Legislative Assembly, will have the effect of voiding his election to the Legislative Assembly thereof and vacating his seat, or of rendering him incapable of sitting or voting in the Legislative Assembly of such Province."

Now, Sir, you see that the man who is disqualified from being elected to or occupying a seat in the House of Commons, under our disqualifying Act—assuming it to be in force in the Island, which I by no means admit—is the man who is a member of the Local Legislative Assembly. Mr. Robertson did not take that oath; he could not take it, because the election for the Local Assembly took place in May, 1882, and the election for the House of Commons took place in June, 1882, and the Local Legislature did not meet until March, 1883; so that during all that time Mr. Robertson could not have taken the oath, and could not have been a member within the meaning of that section. But it is argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that the moment a man is elected, he becomes a member of the Assembly. I think I can satisfy hon. gentlemen who are open to conviction—I will not attempt to satisfy any others than those whose minds are unbiassed, and who do not vote on this question as mere partisans—and I am sure no one here desires to do that—that the mere election is not sufficient; and we must bear in mind that this disqualifying Act is a penal Act, and therefore we must construe the law strictly. For the purpose of my argument, I am going to refer to a case which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), by his zeal and industry, discovered—a case which, in my judgment, has an important bearing on this question, and practically settles the dispute between the majority and the minority of the Committee. You will observe that the ground taken in the report is, that the moment a man is elected to the Legislative Assembly he is a member; the case I quote goes to show that he is not. Of course the cases bearing on this subject are very few, but they rather go to confirm the views of those who differ from the majority of the Committee. The city of Shaftesbury, in England, many years ago obtained a charter from one of the kings of England, under which and by virtue of which that corporation was entitled to elect its burgesses, its councillors and its mayor. A provision was made in that charter that a man who once occupied the position of mayor should not again occupy that office for the space of three years. One of the mayors was elected in September, 1826, and he took the oath of office in October of the same year. In September, 1829, he was again elected mayor, and on the 6th of October he took the oath of office. It was contended that he was disqualified, because he was elected within three years of the period when we first took office; and it was argued that the date of his election decided the question, and not the day he took the oath and occupied his seat at the council board. That case is, in my judgment, so analogous to the case under consideration—that I shall call the attention of the House to the terms of the charter. It is as follows:—

"That the mayor nominated for the position as aforesaid, before he be admitted to exercise that office, shall not only take his proper oath  
Mr. CAMERON (Huron),

well and faithfully to exercise that office, but also all the oaths on the Statute of this Realm upon the next such nomination, before the steward of the Court for the time being, or his deputy, and after such oath so taken, can exercise his office for one year."

There was an application made to unseat the mayor on the ground I have indicated; and Lord Denman says on the subject:

"The party becomes mayor, not by reason of his being elected, but by being sworn into his office."

There is a good deal more in the judgment of the court on the same subject, with which I will not trouble the House. The words of the Island Act are that the successful candidate may not be presented to take his seat in the Local Legislature until he takes the oath prescribed by section 75 of the Island Act. In the case from which I have just quoted the charter provided that before the mayor-elect could be admitted to exercise his office, he must take the proper oath. The Island Act uses substantially the same language, so that the case is clearly in point. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke quoted from Dwarris, the American edition. I quote from the English Dwarris on the same point. It is contended by the Committee that Mr. McDonald was entitled to this seat, because Dr. Robertson was elected to the Local Legislature, that is, that he occupied another office, which disqualified him from being a candidate for the House of Commons. The hon. gentleman will find that by 15 George II, Chapter 22, no commissioner of Revenue in Ireland, no commissioner of the Navy, no auditor of the Exchequer, no auditor of the Admiralty, no paymaster of the Army or Navy, shall be capable of being elected to Parliament, or of voting in Parliament. Now, you will see that that is very nearly the language of our disqualifying Statute—no man who is a member of a Local Assembly shall be capable of being a member of the House of Commons. By 41 George III, Chapter 52, it is provided that no commissioner of Customs, Excise or Stamps, no agent for any regiment, no party to any contract from the Treasury, and no auditor or teller of the Exchequer, shall be capable of being elected or chosen. The language is nearly the same as that in the Dominion Act of 1872, which, remember, I deny to be in force in Prince Edward Island. It is further provided by this Act that no person should be elected a member of Parliament who had not an estate valued at £300 sterling. And in order to enforce the provisions of 9 Anne, Chapter 5, George II, Chapter 20, was passed, which provides that:

"Before any hon. member can take his seat he shall deliver at the Clerk's table a paper signed by himself, containing the names of the parish and county in which the lands lie, whereby he makes out his qualification, and shall also swear that he truly and *bonâ fide* is in possession of the estate as described on the paper."

After laying down this general proposition, Dwarris says, at page 263:

"In order that holding an office may disqualify the actual occupancy and enjoyment of office must be shown. A mere title, if never acted on, will not operate to disqualify."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That applies to the office.

Mr. CAMERON. Precisely; and so is this an office. Can the right hon. gentleman or any person point out any distinction between the two cases? It is said this man is disqualified because he was elected to an office—I do not care what you call it—because he was elected to the position of a member of a Local Legislature. In England it is held that if a man has an office under Government, he is not entitled to be elected, but it is further held that he does not hold an office under Government by a simple appointment. He must be also in the enjoyment of it. He must have something more than the title. Mr. Robertson must be shown to have something more than the title before he can be disqualified. That is the position I take on this subject. There is another point to which I direct the



attention of the House. Assuming, for argument sake, that Mr. Robertson was disqualified, what power has this Parliament to deal with it? We can say that a member of this House has no right to sit here if the disqualification is a personal one—if he happens to be a Senator, if he be a lunatic, if he be a minor—because that has been the law of Parliament from time immemorial, since we have had a Parliament. But I can challenge the hon. gentleman to point out, in the whole history of Parliament, any practice of Parliament justifying our giving a seat in Parliament to a candidate who had the minority of votes, and who was not declared elected by the returning officer. Another important point is this: Assuming that Dr. Robertson was disqualified, how does this House propose to deal with the matter? We can only deal with it on the assumption that the Act of 1872 was in force in June, 1882. If it can be shown that that Act was not in force in the Island in 1882, this Parliament has no power to seat Dr. Robertson. That proposition cannot be gainsaid by anybody. It is only by virtue of this Act, which gives the returning officer power to return a minority candidate, that we can have any pretension to order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to amend the return. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has argued this point, and the point that the Act of 1872 is not in force in any part of the Dominion, but is superseded by the Act of 1873 and the Act of 1874. My hon. friend's argument on that point is clear, viz., that the Act of 1872 is not in force in the Dominion at all, that it is superseded by the Act of 1874. The second section of the Act of 1872 is that which gives the returning officer the power of returning a minority candidate, by declaring that all votes for the disqualified candidate shall be thrown away. That gives the returning officer power to do something more than sum up the votes. We have the Act of 1874, in which the fifty-ninth section provides that the returning officer shall sum up the votes and declare elected the man having the highest number; and section sixty-one provides that he shall return the man having the highest number of votes. I ask the hon. member for Sherbrooke, or any hon. member who desires to view this case apart from any personal or political leanings, I ask the hon. First Minister, if it is not perfectly clear that the fifty-ninth and sixty-first clauses of the Act of 1874 are in direct contradiction and opposition to the second section of the Act of 1872? The one gives the returning officer the power of returning a minority candidate, and the other declares explicitly and unmistakably that the returning officer shall return only the man having the highest number of votes. There is another question apart from that altogether. I say the Act of 1872 is repealed in substance; I say that it is superseded. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the contrary. That is an important legal question on which we ought to have the judgment of our ablest men skilled in the law, for it is a question on which men may fairly differ. But another question arises here. Assuming that the Act of 1872 is not practically superseded by the Act of 1874, is the Act of 1872 in force in Prince Edward Island? Was it ever in force in Prince Edward Island? It is perfectly manifest it was not in force when the Island joined the Union, because the Act of 1872 was passed the year before the Island joined the Union, and it contains no provision that it shall extend to Provinces forming part of the Union after its passage. If that be so I would like to know by virtue of what law the Act of 1872 can be applied to Prince Edward Island; and it is only on the assumption that this Act is in force there that this report of the Committee can by any possibility be concurred in. The Act of 1873 makes express provision that not only would it apply to the Provinces then forming the Union, but also to all the Provinces that might subsequently join the Union; and were it not for the constitutional question that an hon. gentleman has suggested with respect to the

Act of 1873, I would say it was in force by virtue of that clause which extends the Act to Provinces subsequently joining Confederation. It was argued by one hon. gentleman that the Act of 1872 came into force in the Island by virtue of an Act of the Island passed in 1876. It could not, therefore, have been in force from 1872 to 1876. What law was in force during those four years? It must have been the law of 1873 and 1874. The Act of 1872 provides for a disqualification and a qualification for members of this House, yet we are gravely told that Prince Edward Island, one of the Provinces of this Dominion, has the right by legislation of its own—the legislation of 1876—to make applicable to the Island a law that regulates the qualification and disqualification of members of this House.

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

### After Recess.

#### THE NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

On the order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 93) respecting the Northern Railway of Canada, being read,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who has really charge of this Bill, has given notice of some amendments to it, and it would be hardly fair to consider the Bill in his absence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was about to suggest that, as these amendments are important, it would be proper to consider them in the Railway Committee. Under these circumstances, I would move that instead of the House going into Committee on this Bill, it be referred back to the Railway Committee, together with the amendments of which notice has been given. As we have extended the time to receive the report from the Committee, and as there are one or two other Bills before the Committee, there is no risk of delay in making this reference.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My only objection is a fear that it would be delayed too long to be passed this Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no danger of that.

Mr. CAMERON. These amendments were ready when the Bill was before the Railway Committee, but at the request of the Government, and in order that they might consider them, I deferred moving them in the Committee, with the understanding that they should be moved in Committee of the whole House. Of course, I consent to the reference, after the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Order discharged, and Bill referred back to Committee on Railways.

#### THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA.

Mr. COLBY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 113) to authorize the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada to extend their traffic arrangements with the North Shore Railway Company, to fifty years from the date thereof.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Before the Committee reports on this Bill, I wish to say that, as I understand the third reading is not to be to-night, and as my objections to it are to the principle rather than to the detail, I reserve any remarks I have to make until the third reading. I think the Bill is vicious in principle and ought not to be passed by this House, for the reasons I stated in the Railway Committee. I shall probably feel it my duty to move some amendments on third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad my hon. friend from Victoria has made a statement of his objections to the Bill. I have similar objections to those which the hon. gentleman entertains, and which objections I stated very fully before the Railway Committee, but as the matter is to stand over by arrangement to be dealt with on the third reading, I, of course, make no opposition to the Bill at present.

Bill reported.

#### THE DOMINION PHOSPHATE AND MINING COMPANY.

On the order for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Dominion Phosphate and Mining Company, being read,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am informed by the promoters of this Bill that they are content to accept the amendment which the Senate has made, inasmuch as they do not purpose using their borrowing powers, and it is, therefore, of no moment how those powers may be restricted. The limitation imposed by the Senate was that they should not borrow more than the amount of their paid-up capital. As that clause had not usually been inserted in Bills of this kind, I objected to it when it came down here; but as the promoters have no objection to it, I, therefore, move concurrence in the amendment.

Amendments concurred in.

#### KING'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) ELECTION.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had concluded my remarks on the subject of the Act of 1872, known as the Costigan Act. I endeavored to show that that Act was not in force in the Island of Prince Edward at the last Dominion Election for the Dominion, on various grounds. In the first place I pointed out that the Act was passed before the Union was consummated; and that the Act was only intended to apply to such Provinces as had by law abolished dual representation. I pointed out that, by the words of the Statute itself, it could only be applicable to such Provinces as formed the Dominion at the time of the passing of the Act, and that, therefore, by no possibility could it be argued with any show of reason that the Act of 1872 was in force in the Island in 1882. Now, Sir, I contend that the report adopted by the majority of the Committee cannot be adopted by this House, because it is based upon the assumption that the Act of 1872 was in force in the Island on the 13th of June, 1882. But it is argued that the Act of 1873 is in force in that Island; assuming that it was then the report of the Committee is equally at fault, because, as I have said, it proceeds on the assumption that the Act of 1872, which is the only Act that gives the returning officer the power of declaring that the votes given for the minority candidate, if he is disqualified, shall be thrown away—was the only Act in existence at that time. Now, if the Act of 1873 was in force in the Island, then I say the report cannot be adopted. From the facts set out in the report and this view of the law, the conclusion would be that there should be a new election, that the election was null and void, that the returning officer had no power to reject the votes given for the majority candidate. Now, it may be argued further, that if the Acts of 1872 and 1873 were not in force in the Island, that the Union Act passed by this Parliament in 1873 was in force in the Island. You will recollect that the Act of 1872 was passed on the 14th day of June, 1872, and you will recollect that the Island Act was passed and received the Royal Assent on the 23rd of May, 1873, and prior to that the Mills Act was passed. I contend that it cannot be urged successfully that the Act of 1872 was in force, or that the Act of 1873 was in force; but then it may be argued, as it was argued in the Committee, that if neither

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

of these Acts is in force the Act of Union brought the Act of 1873, if not the Act of 1872, into force in the Island. The Union Act was passed on May 23rd, 1873, and among other provisions it contains the following:—

“On, from and after the day on which the said colony of Prince Edward Island shall be admitted to the Union or Dominion of Canada as a Province thereof by Her Majesty, the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, under the provisions of the one hundred and forty-sixth section of the British North America Act of 1867, all the Acts of the Parliament of Canada passed in the present, or any former Session thereof and relating to the following subjects, or any of them, that is to say: (1) The Executive Government and the several departments thereof; (2) The Civil Service of the Dominion; (3) The Legislature and Legislation; (4) The Senate and House of Commons, including the proceedings therein, and the vacating of the seats of members of the House of Commons and the filling of vacancies.”

The last clause I have read is the only one which has any application here. It may be argued that under the words “House of Commons” the Act of 1872 might be imported into the Island, that its provisions might be made applicable to the Island under the clause I have just read. It is important to notice the date of this statute. This Act was passed on May 23rd, 1873. Prince Edward Island was not admitted into the Union at that time. It was admitted by a joint address of both Houses of this Parliament, and a joint address of the Local Legislature and by the Order in Council, to which I will now refer. That Order in Council was passed on June 26th, 1873, over a month after the Statute from which I have just read was passed, and which it is contended brought the Act of 1872 into force in the Island. The point, I think, is a reasonably clear one, that the terms of Union and the conditions and stipulations upon which the Island would join the Union, are all embodied in the address of both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion and of the Island, and in the Order in Council. You will search in vain in the addresses to which I have just referred, for any words that can by any possibility be construed so as to bring either of these Acts into force in the Island. Besides, it may be argued with great force that this Parliament had no power to bind the Island by any Act of this Parliament passed before the Island joined the Union, and had no power to stipulate and fix on any terms and conditions on which the Island should join the Union other than those in the addresses aforesaid and the Order in Council. That was a matter of convention and treaty between the negotiating parties, and the Island not being part of the Union, therefore it may properly be argued that this Statute cannot apply to the Island. If that is so, and I think it is a fair argument, then this result must inevitably follow, that neither the Act of 1872, nor the Act of 1873, nor the Union Act of 1873, can have any force or effect in the Island. If such process of reasoning be correct, then my position is, I think, made out. I stated before recess that the Act of 1873 could not, by any possibility, have any force from 1873 to 1876, when the Island abolished dual representation. If so, what law was in force during those years under which the Dominion Elections in the Island were carried on? Provision is made therefor by this Order in Council. It says:

“And in accordance with the terms of the said addresses relating to the Electoral Districts for which, the time within which, and the laws and provisions under which the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, for such Electoral Districts shall be held, it is hereby further ordered and declared that ‘Prince County’ shall constitute one district, to be designated ‘Prince County District,’ and return two members; that ‘Queen's County’ shall constitute one district, to be designated ‘Queen's County District,’ and return two members; that ‘King's County’ shall constitute one district, to be designated ‘King's County District,’ and return two members; that the election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, for such Electoral Districts shall be held within three calendar months from the day of the admission of the said Island into the Union or Dominion of Canada; that all laws which at the date of this Order in Council relating to the qualification of any person to be elected or sit or vote as a member of the House of Assembly of the said Island shall apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the Electoral Districts situate in the said Island of Prince Edward.”

That very clearly provided for the holding of the first election in the Island, for the purpose of returning members to serve in the Parliament of Canada. I am told that the election of 1874 was held under that Order in Council, and upon the same terms and conditions, and that the qualification for local members was the qualification for members of the House of Commons, in pursuance of that Order in Council. If that be so, it is quite clear that the Order in Council provided for holding the Dominion Elections in the Island, from the time when the Island joined the Union until the Dominion Parliament passed such legislation as was applicable to the whole Dominion. We passed such legislation. We passed the Act of 1874, which was in force in Prince Edward Island, but not for the election of 1874. All the elections in that Island subsequently, were held under that Act, and that Act, as I have pointed out, expressly speaks of the duty and power imposed on Returning Officers, and that duty and power consisted in their having the authority to sum up the number of votes cast, and to declare elected the candidate having the highest number. If that process of reasoning be correct, I say, again that neither the Act of 1872, the Act of 1873, or the Union Act, were in force during the last Dominion Elections. But it was urged in the Committee, and it may be urged again, that the Act of 1872 must be in force there, because the Island passed this law abolishing dual representation. I hold that the Island could not by any legislation of its own introduce there a Dominion law that fixed the qualification of candidates for the Dominion Parliament, or the disqualification of candidates. It was said that the Act of 1872 was in force, because it speaks in the present—that it speaks now to all Provinces affected by it. That is true so far as regards the construction of Statutes, for laws always speak in the present. But it only speaks to the Provinces intended to be under its control, or governed by it, and those were the Provinces which formed the Union in 1872, when the Act was passed. It cannot speak to Provinces which were not in the Union, and which hardly contemplated entering it; and upon all these grounds I hold that the Act of 1872 was not in force in Prince Edward Island at the late Dominion Elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite take a different view of the question. I say there may be something in the view which they hold; it is a question open to argument, and it is the bounden duty of Parliament to obtain the very highest legal adjudication upon it in order that the law may be settled and determined. It may be argued further, and I think with some propriety, that although this Parliament has the power, by virtue of the law of Parliament, to declare that a sitting member who occupies a seat in Parliament is disqualified for personal reasons, such as holding a Government office, being a minor or a lunatic, or something of that kind; but I deny that, although this Parliament has the power to declare vacant a seat in Parliament, it has not the power to do anything else, to declare that any other person shall occupy the seat. Parliament has the power to purge itself, but it rests with the people to say who shall occupy seats in Parliament. Now, I pointed out, when I moved in this matter some months ago, many cases in which Parliament had called upon and directed the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to amend the return, and in every single one of them it was the majority candidate that was declared entitled to the seat, and the returns were so amended; and I think I can challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point out a single instance in which Parliament was ever called upon to amend a return so as to give the minority candidate the seat. The power and jurisdiction of Parliament was never invoked to give a seat to a man whom the returning officer did not declare elected, and the people at the polls did not elect. I referred the House to the Beauharnois, Kent, Oxford, Gaspé, Bagot, Essex, Lennox and Addington, and

Muskoka cases, and in every one of them the returns were amended by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, at the Table of the House, and in every one of them the man ultimately got the seat whom the people said should have the seat by their votes, and he was declared entitled to the seat accordingly. We here simply did what the returning officer ought to have done. It may be said that if we had the power then to do that, we have the power here to do so, because it was the duty of the returning officer to declare the minority candidate elected. I say, no; it is only by virtue of the law of Parliament, and not by virtue of a Statute; it is only—if I may use the expression—by virtue of the common law of Parliament, that Parliament assumes jurisdiction and authority, and directs the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to amend the returns and give the majority candidate the seat. The hon. gentleman will search in vain among the authorities for a single authority to show that the minority candidate was ever ordered by Parliament to occupy the seat. It may be said that the Act of 1872 gives us that power here; but I say it does not. The Act of 1872 gives the returning officer the power, under certain circumstances, where it is in force, to return the minority candidate; but it gives no other person or body the power. Are we to be asked now to assume the power of doing what Parliament never has done, give the seat to the minority candidate, because the returning officer has not done his duty? No. That power is the creature of the Statute, and must be exercised in strict accordance with the provisions of the Statute; and we cannot in Parliament assume to ourselves the duty of doing that which the returning officer ought to have done. This was done in the other case because it was the law of Parliament, and it cannot be done in this case because it is not the law of Parliament, and we cannot make the law of Parliament by a mere resolution of the House. Dwaris, Potter's edition, lays this down very clearly on pages 612 to 620, the doctrine that Parliament cannot acquire power, or jurisdiction, or authority, by merely passing a resolution, that such shall be the case. I have said about all I intended to say on this question; I have pointed out that, according to my view of the law, Dr. Robertson, on the 13th of June last, was qualified to be elected a candidate for this Parliament. I have pointed out that according to my reading of the Statute of the Island, and of our disqualification Act, Dr. Robertson was not disqualified, because the Local Legislature required him to do two things, one only of which he did do, and that he was not, therefore, entitled to the seat or to be called a member of the Legislative Assembly; the second was, that he was to take the oath prescribed by section seventy-five of the Local Act. I have pointed out that the Act of 1872 could not, by any possibility, be in force, for the reasons already given; and that, as to the Act of 1873, it was very doubtful whether it was in force, because, although, in one of the clauses it says, that it shall apply to all the Provinces then forming the Union, and which subsequently joined the Union, it was an Act passed before the Island joined the Union, and that the Island was not bound by that legislation. I have pointed out that it is very doubtful whether the Union Act of 1873 was in force in the Island, for precisely the same reason; that this Parliament has no power, without the assent and consent of the Island Legislature, to make its provisions applicable to the Island. If either of these propositions are correct—I care not which—then the report of the Committee cannot be adopted, because Mr. McDonald is not entitled to the seat. I do not mean to say, I lay down the rule dogmatically, that this is the law, and that there cannot be any doubt about it. I know that there is some doubt about it. I know that lawyers differ on this subject; that the ablest lawyers on the other side of the House have taken a contrary opinion; and that some of them, from their own expressed determination, have done so with great reluctance, and after great hesitation, and

after considerable doubt. I know that some lawyers on this side of the House take a different opinion. We have a difference of opinion in the Committee; and we have a difference of opinion in the House, as we are aware from the observations of the hon. member for Sherbrooke; and as there is a difference of opinion in the House, I think it is the duty of the Government, and of Parliament, and of every man who desires to see the law of the land properly interpreted, and properly administered, to see that we have a proper interpretation of the law of the land. Now, I ask, without the slightest reflection on the honesty, on the integrity, or upon the good faith of every hon. gentleman within the range of my voice now, if they expect to get a clear and sound exposition of the law with regard to these complicated Statutes and legal propositions, which are perhaps difficult to be understood by the hon. members of this House, the majority of whom are laymen, unaccustomed to the construction of Statutes, in this manner; and I ask further, is it possible, that we can so divest our minds of our political leanings, our political prejudices, and our political sympathies, that we can rise above all these and bring to the consideration of this question, minds which are unbiassed and untrammelled by political consideration. I would fain hope so; but as I said in my opening remarks, I fear, that the cheers which greeted the two hon. gentlemen who first addressed the House, are a strong indication that I can hardly hope for that desirable result. If we cannot hope for that here, would it not be better to have a proper adjudication of this question. Sir, I may be right, I think I am right. If this report is adopted, and the court afterward decides that Dr. Robertson was entitled to the seat, and that Mr. McDonald was not so entitled, I ask you what position those members who have voted—as did the majority of the Committee—for sustaining this report, if the majority of the members so vote, will occupy? How will they reconcile with their duty, to their consciences, to their country, and to Parliament, the fact that they put a man with a minority of votes illegally and improperly in his seat in Parliament; and how, on the other hand, if the motion of the hon. gentleman should carry, would the gentlemen on this side of the House feel, if it afterwards turned out on judicial investigation, that Mr. McDonald was all along entitled to the seat? We would not be in a very comfortable frame of mind, I apprehend; and I therefore implore the House, and the Government especially, before they vote to maintain the report, that every means should be adopted, and every scheme resorted to, for the purpose of getting some authoritative exposition of the law bearing on this subject. I think I can suggest—as I did before the Committee—a mode by which justice can be done to all parties; by which the authority and power of Parliament may be vindicated, and the rights of the respective parties in this case may be secured, and secured satisfactorily. I think, Sir, I can point out a way by which justice can be done—and, at all events, whatever the decision may be, we will then have confidence in the decision—namely, the decision of the court of last resort in this country. By the Supreme Court Act, provision is made for the Governor in Council referring any matter to the consideration of the Supreme Court, and that court is bound by law to certify their opinion on the question so submitted; and upon that certificate the Government and House can act. I ask the House, in the interest of justice and fair play, to refer this question as to the disqualification of Dr. Robertson, as to whether or not the Act of 1872, or the Act of 1873, or the Act of Union, or either of them, were in force on the Island on the 13th of June, 1882. Although my views on this subject are strong, I am not so dogmatic—I have not such a profound opinion of my own legal attainments—as to say with absolute certainty that all the law laid down on this side of the House is right, and all laid down on the other side of the House is wrong.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

If I know myself, I want to see that fair play and justice is done to the parties affected; I want to have the interpretation of these laws from the highest authority which exists in this land. I propose to move that this matter be submitted to the Supreme Court, and I hope the Government will assent to so reasonable a proposition; and when we have such an interpretation, the rights of the parties will be disposed of by the House, with some assurance that we are disposing of them on legal and equitable principles. I move in amendment to the amendment:

That a difference of opinion exists in the Select Standing Committee of Privileges and Elections, and exists also in the House, as to the effect of the provisions of the Statute bearing on the Election for King's County, in the Island of Prince Edward.

That the spirit of recent legislation has been to refer questions affecting elections to the judgment of the courts.

That the Supreme Court is the court of last resort in election cases,—that the Supreme Court Act provides that any matter whatever may be referred to the Supreme Court for hearing and consideration by the Governor in Council, and that the court shall thereupon hear and consider the same, and certify their opinion thereon.

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, that before a decision is voted by this House on the subject, steps should be taken to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court on the question, whether under the law regulating the holding the election, James E. Robertson was, on the 13th June, 1882, disqualified to be elected a member of the House of Commons for the Electoral District of King's County, P. E. I.;—and 2nd. whether under the law the said James E. Robertson, or the said Augustine C. McDonald should have been declared elected and returned as member for the said Electoral District in the present Parliament by the returning officer, or whether the said election was null and void.

The Statute under which I move is section fifty-two of the Supreme Court Act.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to read it?

Mr. CAMERON. Section fifty-two says:

"It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to refer to the Supreme Court for hearing or consideration, any matter whatsoever as he may think fit; and the court shall thereupon hear and consider the same and certify their opinion thereon to the Governor in Council."

This enables the Governor in Council to submit the whole case to the Supreme Court.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise merely to say a word or two with reference to the amendment which has just been moved. I think if the hon. gentleman were to go into the precedents, he will find that his motion is altogether unsupported by the Statutes. The clause to which he has referred was taken from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council Act, and he will find that that clause was put in for the purpose of enabling the Crown to ask the Judicial Committee for their opinion, to quiet the conscience of the Crown in matters in which the Crown is concerned. This is a matter connected with the representation of the people in Parliament, with which the Crown or the conscience of the Crown has no concern. It is quite impossible that the Supreme Court could entertain a question relating to the election of representatives in Parliament under this clause.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am glad that the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House from the Opposition side, concedes, at all events, that from his point of view there are some doubts upon this question; and I am glad that he further made the admission that the whole question was open to argument. We are so accustomed to hear hon. gentlemen opposite take the view that all their contentions, or nearly all of them, are right, that it is rather refreshing to find one of their number taking a position about which he, at all events, has some doubt. I, for myself, confess that I had considerable doubt as to this question at the outset. I was not familiar with the question. I was not aware of the true inwardness of the controversy, and I had, at all events, the best qualification for American juryship, inasmuch as I had not even read the papers. I, therefore, came perfectly fresh to the consideration of this question in the Committee, and I endeavored to bring what

the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) says we should all bring to the consideration of this question, a judicial spirit. I quite agree with him that it is proper that hon. members should bring to the consideration of this question a judicial spirit, but I was rather surprised to find, after he had invited the House to investigate this matter in a judicial spirit, that he should have suggested to refer it elsewhere for consideration. We are confronted here with a difficulty which is not of our own making. We have to look at the actual position, which is quite apart from conceding the general rule that the candidate having the majority of votes should be returned to Parliament by the returning officer. We are here confronted with an exceptional state of circumstances, and we must face them. I find that King's County (P. E. I.), is entitled to two members. I find that four candidates presented themselves, one of whom, Mr. McIntyre, obtained the highest number of votes; another, Dr. Robertson, who is a claimant for one of the seats, obtained the second highest number of votes; and Mr. McDonald, who is also a claimant for the seat, obtained the third highest number of votes. It seems that certain representations were made to the returning officer after the election to the effect that Mr. Robertson was not eligible or qualified to be returned to this House. The returning officer had some personal cognizance of the facts which were alleged by way of disqualification. Documents were put before him to show that Mr. Robertson was, in fact, disqualified to become a member of this House, and it is quite reasonable to infer, when so shrewd an advocate as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) admits, that there is a doubt about this question, that the returning officer, in the turmoil of an election, with both parties pressing to have their favorite candidate returned, should have considerable doubt as to what his duty should be under the circumstances. Now, what did the returning officer do under the circumstances? He did not make a partisan return; he did not return one candidate or the other; he returned the senior member for King's County, who now sits in this House—Mr. McIntyre, if I may mention him by name—and he made a special return, or what has been called a double return, with reference to the other two candidates who were highest on the list. He practically said: "I am unable to return either of these candidates, and I will make a return of the circumstances, and leave Parliament to decide for itself." In other words, he said: "I am confronted with a difficulty, and I will make a return of the circumstances, and leave Parliament to decide according to its wisdom." I say, that a returning officer making such a return did not do what was unfair, but exercised a reasonable discretion under the circumstances, and there is no ground for the aspersions cast upon him by some members of this House. Under the English Ballot Act, the rule is precisely the same as ours: the returning officer is enjoined to return the majority candidate; but I notice Mr. Cunningham, on Elections, says:

"Where a disqualified candidate obtains a majority of votes, it is thought to be a better and safer course to return such candidate, together with the candidate or candidates, according to the number of vacancies, who come next to him in the number of votes. [And there is no question that when there is any doubt as to the fact of the disqualification, it would be much safer to follow this course than either to return the candidate alleged to be disqualified, to the exclusion of another, or, on the other hand, to return another candidate to the exclusion of him alleged to be disqualified.]"

Again, I find that Rogers, a writer on Elections, says:

"In the Leominster case, under similar circumstances, the Sheriff returned both the qualified and unqualified candidates, and his conduct does not seem to have been reflected upon; and this, it is conceived, is on the whole the safest course for the returning officer to pursue as regards places in England and Scotland. Parliament, looking at the difficult position in which a returning officer, under such circumstances, would be placed—the question depending perhaps upon nice points of law or fact, and having to be decided upon the spur of the moment, during the turmoil of a contested election—would hardly, it is presumed, refuse to uphold the conduct of the returning officer."

So that the returning officer had the warrant of English precedent, at all events, for the course he adopted. Now, I do not pretend that he adopted the correct course. I contend that he should have adopted another course—that, according to the law, he should have returned the minority candidate under the circumstances; but while I say this, I maintain that he acted with a discretion which, under the circumstances, was not unreasonable. The remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) were based, mainly, on the assumption that the returning officer is in all cases bound to return the candidate having the majority of votes. That is the rule undoubtedly; but there may be some special circumstances that take the case out of the general rule; and the question for us to consider is, are there any such circumstances in this case? I hold that such circumstances have been involved in this case as would warrant the returning officer in returning the candidate having the next highest number of votes. The whole question was referred to the Committee, and we have their finding on the law, and a complete statement as to the facts. The Committee make two main reports. They first report, as to the facts, that at the date at which Dr. Robertson was nominated to the House of Commons, he was a member of the Local House; and they find, as to the law, that being a member of the Local House, he was ineligible as a candidate for the House of Commons, and that furthermore, under the law, the votes cast for him were thrown away. They further find that under the law the returning officer was bound to return the candidate having the next highest number of votes. Now, what are we to do? I maintain that, having the law and the facts before us, the duty of this House is to do now what the returning officer, on a strict interpretation of the law, should have done in the first instance. If this House does what the returning officer should have done on the 26th of June, which was, I believe, the declaration day, I believe justice will have been done, and no complaint can fairly be made against the returning officer. As to Dr. Robertson being a member of the Local House, there can be no doubt whatever. There was a local Election; Dr. Robertson was nominated as a candidate on the 1st of May, and was elected on the 8th of May; his return was made to the Provincial Secretary on the 27th of May, and was published in the *Royal Gazette* of the Island on the 3rd of June; and, by all these steps, Dr. Robertson became the representative of the Fourth Electoral District of King's County in the Island Assembly. We next come to the dates of the Dominion nomination and Election, the 13th and the 20th of June. The contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is that Dr. Robertson resigned on the 12th of June, the day before the nomination, and was, therefore, qualified as a candidate for the Commons. I must modify that statement, because I now understand the hon. member for West Huron to argue that he never was a member of the Local House, whereas I understand the hon. member for St. John to argue that he was a member, and that he properly resigned. I might leave these two hon. gentlemen to settle their dispute between themselves, but I prefer to take up in turn the positions assumed by those hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for West Huron cited the Island Statute; he cited section seventy-five of 19 Vic., which provides that it shall be not only necessary for a member-elect of the Local Assembly to put in a property qualification at the time of his nomination, but necessary to re-swear to his property qualification before he takes his seat. I shall take the liberty of reading the section again:

"No person shall be capable of being elected a member for any Town and Royalty or district in this Island, unless he shall, for a period of at least twelve calendar months before the date of the writ for holding the election at which such person shall claim to be elected, have been in the seizin or possession of a freehold or leasehold estate within this Island of the value of fifty pounds, over and above all encumbrances that may affect the same; and shall, before he be presented to take his seat in the House of Assembly, take one of the oaths in

the schedule of this Act prescribed for members, relative to a freehold or leasehold estate, as the nature of his qualification may require."

What is the meaning of that section? It is that in order that he may be qualified to be a candidate, or to be elected, he shall first have taken an oath that he has a certain property qualification; and, in order, further, as I interpret it, that the Island Assembly may be perfectly aware he has not become dispossessed of that property qualification, that Assembly made provision against his losing that qualification between the election and the time he may take his seat. I see nothing in that law that implies that a member-elect is not a member of the House until he takes this particular oath. I see nothing in it to conflict with our pretension that he is a member chosen and properly returned in the way provided by the law before he shall present himself to take his seat, and to take the oath of allegiance to his sovereign exacted from the member-elect. I find in the Island Statute another section that recognizes completely the principle that he is a member even before the first meeting of the Assembly after General Election. The Statute passed in 1876, section 18, says:—

"Any two members of the House of Assembly may notify the Lieutenant-Governor, under their hands and seals, of any vacancy arising subsequently to a General Election, and before the first meeting of the General Assembly thereafter, by reason of the death or acceptance of office of any member."

Here is a recognition of the competency of two members—I call them "elect," for the sake of convenience, as distinguished from members who have taken the oath—before they have taken the oath or their seat, to perform a certain executive act, as what?—as members of the Legislative Assembly. Here is the Island Statute itself recognizing these men as members. Under these circumstances, and I do not see how it can lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen to say they are not members. But there is a further authority on this subject. Now, I think I may say, without a chance for successful contradiction, that in England, when a member is elected for the Commons, he is a member of that House after his election and return, even before he has taken the oath; and, as a matter of fact, some men have been elected and returned, and have been members of the House and have acted on the Committees, though they never took their seats. They were treated as members to this extent, that they could not free themselves from their office as members of the House without accepting the Chiltern Hundreds, which disqualified them by taking office under the Crown.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACMASTER. I will cite May's "Parliamentary Practice":

"But although a member may not sit and vote until he has taken the oath, he is entitled to all the other privileges of a member and is otherwise regarded both by the House and by the laws as qualified to serve until some other disqualification has been shown to exist. On the 11th of May, 1858, acting upon this precedent, the House added Baron Rothschild, who had now continued a member for eleven years without having taken the oaths, to the Committee appointed to draw up reasons to be offered to the Lords at a conference for disagreeing to the Lords amendments to the Oaths Bill; and on the 18th he was appointed one of the managers of the conference.

"In 1849 Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild had been a member for two sessions without having taken the oaths; when he accepted the Chiltern Hundreds. On the 27th June, a new writ was issued for the city of London, and he was again returned and continued to be a member without taking the oaths; but being again returned in succeeding Parliaments, he accepted the Chiltern Hundreds a second time in 1857, and on the 23rd July, a new writ was issued for the city of London, and he was for the fifth time returned. It is usual for members who have not yet taken the oaths, to sit below the bar; and care must be taken that they do not inadvertently take a seat within the bar, by which they would render themselves liable to the penalties and disqualifications imposed by the Statute."

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) referred to a case in which a mayor was held not to be a mayor until he had taken the oath. In order that we may know the value of

Mr. MACMASTER,

that decision we would require to have the charter of the municipal or other corporation that regulated the election of the mayor. If we had that charter before us we might find that it contained some special regulations to the effect that a man is debarred from performing any executive act as mayor until he has actually taken the oath; but without that act of incorporation we are utterly unable to appreciate the value of the decision the hon. gentleman has placed before us. The hon. member for Huron cited another case from Durriss on Statutes to prove that there must be a holding of office to complete the function and make a man a member. But the hon. gentleman omitted to cite the context of the Imperial Statutes therein referred to, from which it is evident that they refer to an appointive and not to an elective office; so that the case cited by the hon. gentleman does not apply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A Member of Parliament is not an officer.

Mr. MACMASTER. I think it is perfectly clear that Dr. Robertson was a member of the Prince Edward Island Assembly, and I must now proceed to the consideration of the other difficulty raised by the hon. member for St. John, as to whether Dr. Robertson did properly resign. Now, there is an initial enquiry as to whether he could resign at all, and with that question I propose to deal at the outset. I will cite again from May's "Parliamentary Practice," in which he lays down as an elementary rule:

"It is a settled principle of Parliamentary law that a member, after he is duly chosen, cannot relinquish his seat; and in order to evade this restriction, a member who wishes to retire accepts office under the Crown, which legally vacates his seat and obliges the House to order a new writ."

As, therefore, a member, once a member, cannot free himself from the office unless by some satisfactory relief or provision, we must look into the Prince Edward Island Statutes to see if we can find any way in which Dr. Robertson could have freed himself from his membership. The hon. member for St. John stated it was unfair for the hon. member for Sherbrooke to argue that the twenty-one days clause did not apply to this case—I call it the twenty-one days limitation clause, for the sake of convenience. But the hon. member (Mr. Weldon) frankly said that what applied to this case is the fifteenth section of the Prince Edward Island Statute of 1876. What is the fifteenth section? With the permission of the House I will read it. I ask the special attention of the House to it, because an important judicial decision has been based on a provision precisely similar in terms. Among the methods provided for resigning are, first, that the member shall put in his resignation while the House is sitting; next, that he shall send his resignation to the Speaker. Both imply that there is a Speaker to which the resignation can be sent directly or indirectly. Then comes the provision that no member shall tender his resignation while his election is being lawfully contested, or until the expiration of the time during which it may by law be contested for other grounds than corruption or bribery. Now that delay is twenty-one days as fixed by another section of the Statute. Now we come to the fifteenth section which the hon. member for St. John says applies to this case. That section is as follows:—

"If any member of the House of Assembly wishes to resign his seat in the interval between two Sessions of the General Assembly, and there is then no Speaker, or if such member be himself the Speaker, he may address and cause to be delivered to any two members of this House the declaration before mentioned, of his intention to resign, and such two members, upon receiving such declaration, shall forthwith notify the Lieutenant-Governor thereof, under their hands and seals, who is hereby empowered and required, within seven days after the receipt of such notification as aforesaid, to issue a writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member so notifying his intention to resign. And the member so tendering his resignation shall be held to have vacated his seat and ceased to be a member of the House."

Now, we have here the peculiar words :

"If any member of the House of Assembly wishes to resign his seat in the interval between two Sessions of the General Assembly."

What does that mean? Does it mean in the interval between two Sessions of the same Parliament, or does it mean in the interval between the end of one Parliament and the first Session of the next Parliament? Upon this head we have an important judicial decision rendered in the Province of Ontario; and I may remark that this Statute of 1876, of the Island of Prince Edward, seems to have been taken, word for word, from the Ontario Statute, 32 Vic., chap. 4. There are a few slight verbal differences, because it is the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that issues the writ in the Province of Ontario, and it is the Lieutenant-Governor in the Province of Prince Edward Island; but with the exception as to the executive acts of these particular officers, these sections are precisely the same. This section fifteen is word for word as section twelve in the Ontario Act, 32 Vic. Now, a General Election took place, some years ago, in the Province of Ontario, at which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, was the successful candidate for the Local House. After the election he wished to resign, and he sent his resignation to two members of the Local House, and these two members called on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue his writ, but he refused to issue his writ, and took the ground that he could not do so. They proceeded by a *mandamus*, or some other summary proceeding, against him, and the matter came up for adjudication before the hon. Mr. Justice Wilson, and here is what he says :

"As a rule, the member of Parliament elected or fully installed, cannot renounce his election or resign his seat of his own mere motion. It is a trust not for himself but for the public benefit.

"If there be a voluntary resignation, it must be made under the authority of a statute.

"In this Province, the Statute 32 Vic., chap. 4, sec. 10, has provided for the resignation by members of the Legislative Assembly :—

"1. By their giving notice in their places in the Assembly, of their intention to resign.

"2. By their delivering to the Speaker a declaration in writing of their intention, under their hands and seals, made before two witnesses, either during a Session or in the interval between two Sessions; or under sec. 12.

"3. By their delivering the declaration to any two members of the House, in case there is no Speaker, and in case the resignation is made in the interval between two Sessions.

"These two Sessions mean, no doubt, two Sessions of the same Parliament or Assembly, or, at all events, refer to a period when there is a Speaker. There is no other case of a voluntary resignation provided for, or, what is the same thing, there is no other mode by which a resignation can be made or completed, than by one of these three methods specifically pointed out."

Now, these are precisely the three methods provided in Prince Edward Island. It is admitted by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and it cannot be controverted, that the first two do not apply, and so it was only under the third method that there could be any possible ground for contending that he could resign before the meeting of the Legislature. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, there was no meeting of the Legislature; the Legislature of Prince Edward Island did not meet until the month of March this year, so that it was not possible for Dr. Robertson to have sent in the resignation of his membership in the Local House, even if he had so wished, up to the time of the General Election for the House of Commons. Now, in the case to which I refer, called the Election for the West Riding of Durham, the hon. Judge upheld the position that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery took, and he determined that the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition in this House with so much shrewdness and ability, able and distinguished lawyer though he is, had been in that case mistaken in his law and that that resignation could not be made. In the face of that I do not expect that hon. gentleman at this time will stand up against the decision of the courts in his own case, and pretend, as the hon. member for St. John has contended, that there could be a resignation under the

fifteenth section. But this is another little difficulty that I leave to the two hon. gentlemen to settle between themselves. I may say here, as a corollary to what I have said, that the only chance for Dr. Robertson to have got free from his membership in the Local House, was one that he would not voluntarily accept—death, or secondly, by accepting some office under the Crown; but in no other way could he get free from his membership in the Local House until the Assembly met and elected a Speaker. If the Local House had met within twenty-one days after the return of the writ, he could not even then have resigned before the 22nd June—too late to be eligible for the Commons candidature. But as it did not meet, the twenty-one days clause cannot be made to apply, and the result is that under the actual circumstances existing in this case, he could not make a legal resignation, and never did make a legal resignation, and so far as I can see, he is a member of the Legislative Assembly to this day. But it is not necessary to go that length. I am perfectly aware that the Attorney-General of Prince Edward Island took the ground that this alleged resignation, that Dr. Robertson sent to two members of the House, and that they kept in their pockets until after it was perfectly certain that he had a majority of the votes—I know that the Attorney-General took the ground, that in order that that resignation should be valid, it ought to have been sent into the Lieutenant-Governor, who would then have issued the writ. That view is quite correct, provided Dr. Robertson could resign by that method, but I deny that he could resign at all. In process of time, when that resignation was sent in to the Lieutenant-Governor, the writ did issue. All I have to say with regard to that, is that, in my humble opinion, the Attorney-General was mistaken in his law, just as the hon. leader of the Opposition was mistaken in his law with regard to the case of the West Riding of Durham. I take it for granted that the Attorney-General of Prince Edward Island, whom, I believe, is an able jurist and an experienced Parliamentarian, had not in all probability read the case relating to the West Riding of Durham. Had he read it he might have taken a different view, but the view he may have taken is not material to the decision of the issue in this case. Now, if the position is clear—and I have endeavored to make it clear—that on the 13th of June last, Dr. Robertson was a member of the Local Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and that he could not resign, he was a candidate for the House of Commons while a member of the Local House, and he was elected to the House of Commons—I use the word elected in the ordinary conventional sense—while being a member of the Local House. What is the effect of this? Now, to make the matter as plain as I am able, we have a Statute in force in Canada, passed in the year 1872, which says, that in any Province of the Dominion in which they have passed an Act that a member of the House of Commons shall not be eligible to sit in the Legislative Assembly of that Province, a member of the Legislative Assembly of that Province shall not be eligible for a seat in the House of Commons. The Statute of 1872 says: We will give reciprocity of prohibition if you prohibit us from going into your Assembly, we will prohibit you from coming into ours. But that Statute says more; it says that: in the event of any member of a Legislative Assembly being a candidate and getting a majority of the votes, the returning officer shall throw those votes away and shall declare the candidate having the next highest number of votes to be properly elected. Now, here is the expression of the Statute, and if that Statute is binding and the law of the land, the returning officer has no discretion :

"2. If any such member of a Provincial Legislature shall, notwithstanding his disqualification as in the preceding section mentioned, receive a majority of votes at any such election, such majority of votes shall be thrown away, and it shall be the duty of the returning officer to return the person having the greatest number of votes, provided he be otherwise eligible."

Hon. gentlemen may talk about judicial or ministerial power, but it is no use wasting idle terms, because there are the plain words of the English language which say that if this provision is applicable to the election, the returning officer shall throw away the votes thus given, and shall return the candidate having the next highest number of votes. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) frankly recognized that position, and said if the Statute of 1872 is in force, I admit the returning officer should return the minority candidate. In that respect, again, the hon. gentleman is in conflict with the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), who warmly declared against the great injustice it would inflict on the electors of King's County, if that county should be disfranchised, as he held the House was about to disfranchise it. With clearer and better judgment, the hon. member for Huron said, if that is the law and if it is applicable, then the returning officer should have returned the minority candidate. I have spoken of the Statute of 1872. Let me see if that Statute applies to Prince Edward Island. First, as to its special provisions, we find that, in 1876, the Island Legislature passed a Statute in which they enacted reciprocity of prohibition; in which they said that no member of the House of Commons shall be eligible to sit in the Local Assembly. Thus the Island, by its legislation, created the state of affairs that brought into operation as applying to it the Statute of 1872. The hon. gentleman argues, how can it be possible that a Statute passed by the Dominion Parliament in 1872 can have any relation to a Statute passed in 1876 in Prince Edward Island? It is well known to all legal gentlemen here—and as hon. members opposite have appealed to the laity in this House, I may be permitted to read a section from the Interpretation Act that I would not otherwise read, that a law once enacted on the Statute-book is constantly speaking:

"The law is to be considered as always speaking, and whenever any matter or thing is expressed in the present tense the same is to be applied to the circumstances as they arise, so that effect may be given to each Act, and every part thereof, according to its spirit, true intent, and meaning."

The Interpretation Act is the lamp by the light of which our Statutes must be read. The Act of 1872 was in full force, waiting for—what? Waiting for circumstances to arise in the different Provinces of the Dominion, by which it would be put into operation. While the Act of 1872 was thus speaking, Prince Edward Island passed its Statute in the face of that Act, and accorded reciprocity of prohibition. I believe the junior member for Queen's was Attorney-General of the Island at that time.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Mr. MACMASTER. Then I have been misinformed.

Mr. DAVIES. My colleague was.

Mr. MACMASTER. At all events, the hon. gentleman was Premier, or was occupying some distinguished position in the Councils of the Island.

Mr. DAVIES. I was leading the Opposition at the time.

Mr. MACMASTER. The position of the leader of the Opposition is only second to that of the leader of the Government, and no doubt the hon. member for Queen's exercised as wholesome an influence as he would have done as leader of the Government. We have not been informed that such a law was passed against his protest, but there was placed on the Statute-book of Prince Edward Island a law by which the hon. gentleman brought the Islanders within the operation of the Statute of 1872. I think it is perfectly plain, if the Statute of 1872 is to have application and to be in force, that the returning officer should have thrown away the votes cast for Dr. Robertson and have returned Mr. McDonald. But a question has been raised here as to whether the Act of 1872 was in force. The matter is put

Mr. MACMASTER.

in a plausible and popular sort of way; it is asked, how can it be said that a Statute passed in 1872 can have any bearing on Prince Edward Island, since the Island was not admitted into the Dominion until 1873? At first sight that position is an exceedingly staggering one, and no doubt many people will find great difficulty in answering the question. But there is an answer to it, and an answer that I think is perfectly conclusive. Prince Edward Island came into Confederation in 1873. Before it entered the Union a Statute of the Parliament of Canada was passed, by the terms of which it is provided that:

"All the Acts of the Parliament of Canada, passed in the present or any former Session, and relating to the following subjects, or any of them, that is to say: the Executive Government and the several departments thereof; the Civil Service of the Dominion; the Legislature and Legislation; the Senate and House of Commons, including the proceedings therein, and the vacating of seats of members of the House of Commons, and the filling of vacancies—"

And other matters which I will not recite—

"shall, in so far as they are not consistent with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, or with those of the Order of Her Majesty in Council, admitting the said Colony into the Union or Dominion, apply to and be in force in the said Colony or Province of Prince Edward Island, as if it had formed a part of Canada when the said Acts were respectively passed."

The terms of this Statute of May, 1873, are, in the plain vernacular, these: that Prince Edward Island, then about to come into the Confederation, shall be subject to all the laws then existing previously passed by the Parliament of Canada with respect to a certain set of subjects, and should apply as effectually to the Island as if the Islanders were in the Union at the time they were passed. It seems to me that if the framers had desired to make an Act retroactive, they could not have done so more effectually. They made it so retrospective that it extends to the Island, not only the Statutes that were passed in 1873 and subsequently to that, but all Statutes previously passed by the Dominion Parliament in so far as they are of general application to all the Provinces which first entered into Confederation. A question was raised by an hon. gentleman as to whether the term "House of Commons" should be construed to include a regulation of the nature provided by the Act of 1872. When we take up the Act of 1872 we find the very title of it is "An Act to compel members of the Local Legislature in any Province where dual representation is not allowed, to resign their seats before becoming candidates for seats in the Dominion Parliament." If we look at the Confederation Act we find "Dominion Parliament" is defined, and that it includes the Senate and the House of Commons. So there can be no doubt whatever that the Act of 1873 is wide enough in its terms to include the Statute of 1872, the application of which is doubted by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is said how can that Act of May, 1873, have application to Prince Edward Island, inasmuch as it did not come into the Union until the June following. It has application by its distinct terms, and it is retrospective in its effects. It does not lie in the mouth of any hon. gentleman in this Assembly, who passed the Act of 1873, to question its retrospective effect or its constitutionality. The Acts of this Legislature can only be set aside and disallowed by the Sovereign, or, judicially, by the courts. The Union Act of 1873, being in full force and effect in every respect whatever, and retrospective in its terms, extended past Statutes of Canada to the Island; and its constitutionally cannot be questioned in this Assembly. I am aware that hon. gentlemen have raised another difficulty, which is this: They say that the Union Act of 1873 provides that it shall be only binding on the Island of Prince Edward, when it is not inconsistent with the provisions of the British North America Act, or an Order in Council, that may be made by Her Majesty, with reference to the admission of Prince Edward Island into Canada. Now, on examination it will be found that temporary provisions made for the management of the



Island of Prince Edward, just after it came into the Union, were almost precisely the same as those made for the management of the old Provinces, on the formation of Confederation. The forty-first section of the British North America Act provides, with regard to the old Provinces, as follows:—

“Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union, relative to the following matters or any of them, namely, qualification or disqualification—”

I call the attention of hon. gentlemen especially to these words:

“Qualification and disqualification of persons to be elected to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly, or the Legislative Assemblies of the several Provinces, etc., shall respectively apply to the election of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces.”

Now, we find that the British North America Act provides that Election Laws in existence in the old Provinces, just preceding Confederation, shall have application in the Confederacy, until fresh laws are made applicable to the new state of affairs; and you will observe the words “qualification and disqualification of members” are used in the British North America Act. When we take up the Order in Council, under which Prince Edward Island was, under the 146th section of the British North America Act, admitted into the Confederacy some years afterwards, we find that these words “disqualification of members” are entirely omitted. Now, here is what the Order in Council says, regarding the admission of Prince Edward Island:

“All laws, which, at the date of this Order in Council, relating to the qualification of any person—”

There is not a word about disqualification.

“To be elected to sit or vote as a member of the House of Assembly of the said Island, etc., shall apply to the election of members to serve in the House of Commons for the electoral districts of the said Island of Prince Edward.”

Now, the point I wish to make with regard to this, is as follows:—That whereas, when the four old Provinces were united to form the Dominion of Canada, the old Election Laws were confirmed in the different Provinces, it was specifically mentioned that these laws should continue, not only as to the method of voting, &c. but as to the qualification and disqualification for candidature, existing under the Local Laws of the several Provinces. I direct the special attention of hon. members to the fact, that when the Island of Prince Edward came in, the word “disqualification” is excluded from the terms of the Order in Council; which, according to my view, goes to show that the high contracting parties had in view the fact that, in the meantime, the Dominion of Canada had made some legislative restrictions with regard to eligibility for the House of Commons. It seems to me as if the contracting parties foresaw this and said: We cannot exactly agree to have enacted what the old Provinces did with regard to the qualification and disqualification of candidates. Why? Because certain Statutes have been, meantime, passed by the Parliament of Canada, which provide certain disqualifications, and we must recognize these disqualifications; and in the arrangements with Prince Edward Island, we must eliminate the word “disqualification” from the terms. In other respects the provisions with regard to the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Confederation were practically temporary provisions, until Prince Edward Island could be brought fully within the purview of the Dominion Laws. Now, the Union Act of 1873, which is retrospective in its terms, makes the Statute of 1872 apply to and in force in Prince Edward Island, and if it is in force there cannot be a doubt that the conclusions of the Committee are correct. If it is not in force, it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to show how such is the case. Upon them is the burden of this argument, and it is no wonder that my hon.

friend from Huron felt himself in doubt, for his undertaking was a very serious one indeed. That Act (1872) must be in force, unless it is superseded by the Dual Election Act of 1873, or by the General Election Act of 1874. Hon. gentlemen are aware that in 1873, another Act was passed with reference to Elections to the House of Commons, in which it was provided that no member of the Local Assembly should be eligible for a seat in the House of Commons. Now, there is a difference between this Act and the Act of 1872. The Act of 1872 says to the Local Assemblies: “If you prohibit us going to your Assemblies, we prohibit you coming to ours;” and the Act of 1873 says: “Whether you prohibit us or not going to your Assemblies, we prohibit you coming to ours.” That is the difference between the two Acts; but there is no contradiction between these two Dual Election Acts; they both apply to different series of circumstances, and are both susceptible of operation side by side. One (1872) is a Special Act relating to Dual Elections, the other (1873) is a General Act relating to the same subject. One may have application to-day as regards Prince Edward Island, because it has prohibited our members going there; and the Dual Election Act of 1873 may have application as regards one of the other Provinces, that has not prohibited us going there, so the two Acts are perfectly reconcilable, and may exist side by side. The 1873 Act has a general sphere of operation; the 1872 Act has a special one. My hon. friends have argued, that the Act of 1872 could not be in force, under any circumstances, having been passed before the Union Act of 1873. The hon. member for Huron, since Recess, very circumspcctly has taken up the ground, that the Act of 1873 relating to dual elections could not be enforced as regards Prince Edward Island, because it was passed before the admission of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, before Recess, was not so precise with regard to the objection on this score; and the hon. gentleman from St. John did not take very strong ground with regard to that matter. I think the hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their minds. The hon. member from Huron now thinks, that the Dual Election Act of 1873 is not in force as regards Prince Edward Island; but what did this hon. gentleman say in Committee. I do not know if I am in order in referring to the proceedings before the Committee; but if I may be permitted to refer to the report of the proceedings of the Committee, I will do so. I think that the motion moved by the hon. member for Queen's County (Mr. Davies) recognizes the fact that the Act of 1873, relating to dual elections, was in force as regards Prince Edward Island, notwithstanding the fact that it was passed by the Parliament of Canada, before the Terms of Union were consummated. Here are the terms of this motion:

“Be it therefore resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee, the said James E. Robertson was not a member of the House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island on the 13th day of June last, within the meaning of the Disqualification Act, 36 Vic., cap. 2, 1873, and consequently was eligible for election to the House of Commons of Canada.”

In other words, that this case did not come within the operation of the Disqualification Act, and consequently he was perfectly qualified to be a candidate for the House of Commons of Canada. I think if the hon. gentleman will analyze his resolution he will find that it implies a recognition of the disqualifying Act of 1873. Of course I cannot expect him to admit that now, as it would be inconvenient for him to do so, but I think he will find a recognition of it in his motion, and as this Act was passed before Prince Edward Island became a member of Confederation, the objection which the hon. gentleman raises to the application of these Acts entirely falls to the ground. I come now to the next ground of objection, which is the gravamen of the whole matter. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment contended that the Act of 1874 repealed the Act of 1872. He says that the General Election Act of 1874 provides that the candidate having the majority of votes must be returned, and that the provi-

sions of that Act are inconsistent with the Act of 1872, which enjoins the returning officer to throw away the votes of the majority candidate, if he is disqualified, and to return the minority candidate. I admit that that is a fair and arguable position to take. But let us compare the Act of 1874 with the Act of 1872. The Act of 1874 is a General Election Act intended to have application to general cases, while the Act of 1872 is a Special Act intended to refer to special cases—cases which, as it were, are taken out of the category of what might be called general regulations referring to elections. We must also look to the association with which we find the Act of 1872 when it was passed. The hon. gentleman says that it is repugnant to the Act of 1874, but the Act of 1872 was put on the Statute-book, and was operated side by side with the Election Acts of the old Provinces of Canada, all of which provided that the majority candidate was to be returned. Therefore the Act of 1872 was passed at the time when the general law in all the Provinces then in Confederation was that a majority candidate should be returned, and it was passed to provide for a special case, namely, the case in which a disqualified candidate should present himself for election. My hon. friends opposite have cited from two or three authors with regard to the construction of Statutes. I will take the liberty of citing from a late author—Maxwell on Statutes—and I do so with reference to the effect of the General Acts of 1873 and 1874, and the Special Act of 1872:

“When the latter enactment is worded in affirmative only, without any negative expressed or implied, it does not take away the earlier law. The governing principle in all these cases is to construe the acts, if possible, as reconcilable and capable of co-existence.”

Now, the point I put is this: If the Act of 1872 was capable of co-existence with a General Act prevailing in 1872, by which the majority candidate could be returned, why should it be repugnant to or incapable of co-existence with an Act passed in 1874, which said the same thing? Mr. Maxwell says again—and this has a very strong bearing on the case:

“A general later law does not abrogate an earlier special one. It is presumed to have only general cases in view, and not particular cases which have already been provided for by a special or local Act, or what is the same thing, by custom. Having already given attention to the particular subject, and provided for it, the legislature is reasonably presumed not to intend to alter that special provision by a subsequent general enactment, unless it manifests that intention in explicit language. It is therefore, a received maxim of statutory interpretation that *generalia specialibus non derogant*. The general statute is read as silently excluding from its operation the cases which have been provided for under the special one.”

If we were to search the books indefinitely it would be difficult to find a quotation more applicable to the case in hand. He says that when the Legislature has dealt with regard to special cases it is not presumed, when it again makes a general law, to interfere with the special cases which are provided for. I argue in this case, and I submit that the argument would be sustainable before any court of justice, that the General Act of 1874 is only intended to have in view general cases, and that it has no reference whatever to the special contingency which might not occur more than once in fifty years, and which are provided for in the Special Act of 1872. The Dual Election Act of 1873 is also a General Act as regards the Special Act of 1872, and the same reasoning applies with reference to their operation. Again, if there was any doubt about the application of the Act of 1872, how is it that it was not specially repealed? Hon. gentlemen opposite were in power when the General Election Act of 1874 was passed, and if there was any doubt about the application of this Act of 1872, how was it that when they made a general law they did not take away these doubts? If you look at the Act of 1874 you will find that they repealed other Acts. It says:

“The Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in the 36th year of Her Majesty's reign intituled: An Act to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, is hereby repealed.”

Mr. MACMASTER.

There is not a word here with regard to the repealing of the Statutes of 1872 and 1873, and that for the best of reasons, namely, that these Statutes made provision for circumstance which might occur at rare intervals, but which did not come within the grasp of a General Act having reference to the General Elections throughout the country. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said that the votes given for a candidate could not be thrown away without notice. I admit that that is the rule in England. But the hon. gentleman will look in vain for a Statute in England by which in express terms the officer is enjoined to throw them away. The English books and the English decisions take the view that if there be a real disqualification existing at the time of nomination or election, it is but fair and reasonable that it should be brought to the notice of the electors, in order that they might not throw away their votes. A great deal of false sentiment and vacant platitude has been wasted over this question of the notice to the electors of King's County. The electors of King's County knew of the disqualification. They are presumed to have known the law, and if they did not know it, they knew the facts, because they had elected Dr. Robertson to the Local Legislature only a few weeks before. It was their duty, then, to be on their guard, and to satisfy themselves as to whether he was competent to be elected to the House of Commons. There was a strange negligence on the part of the friends of Dr. Robertson on that occasion. Was it fitting for them to nominate him as a candidate a fortnight before the nomination, and to permit him to walk about all that time without handing in his resignation if he could resign? I was in the same plight as Dr. Robertson in one respect. I was a member of the Legislature of Ontario when my friends in Gengarry thought proper to nominate me for the House of Commons. Do you think I allowed them to risk their votes upon a disqualified candidate? Do you think it would have been proper for me to have kept back my resignation until the very day before nomination? Would it have been just or fair treatment to the electorate to have done so? No; I think not. So strong was my feeling on that point that before a single name was on my nomination paper, not only had I sent in my resignation, but I had the acceptance of it in my pocket. I say that the good faith to the electorate required that that should be done, and good faith to the electors of King's County required that Dr. Robertson should have sent in his resignation before he did, if he could legally resign, in order that the electors of that county should not have been conducted to a false issue. Hon. gentlemen may make such inuendoes as they please; but facts are more eloquent than words. One hon. member enquires why the Committee did not ask Dr. Robertson why his resignation was not sent in at an earlier date? Why, his resignation was sent in on the very eve of nomination day.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). On the morning of the day of nomination.

Mr. MACMASTER. Yes, on the morning of the day of nomination or thereabouts. Well, what do we find? We find that the two members to whom he sent his resignation kept it in their pocket until the 7th or 8th of July following. When they found that Dr. Robertson had a majority of the votes, they sent in his resignation, dated the 26th or 27th June, but the post mark upon the document bears the date of the 8th of July, and there is no distance on that Island so great that it would take that length of time to reach its destination, so that the case is not entirely free from suspicion; and, judging by what occurred on a previous occasion with regard to another candidate on Prince Edward Island, it appears that had Dr. Robertson been unsuccessful, he might not have claimed to have sent in a resignation, and these gentlemen to whom he sent it could have very

conveniently returned it to him, because they had not communicated it to the Lieutenant-Governor. I fear that the actual circumstances indicate that this was the case of a candidate with a card in the sleeve; that the friends of Dr. Robertson were ready for either issue, as Virgil puts it; that it was a case of "heads I win, tails you lose." However, it is not necessary to go into that, nor did I intend to do so; but when I found hon. gentlemen opposite talking about the rights of the people being outraged, I thought it well to point out to them that they are not free from the taunt that everything was not as pure as Cæsar's wife, with regard to the candidature of Dr. Robertson. Now, I have endeavored to put this case fairly before you; I have endeavored to show that the report of the Committee was correct as to the fact that Dr. Robertson was, as a matter of fact, a member of the Local Assembly, and that he could not resign under the circumstances, and that he could not be and was not legally a candidate. I have further endeavored to show, as a matter of law, that by the Union Act by which Prince Edward Island came into the Confederation, the Act of 1872 was retrospectively applied to that Island, was in full force and effect there, and was brought into operation, as regards this particular case, by the Statute of 1876, passed in the Island Legislature. If this be so, the argument is complete. Dr. Robertson was disqualified, and if that Statute of 1872 is applicable, there is no escape from the position that the votes given for him must be declared to have been thrown away, and Mr. McDonald must be declared to have been elected. That would have been the duty of the returning officer on a strict reading of the law, though I do not blame him for not being able, on the spur of the moment, to interpret the carnival of Statutes that beset him. It is unfortunate that the majority of the electors of King's County should not have their choice on the floor of this House. I freely subscribe to this—that the choice of the people should be here; but the people made their choice unwisely, and, like all other people, they must abide by their choice. They made a bad choice—they chose a disqualified candidate, and they threw away their votes by their own act. Now, I have heard it asked, and by some of my hon. friends on this side of the House, whether it would not be possible to void the election and run it over again? I would be very glad to see that result attained, if it were practicable; but if the law of 1872 is applicable at all, it is applicable in its entirety, and that portion of it which excludes Dr. Robertson from this House and seats Mr. McDonald here, is just as binding upon us as the other sections of this Act. It passes almost as a proverb that the House of Commons has power over its own members. Well, I am free to concede that; but I ask hon. members of this House, if the law is plain and clear that Mr. McDonald is entitled to the seat, under the circumstances, what power is there in this House to overturn the Statutes of the land and to say that they shall not be obeyed? Is this House constituted by itself, or are there three branches of the Legislature? It took three branches of the Legislature to make the Act of 1872; are we prepared to say that one branch can abrogate it? Are we prepared to say, by the fiat of this House, that we can set aside that Act? I do not think we can. As I said, that Act is binding upon us. We must recognize it. If it is in existence it is as binding upon us as upon the humblest subject in the land, and I think it would be a sorry day, not only for this House, but for the country, if the time arrives when the House of Commons, by its own mere motion, could say: "Our powers of destruction are greater than our powers of creation, and that we can set aside, by a single Act, Statutes that require the action of the three branches of the Legislature to bring into existence." I think, further, it is just as necessary, though we are participators in the law making functions, that the law of the land should be as vigorously respected and recognized

by us as by the humblest subjects. When they are not that equilibrium of justice, which is applicable to all, will be very rudely disturbed. In this case I had some regret, I must confess, in coming to this conclusion, but we were appointed as a Committee to act judicially in the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACMASTER. One of my hon. friends says "hear, hear." I believe he was not a member of the Committee and probably that accounts for his "hear, hear." The Committee went into this whole matter carefully from beginning to end, no point was ignored, and when a grave point was raised by the hon. member for Queen's County the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), suggested that an adjournment should take place until the following day, in order that time might be taken to consider it. I am sure my statement will be corroborated by the Chairman of the Committee, when I say the members of the Committee studied the case carefully with the view of arriving at a correct conclusion, and if the conclusion at which we have arrived be one that may not be acceptable to the majority of the electors of King's County, we can only regret it. We have endeavored to do our duty, and if this House finds we have correctly done our duty I hope it will have the courage of its opinion and confirm by its resolution the decision of the committee. I must say that this being the first time I have had the honor of addressing this House, I have, perhaps, not presented my views with the conscientiousness I should like to have presented them, but I feel I have been treated with the greatest indulgence by hon. members on both sides, and I beg, before taking my seat, to express my gratitude to you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentlemen on both sides for the indulgence and sympathy extended to me.

Mr. GIROUARD. I have listened with great attention to the interesting speech of my hon. friend from Glengarry, and the loud applause with which his remarks have been greeted show how well his speech has been appreciated by hon. members. I have endeavored, within the last week or so, to give as much time as possible to the consideration of this case, since the report has been made by the Committee of this House, and I am sorry to say I find myself placed in a rather difficult position. Here we have three motions—one asking that this House should concur in the report of the Committee, or, in other words, that Mr. McDonald be declared elected; another, that Dr. Robertson be declared elected; and a third, that the whole subject be referred to the Supreme Court. Not one of these three motions meets my views. I am in favor of voiding the election and in doing so, I wish merely to respect the law of the land as the hon. member for Glengarry has said. My hon. friend has mentioned a great many points in which I agree with him. In the first place, I believe that the facts which have been returned by the Committee show beyond doubt that Dr. Robertson was a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Island on the nomination day in June last. I am not going to review those facts that have been dealt with at such great length by the hon. gentleman. I do not think further comment on them is necessary. I also agree with him that the Statute of 1872 and the Statute of 1873 concerning, dual representation, apply to Prince Edward Island as much as to the other Provinces. As a lawyer, I must confess, however, that the Union Statute, as it has been called, of 1873, which was passed in anticipation of the Union of Prince Edward Island with the Dominion, is unconstitutional. I take it for granted that this Parliament has no right to make laws for a province or for a colony which is not represented in this Parliament—that we cannot for instance make laws for a colony like Newfoundland, which, I hope, will soon join the Confederation. Are we going, for one moment, to contend seriously that any colony which

has joined Confederation, joined it on other terms than those agreed upon both by the Dominion and the Colony? The contrary proposition is to my mind so clear as to be beyond doubt. We find it laid down in the British North America Act, which says that all the laws of the Provinces shall remain in force until repealed by competent authority, and it makes no exception with regard to Election Laws. As I say, I am now expressing my opinion as a lawyer, but although it has been said we are discharging judicial functions, I am not prepared to say our functions are altogether judicial. We are discharging *quasi* judicial functions only under our Statutes and regulations. I assert we cannot put in question the constitutionality of any Statute after that Statute is passed. There is only one authority in the land capable of determining such constitutional questions. We all know that when, as in the case of a Bill introduced, a constitutional question is raised either in this House or in the Senate, we have to deal with it as a court of justice would. But the moment a constitutional question has been settled by the three branches of Parliament, the Commons, the Senate, and the Governor General, it would be unbecoming on the part of a Member of Parliament to set up his own opinion against the decision of these three branches. For these reasons, although, as I said, if I were preparing an opinion as a lawyer, or sitting as a Judge, I would have no hesitation in declaring that the Union Statute of 1873 was unconstitutional, and that we had no right to pass such a law with regard to a colony not represented in this Parliament, not a member of the Confederation. For the reason that in this House we must presume every Statute constitutional, I am willing to consider this case exactly as if coming from Quebec or Ontario. What is the position of the parties? The hon. member for Glengarry has given, I believe, a complete answer to the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Statute of 1872 was repealed by the Statute of 1874. No such contention can, in my opinion, be maintained. The Statute of 1872 provides for a special case, the case of the disqualification or qualification of a member of the Legislative Assembly of a Province. The Statute of 1874 provides for all the general cases of elections. According to the principle which has been cited by hon. Members from Maxwell and from Hardcastle—I will not trouble the House, therefore, with repeating the quotations—general laws do not supersede special laws. For that reason I hold, that the Statute of 1874 did not supersede the Statute of 1872. There is another question, the main question in this case, which has only been referred to by the hon. member for Glengarry. In fact, it is the only serious question we can raise as members of Parliament. It is this: Does the Statute of 1873 concerning dual representation repeal the Statute of 1872, dealing with the same matter? I maintain that it does. The title of the Statute of 1872 is: "An Act to compel members of the Local Legislature in any Province where dual representation is not allowed, to resign their seats before becoming candidates for seats in the Dominion Parliament." The first clause provides exactly for the case mentioned in the title of the Bill; and then the second clause says, that "if any member of any Legislative Assembly"—mentioning the case stated in the first clause and in the title of the Bill—that in such case the returning officer shall throw away the votes; not a word is said about the election being void in that Statute. There was a very good reason for it; it was an impossibility to have an election under that Statute. A member of the Legislative Assembly was disqualified; therefore, the returning officer was bound to throw away the votes, and consequently an election of that disqualified member was an impossibility. But suppose the returning officer had not done his duty, and had returned a member so disqualified, what would have been the duty of this House? It would have been to perform exactly the duty of the returning officer, and to de-

Mr. GIBOUARD (Jacques Cartier).

clare the member so ineligible, disqualified, and to give the seat to the other candidate. Now, let us look at the Statute of 1873, which deals again with the whole subject, not only with a portion of it. It is entitled "An Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included, or which may hereafter be included within the Dominion of Canada, ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada." The first clause is a modification of the first clause of the Statute of 1872; it is not inconsistent, but it goes beyond it. The Statute of 1872 says that if the Local Legislature shall prohibit a member of this House from being a member of the Local Legislature, then a member of that Local Legislature shall not be eligible to a seat in this House. But the Statute of 1873 goes beyond that. Whether there is prohibition on the part of the Local Legislature or not, this Parliament declared in 1873 that no member of the Legislative Assembly shall be a member of the Dominion Parliament; and if so elected, "then his election shall be null and void." I say that that declaration, that nullification of the election in the Statute of 1873, is inconsistent with the powers given by the Statute of 1872 of throwing away the votes. If the returning officer has power to throw away the votes, the election is impossible and consequently there is no voiding of the election. But there are some other clauses in that Statute of 1873, which show that this Parliament at that time intended to deal with the whole subject of dual representation, and to repeal all former laws. The Statute of 1872 did not provide for any penalty for a member who, being so ineligible, should be returned, and who would act and vote in this House. Why was that not provided against in the Statute of 1872? Why was it mentioned that in case of a member so sitting and voting, he should not be subjected to a penalty? The Statute of 1873 says he shall incur a penalty of \$2,000 for every vote. Why? It is very simple, because, under the Statute of 1872, it was impossible to have an election of a candidate so placed. The votes were thrown away by the returning officer, and if not thrown away by him, they would have been thrown away by this House. Therefore, the case of a member elected under those circumstances and sitting and voting in this House, was practically an impossibility, but under the Statute of 1873 he may be elected, illegally elected it is true, and for that reason he would be liable to the penalty. Then, in that Statute of 1873, we have another clause which is not to be found in the Statute of 1872, in order to make legislation upon the subject-matter perfect and complete, that is the case when a member of this House becomes a member of the Local Legislature. The law says, then, that his election shall be void. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask if it is possible to find a Statute more complete on the subject-matter which we are discussing than that of 1873? And upon that I will take the liberty of referring to an authority which has been already quoted and is admitted in all courts of justice—Hardcastle on the construction of Statutes. After stating that in all these cases the repeal by implication of a former Statute by a subsequent Statute is always a point of difficulty, he says:

"The prior Statute would, I conceive, be repealed by implication if its provisions were wholly incompatible with a subsequent one."

I contend that is the case here, that the Statute of 1873 concerning dual representation is entirely incompatible with the Statute of 1872:

"Or if the two stated together would lead to wholly absurd consequences."

That is one branch of the case which I intended to allude to. The Statute of 1872 is intended to be passed only for the Provinces in the Confederation at the time of its enactment. The Statute of 1873 in expressed words is declared to extend not only to any Province now included, but also

which may be hereafter included within the Dominion of Canada. If the Statute of 1872 does not apply by the intention of the Legislature to the new Provinces, and if the Statute of 1873 alone is to apply to the new Provinces, then we find that as far as the old Provinces are concerned, the returning officer will be empowered to throw away the votes, whereas in the new Provinces, conformable to the Statute of 1873, no such power would exist. Such a result is not reasonable. Then there is another case where the subsequent Statute repeals by implication the former Statute, Hardcastle says: "If the entire subject-matter were taken away by the subsequent Statute." That is exactly the position. I say that the Statute of 1873 has entirely dealt with the whole subject-matter, and consequently it repealed the Statute of 1872. For all these reasons I cannot vote for the motion asking that the seat be given to Dr. Robertson. I consider that Dr. Robertson was a disqualified candidate at the time of the last election, and for that reason is not entitled to a seat in this House. But it may be said that if the Statute of 1872, which gives power to the returning officer to throw away the votes, has been repealed by the Statute of 1873, then the Statute of 1874, which makes it imperative for the returning officer to return the candidate having the majority of votes, applies to the returning officer in this case and he should have returned Dr. Robertson instead of making a double return. I entirely concur with the writer cited by my hon. friend from Glengarry. I believe the English practice is the only consistent one, with a view of giving justice to all parties concerned. I believe in cases of that kind a double return should be made, and that the returning officer should not decide a case which is often very complicated, as this one appears to be. But even if the returning officer, as in this case, did not return Dr. Robertson, are we going to give him the seat while we have on the Statute-book the law of 1873, whereby he is disqualified from holding a seat in this House? No; we could not give him the seat. The next question is: whether the report of the Committee should be accepted? For the reason that the Statute of 1873 repealed the Statute of 1872 concerning dual representation, the Election is simply void. I have been astonished, during the discussion, that this point has not been more seriously alluded to. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) in his able argument, complete as it was, in every respect, had only one word to say with respect to this point: whether the Statute of 1873 did repeal the Act of 1872, whether the Act of 1873 declared that the election of a candidate, so disqualified, shall be null and void only? How can an election be declared void if the election could not take place? It is a matter too clear to be susceptible of doubt. If I had any doubt on the point I certainly would not give it in favor of the report of the Committee, although that Committee is composed of men well known in the House and in the country, for their legal and Parliamentary learning. This is not a political or party question or a matter of sentiment. It would be natural that we should desire our old friend, whom we had here during four years of the old Parliament, to sit here during the present Parliament; but it is not a matter of feeling and sentiment; it is a matter of serious import. In a case like this, where the dearest privileges of the people are at stake, where their right to exercise the electoral franchise is in question, I believe, if there is any doubt, it is the duty of every member of this House, who appreciates free institutions and government by the people, to give the benefit of that doubt, not to our political friends, as we do pretty often on merely political questions, not to give it to any of the candidates, but to give the benefit of that doubt to the people whose mission it is to make Legislatures. Another motion has been made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) asking that the case be referred to the Supreme Court. I am sorry I shall have to vote against that motion also. I believe we have admitted, by referring the question to the Commit-

tee on Privileges and Elections, that Parliament is seized of the whole subject-matter. If there is any doubt it will disappear by referring to May's "Parliamentary Practice." In the edition of 1873, May reviews the whole. In England they have a Statute from which our own Controverted Election Act of 1874 has been copied, providing that all election matters shall only be questioned before the courts. May says:

"A few words will suffice to explain the proceedings of the House, so far as its judicature is still exercised in matters of election. It being enacted by section 50 of the Election Petitions Act that no election or return to Parliament shall be questioned, except in accordance with the provisions of this Act, doubts were expressed whether this provision would not supersede the proper jurisdiction of the House in determining questions affecting the seats of its own members, not arising out of controverted elections."

Then he goes on and cites two cases:

"In the autumn of 1868 an election petition had been presented to the Court of Sessions in Scotland, complaining of the election of Sir Sidney Waterlow, for the county of Dumfries, on the ground of his holding a Government contract. In the ensuing session, however, this petition having been withdrawn, a select committee was appointed to "consider whether Sir Sidney Waterlow is disqualified from sitting and voting as a member of this House, under the statute 22 George III, c. 45." And on receiving the report of this committee, which declared him disqualified, a new writ was issued for the county of Dumfries. Thus the very same question which might have been determined, upon petition, by an election judge, was adjudged by the House itself. The House is, in fact, bound to take notice of any legal disabilities affecting its members, and to issue writs in the room of members adjudged to be incapable of sitting. But, notwithstanding this conclusive precedent, it was contended in 1870, in the case of O'Donovan Rossa, that the House had become completely divested of the right of determining upon legal disqualifications affecting its own members. This argument, however, found no favor, it being justly said that it amounted to this, that even a peer chosen to sit could not be excluded, and that a lunatic was to be suffered to continue a member."

May lays down the practice to be followed in the House:

"Where it has been determined that the sitting member was not duly elected, and that some other candidate was duly elected, and ought to have been returned, the Clerk of the Crown is ordered to attend, and amend the return, by erasing out one name and inserting the other name instead thereof, which he accordingly does, at the Table of the House. In the case of a double return, the Clerk of the Crown is ordered to attend, and amend the return, by erasing out the name of one of the parties, and what relates to him in the return. When the election is void, a new writ is ordered, unless the House shall think fit to suspend its issue."

The parties in this case did not think proper to go before the ordinary courts of justice, and after the time for filing an election petition had expired, Parliament was called upon to consider the question. Two members took the oath and presented themselves to sit here. Are we going to surrender our power to decide which of them is entitled to the seat? I say we should not refer the case to the Supreme Court, because we are as competent as is the Supreme Court to decide these legal questions, and it is our duty to uphold the power to pronounce on cases of members applying to sit in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD. Some hon. members say "hear, hear," when I remark that this House is as competent as the Supreme Court to decide a case like this. In election cases I believe men outside of the House, even on the Bench, continue to be men. I will only mention one case which is perfectly well-known, not only in this country but throughout the whole world. Hon. members will no doubt recollect when the election of President Hayes, of the United States, was contested. A special tribunal was appointed, by both political parties, composed of fifteen of the best Judges of the Union, seven belonging to one party and eight to the other party, dividing the politics of the neighboring Republic. What was the result? Upon every question that came before that special tribunal, whether interlocutory or final, the eight Republicans voted one way, and the seven Democrats the other. We cannot be told that these men acted in bad faith—I cannot believe

it; but it shows conclusively that, more or less, how difficult it is, in election matters, connected more or less with the party in power or in opposition, to divest ourselves of our feeling, either of sympathy or opposition, as the case may be. That is the reason why I say that this Parliament, containing as it does many lawyers of standing, is just as competent as the Supreme Court to decide a case of this kind; and for that reason, and also because I consider it is the duty of this House to decide any question of the admission of a member to sit here, I will also vote against the motion of the hon. member for Centre Huron. We have heard something this evening about members not being independent, and being partisans. I do not know really where I am going to be. I cannot vote for the report of the Committee, because it gives the seat to a man who did not obtain the majority of votes. I cannot vote also for the candidate of the majority, because I believe that he is not a qualified candidate. My opinion is, that the election is void within the meaning of the Statute of 1873, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be requested to issue a new writ for King's County, Prince Edward Island. I want to give these explanations, as I believe my position is a peculiar one. I conceived that I ought to offer some explanations before I gave the votes, which I will give on this matter.

Mr. DAVIES. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I am unable to follow the reasoning of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, which led him to the conclusion he announced that this House was the proper tribunal to determine this question, and that the Supreme Court, to which it is proposed to refer it, was not a proper tribunal. I regret it the more because I think that the illustration which he gave to show that the Supreme Court was not a proper tribunal was unfair, and I do not think that the implication which he has drawn is the implication which any other hon. gentleman will draw against the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. I am quite satisfied that if this case be referred to their Honors of the Supreme Court, [they would decide it irrespective of any political proclivities which they may have had before they went on the Bench, and purely as a question of law, and I think that the best answer which can be given to the hon. gentleman's statement that this House is the proper tribunal to try this question, and not the Supreme Court, is the statement made by the hon. gentleman himself that while, as a lawyer, he believed that Mr. McDonald was not entitled to the seat, and that the Act of 1872 does not apply, still he was going to vote as a member that it did apply. The hon. gentleman while stating in the House his conviction as a lawyer, and the conclusion at which he, as a lawyer, had arrived after a long train of reasoning and a great deal of thought and application, says that, nevertheless, as a member of the House he is going to vote in another way; and therefore I say that he used, in that very statement, one of the strongest arguments that can be presented to the House in favor of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Huron. I agree with a great deal that has fallen from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as to the application of the Act of 1872. I shall not weary the House by repeating the arguments which he has very ably presented to the House, that the Act of 1872 has been repealed; but I wish to say a word or two with reference to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Glengarry. That hon. gentleman in delivering what was, to a very large extent, an able speech and devoid of improper references, thought fit, at the close of it, to impute—and I think unjustly and unnecessarily too—to the two gentlemen to whom Dr. Robertson had entrusted his resignation, a conspiracy on their part and with Dr. Robertson in some way to evade the law of the land. Sir, I find no evidence brought before the Committee to justify

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).

any imputation of that kind, and no question was put by the hon. gentleman himself when on the Committee, to the witnesses who were examined, to show that he entertained any such view then; and certainly there is no evidence to justify any such view. If the hon. member will reflect for a moment he will see that the facts themselves show that this imputation or charge is without any foundation. What is that imputation and charge? He says that those two gentlemen conspired with Dr. Robertson, for if they were not doing so they would have sent in his resignation without allowing so long a delay to take place. Why, the hon. member, if he turns to his own report, will see why the resignation was not forwarded by these two members when Dr. Robertson was elected. If those members were only waiting till Dr. Robertson was elected—to see whether he were elected or not—and if they were in the conspiracy which he supposes, they would have forwarded his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor, on the evening when the election took place. It was well known all through the county and through the length and breadth of the Island, that Dr. Robertson was elected, and if they were part of that conspiracy they would have forwarded the resignation on that very night. He knows further—and this is on record in the evidence returned to the House, and it is the only bit of evidence on that point—that the reason why the resignation was not returned sooner to the Lieutenant-Governor was because one of the gentlemen to whom it was delivered was absent from the Island during nearly the whole time. That statement is there on record. That statement was not questioned or attempted to be controverted; and I say that it is now rather too late in the day, and rather unfair and unjust, both to Dr. Robertson himself and to these two gentlemen, to have these insinuations thrown out by the hon. member. "Oh, but," says the hon. member, "good faith to the electors of King's County required that Dr. Robertson should resign sooner!" Sir, I felt somewhat surprised that the hon. gentleman should not have shrunk from using the words "good faith to the electors of King's County" at the very time when he was urging the House to break faith with the majority of the electors of that county and to return to this House a man whom they refused to send here. Good faith, forsooth. Why, Mr. Speaker, these are the last words and the last phrase which the hon. gentleman should have used in connection with the arguments which he presented to this House. Good faith to the electors of King's County requires that the member whom they elected, unless it is clearly and distinctly shown that he is disqualified, should be returned here; and it is bad faith—if I may be permitted to use the expression—not only to refuse to allow the man whom they elected to take his seat, but to force in upon them as their representative, a man, whom they refused to elect and whom they rejected at the polls. Now, there are two or three larger questions involved in this discussion of a constitutional character, and a number of smaller ones, and I noticed that my hon. friend from Glengarry, with the ingenuity which distinguishes him I believe at the Bar, glided very swiftly and quietly over the larger questions and devoted the major part of his speech to the discussion of the minor ones. Let me recall the attention of the House for a moment to the larger ones. I will not weary the House long, because my friends who preceded me on this side, have discussed them at some length. The question which is first involved here is the question as to the rights of the majority, the question is whether the rights of the majority are to rule here or not. I think I am not using too strong language, when I say, Mr. Speaker, that the right of the majority to govern, is a fundamental principle of our constitution; that it affects not only the election of the members of this House, and not only the votes of this House, but the government of the country itself. We are here by this

right of the majority to return us. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government, leads it by right of this fundamental principle; and I maintain, Sir, that the report of the Committee which we are asked to adopt on this occasion, asks us to violate that principle, and to adopt a new principle altogether; a new principle unknown to the constitution; a new principle which substitutes the minority of a partisan returning officer and a minority of the people for the majority of the people, that the law has declared shall return us to Parliament. Sir, before this House adopts the report of the Committee, involving the introduction, I say, of this new principle, let them very carefully look at all the Statutes, and adopting the language of the member for Jacques Cartier, if they have any reasonable doubt on the point, let them give it in favor of the people and not in favor of a partisan returning officer, or in favor of a gentleman who it is supposed will vote with the hon. gentlemen opposite when he gets here. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look for a moment, then, at the law. The question which first comes up is this: Do, or do not, the Acts of 1872 and 1873 apply to elections in Prince Edward Island? That is the great question; and if they do apply to Prince Edward Island, and if they were in force at the last election, of course we must admit that Dr. Robertson, if he was a member of the Local House, and had not resigned was disqualified, and a minority candidate might have been returned. Now, Sir, in coming to a conclusion on this question, I beg the House to mark that Prince Edward Island, neither when the Act of 1872 was passed, nor when the Act of 1873 was passed, was part of the Dominion of Canada. Prince Edward Island had then a separate and independent Legislature of its own—a Legislature having power and jurisdiction in Prince Edward Island co-ordinate with the powers and jurisdictions of this Legislature in the Dominion—and I maintain that the Dominion of Canada has had no more right before the Confederation which took place with Prince Edward Island, to pass a law binding it, than the Legislature of Prince Edward Island had to pass one binding any part of the Dominion of Canada. It would be a ridiculous thing to argue that the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, before Confederation, could pass a law applicable to any part of the Dominion of Canada, but that would be just as good an argument as to propound that the Legislature of Canada should have the jurisdiction to pass a law before Confederation which should be binding on Prince Edward Island. It cannot do it. The powers of those two Legislatures were co-ordinate in their respective spheres, and one had not power to pass a law binding on the other. If hon. gentlemen will look at the mode in which Prince Edward Island joined the Union they will see that it was not by virtue of any Act of Union—a phrase which though used in this debate really has no meaning. There was no Act of Union cementing the joining of Prince Edward Island to the Dominion. There is no such Act in our Statute-book. This Confederation was not brought about by an Act of this Parliament. It was a contract arranged and entered into by two independent Provinces—a compact entered into by means of resolutions carried in the Legislatures of both Provinces pursuant to the British North America Act. Those resolutions, when they were ratified by Order in Council, became in themselves an Act of Union—and I call attention to that point because I will ask hon. gentlemen to consider the terms of those resolutions which were really the only Act of Union or compact between the Island and Canada. The 143th section of the British North America Act, 1867, says:

"It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the Colonies or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those Colonies or Provinces into the Union; and on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-Western

Territory, or either of them into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf, shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

In other words, a resolution of this Legislature, and of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, when ratified, became an Imperial Statute—a supplement to the British North America Act, not capable of being appealed, amended, or impugned by any Act of this Legislature whatsoever. Now, when we turn to this compact, what do we find? We find that some fifteen or sixteen resolutions were adopted by this Legislature and the Legislature of Prince Edward Island. Let me ask those hon. gentlemen, who contend that the Act of 1872 applies to the Island, to turn to those fifteen resolutions which, by Order in Council, were subsequently made an Imperial Statute. Let them point out where the Act of 1872 was agreed to by Prince Edward Island in any way. I say these resolutions are entirely silent as to the application to the Island of any Statute passed by the Dominion of Canada prior to Prince Edward Island joining the Union. I am sure the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) will come to the conclusion, unless he can point out within the four corners of those resolutions some clause declaring that the previous Acts of the Dominion of Canada shall apply to Prince Edward Island, that they do not apply. I am sure that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), if he had given the same attention to this branch of the case that he gave to others of subordinate importance, would have come to the same conclusion. Hon. gentlemen may say, if these resolutions are silent altogether on the question of Elections: Then you have no Election law at all! Not so. The Legislature of Prince Edward Island and the Parliament of Canada by these resolutions, which subsequently became an Imperial Statute, provided for this very subject-matter. In the clause following the fifteenth resolution, passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, machinery is provided by which members of this Legislature, from Prince Edward Island, should be elected—it declared what laws should regulate the qualification of members to be elected, and what laws should regulate the qualification of voters to vote for those members. It went on expressly to provide what laws should regulate the powers, conduct and duties of returning officers in these elections; so that not only was the law silent as to applying any provisions of the Legislature of Canada to Prince Edward Island, but it expressly provided that not the Act of 1872, but the Local Election Law, should apply to Prince Edward Island. That clause reads as follows:—

"That for the first election of members to be returned by this Island for the House of Commons for the Dominion of Canada, this Island shall be divided into Electoral Districts as follows: That 'Prince County' shall constitute one district, to be designated 'Prince County District,' and return two members; that 'Queen's County' shall constitute one district, to be designated 'Queen's County District,' and return two members; that 'King's County' shall constitute one district, to be designated 'King's County District,' and return two members; that the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, for such Electoral District, shall be held within three calendar months from the day of the admission of the said Island into the Union of the Dominion of Canada; and we further humbly pray that all laws which, at the date of the Order in Council, by which the Island shall be admitted into the Union, relating to the qualification of any person to be elected to sit or vote as a member of the House of Assembly of the said Island, and relating to the qualifications or disqualifications of voters, and to the oath to be taken by voters, and to returning officers and poll clerks, and their powers and duties, and relating to the polling divisions within the said Island, and relating to the proceedings at elections, and to the period during which such elections may be continued, and relating to the trial of controverted elections, and the proceedings incidental thereto and relating to the vacating of seats of the members, and to the execution of new writs, in case of any seat being vacated otherwise than by a dissolution, and to all other matters connected with or incidental to elections of members to serve in the House of Assembly of the said Island, shall apply to the elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the Electoral Districts situate in the said Island of Prince Edward."

When that resolution was ratified by the Queen's Order in Council, the question arose whether or not the ratification limited it only to the first election, or whether it should apply to subsequent elections, and when this question was argued before the Committee, grave doubts were expressed on the subject. I admit that if you read the Order in Council alone without reference to this resolution, very great doubts might arise, because the first part of the Order in Council limits it to the first election, but in the latter part it is provided that the same law shall apply in the case of the issue of new writs. This point, which was put forward by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), has not been answered by hon. gentlemen opposite, and until it can be answered we cannot get away from the position that, until the Act of 1874 was passed by this Parliament, when Prince Edward Island was part of the Dominion, the only law which regulated the election of members in the Island to this House was the local law of Prince Edward Island, which had been applied to its elections by the Queen's Order in Council, which had the effect of an Imperial Statute. Why, Sir, there never was a doubt raised about it. The election of 1873 was held under these laws; the election of the hon. David Laird, who held office in Mr. Mackenzie's Government, was held under these laws; the election held in the beginning of 1874 was held under these laws; and no person ever raised a doubt in the Island, or out of it, that the law which regulated the election of members from that Island to serve in the House of Commons, was the law passed by the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and ratified by the Queen and Council. The position I take is this: I say, as a matter of constitutional law, that the Parliament of Canada—the Parliament of the four Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick—had no power before Prince Edward Island joined them, to pass a law which should apply to Prince Edward Island—no more power than had the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, which was an independent Legislature, to pass a law to operate in the Province of New Brunswick. Therefore I say, and I have not heard that position challenged successfully—and I should very much like to hear the opinion of the Prime Minister on this matter—that until the Act of 1874 was passed, no law had been passed by the Parliament of Canada affecting the elections of Prince Edward Island. If that position is correct as a matter of constitutional law, are hon. members here to shrink from the logical consequences of it, and refuse to vote, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) says he will refuse, although he admits we are right. We are here, he says, in the position of *quasi* judges, and in the same breath he says he will refuse to exercise his judicial functions. If hon. gentlemen are satisfied, as I believe, under these Statutes they must be satisfied, that the position I take is correct, Dr. Robertson is the legally elected member for King's County, and ought to be voted into his seat. Now, Sir, I will just call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the dates in this matter, because I believe them to be very important. The Act known as the Costigan Act was passed in June, 1872, and the other Act, known as the Mills Act, was passed on the 3rd of May, 1873. The resolutions of the Commons and Senate of Canada for bringing in Prince Edward Island were passed on the 20th of May, and the Legislature of Prince Edward Island passed them on the 28th of May. Three days after the House of Commons had passed the compact of Union with Prince Edward Island, and over a month before the compact was carried into effect it undertook to pass a law applying certain laws of Canada to that Island. What right had it to do so? Where did it derive its power, on the 23rd of May, to legislate for Prince Edward Island? That Province was not then a part of the Dominion. The Imperial Statute provided that if she came into the Dominion, she could only come in on such terms and conditions as the two Legislatures should

Mr. DAVIES.

agree upon. If the Parliament of Canada wished to apply any of those laws to the incoming Province, it was its duty to have declared in the resolutions, that when Prince Edward Island joined the Union, such and such laws should apply in that Province. But the Parliament of Canada did not do so; but before Prince Edward Island had a vote here, it attempted, without her consent or authority, to pass a law which should bind her people. That Province had a right to be governed by those principles which govern in this country and in the Mother Country, and which are at the root of all representative Government, namely, that no law shall be applied to a people who have had no voice in making it, unless they consent to its application. That this Parliament, having a limited jurisdiction under the British North America Act, limited as to place and to persons, should have power to pass a law binding another country, when that country had no voice or vote upon it, is a monstrous and unconstitutional proposition, which I believe the hon. First Minister, on reflection, will not sustain. I say that that Act was *ultra vires* of this House. The same argument will apply to the Mills Act of 1873, passed nearly a month before Prince Edward Island became a part of this Dominion at all. Now, leaving that branch of the subject, I will ask the indulgence of the House while I address myself to the other branch for a few moments. Assuming for the purpose of argument that the Act of 1873, the disqualifying Act, is in force, I want to ask whether or not Dr. Robertson was disqualified within the meaning of that Act. That Act provided that:

"After the dissolution of the present Parliament of Canada, no person who is a member of a Legislative Council, or of any Legislative Assembly of any Province now included, or which may hereafter be included within the Dominion of Canada, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons."

This Act is both a disqualifying Act and a penal Act—a combination of the two; it disqualifies certain people from being elected, and it imposes a penalty upon them, if they presume to sit. When we come to consider that Act, we must put a strict construction on its words. I do not think there is any doubt about that; it is laid down in all the text-books that these disqualifying and penal Acts are to receive a strict construction. I find it laid down in Rogers on Elections:

"As all penal and disqualifying Statutes are to be construed strictly, the House as well as Committees have always required proof, in case of offices accepted after the election, that such acceptance has been complete; and in case of offices renounced before the election, have admitted evidence of a substantial though informal renunciation; and this, whether such office incapacitates for being elected, or only vacates the seat."

There the principle is laid down clearly and distinctly. Now, Sir, when we come to look at that disqualifying Act, we have not to ask ourselves whether Dr. Robertson was a member of the Local Legislature in the colloquial sense, but whether he was so in the meaning of that Statute; and in doing so, we have to look to what is the object of the Statute. It was intended to abolish dual representation, to prevent members from sitting in both Houses—not to prevent members from being elected for both Houses. I presume it will not be disputed, that if elections were held simultaneously for the Local and Dominion Parliaments, one person would be capable of being elected for both Houses. The Act was not passed to prevent anything of that kind, but was passed to prevent a complete member, a legal member of the House of Assembly, from being elected for this House. The question is, was or was not Dr. Robertson a legal member of the House of Assembly. I submit he was not. It has been assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a man is a member once he is elected, and the hon. member for Glengarry cited several instances from the Imperial Parliament, for instance, the case of Baron Rothschild, who had been elected for the House of Commons, and who, although he could not take his seat on account of his inability to take the oaths, nevertheless



was permitted by the House to serve on a Committee. Hon. members will see there is a great distinction between the case of a man elected to the House of Commons, and permitted by that House to act on its Committees, and that of a man elected to a Local Legislature, the law relating to which prescribes a qualification without which he is not entitled to take his seat, or to vote, or to act as a member of that House in any way. Dr. Robertson could not take his seat in the Legislature of the Island, or act on its Committees, or vote, or act in any sense as a member of that body. I find that the Judges in England have drawn, in the cases that have come before them, a very clear distinction between a member-elect and a member who has complied with the requirements of the law, and taken his seat. In a case that came before the Court of Exchequer in England, that of *Miller vs. Salomons*, it was argued that a man was a member of the House because he was elected, but the Lord Chief Baron held that "a person is not a member of the House until he has taken his seat." Counsel go on to argue: "It is submitted that he is a member before, otherwise he could not be entitled to vote for the Speaker which he may do," and the Lord Chief Baron says: "There is nothing of which I am aware to prevent a minor, or a woman, or even an alien enemy, from doing so." They go on to cite a precedent, similar to the case cited by the hon. member for Glengarry, by which it appears that "on the 30th April, 1715, the House of Commons determined that Sir Joseph Jekyll was a person fit to act on a Committee of Secrecy, though he had not been sworn at the Clerk's Table." What answer did the Lord Chief Baron make? He said: "It was perfectly competent for the House of Commons to allow him to sit on Committees, although he did not take the oaths or his seat. The question was whether a party returned as a member is bound to attend Committees, or is liable to the jurisdiction of the House, before he has taken his seat." The Lord Chief Baron thought he was not a member of the House before he had complied with all the requirements of the law. That is not all. In the very case which an hon. member quoted—I noticed he stopped short in the reading of it—the case of the West Durham election, Mr. Justice Wilson says on this point which came up incidentally: "It is a matter of very grave doubt whether a man is a member or not until he has taken the oath." Then we find this case which was quoted by the hon. member for West Huron, which I had the honor to cite before in the Committee. It is the only authority that bears squarely on the question, and the hon. member from Glengarry did not attempt to distinguish it in any way. There it stands in a legal decision, that a man who was elected to be a mayor in a certain city, was held by all the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, not to be a mayor, in a legal sense, until he had taken the oath of qualification. Lord Tenterden laid down this ruling:—"A party becomes a mayor, not merely by reason of his being elected, but by reason of his being sworn into office." Bailey, Justice, takes the same ground. He says:—"He, before he executes his office, is to be sworn in, and he becomes the head of the corporation, not when he is elected and nominated, but when he is sworn in." The other Judges concur in that opinion. That is a case precisely analogous to the one before the House. By the charter of that town it was provided that, before "he be admitted to execute his office, the person elected and nominated for mayor should not only take his corporate oath, well and faithfully to execute that office, but also all the oaths by the laws and Statutes of this realm appointed by a mayor to be taken." The law of Prince Edward Island, with reference to a member of the Assembly, is in very nearly the same terms as the law upon which we have a judicial decision of the Court of Queen's Bench in England. In the 75th section it is prescribed:

"No person shall be capable of being elected a member for any Town, Royalty or District in the Island, unless he shall, for a period of at

least twelve calendar months before the teste of the writ for holding the election at which such person shall claim to be elected, have been in the seizin or possession of a freehold or leasehold estate, within this Island, of the value of £50 over and above all encumbrances that shall affect the same; and shall, before he be presented to take his seat in the House of Assembly, take one of the oaths in the schedule of this Act prescribed for members relative to freehold or leasehold estate, as the nature of his qualification may require."

Dr. Robertson never took that oath, and never could have taken it, because the Legislature did not meet. A case may occur—it is not at all improbable—where a man may be elected to the House, and take the oath on nomination day, but through business losses be unable to take the qualification oath or his seat as a member when the House meets. How can it be argued in that case that he is a member when the Act specially provides that he shall not exercise the functions of a member in any way or take his seat until he takes this oath. Under that law, even supposing the Act of 1873 to be in force, it being a penal disqualifying Statute, it must have a strict construction; and a member of the Legislature, as understood by it, is a complete legal member, which Dr. Robertson was not, and therefore he was not disqualified for election to this House. But suppose we go further. The hon. member for Glengarry devoted some time to show that if Dr. Robertson was a member he did not, or could not, resign. Whether he could or could not resign is a legal question. Whether he attempted to resign is a different question, and I was sorry to see the hon. Member encumber his argument with imputations which the evidence did not justify. The question here is a purely legal one—could he, or could he not, resign? I find that the Committee on Privileges and Elections in this House, in the year 1874, passed their opinion on cases of this kind. In the case of Mr. Perry, the House determined what is the real meaning to be put upon that disqualifying Act—whether you are to go by the literal words of it as used in a legal sense, or whether you are to consider it in the spirit and intent of the law? I find that at that time Mr. Perry was a member elected to this Parliament, and was also a member of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island. At that time there was no provision made for resigning, but he went through the forms of sending his resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor and the Clerk of the House, and every other official he could think of. He did all in his power to divest himself of the position of member legally, but he could not do it, as there was no provision in the law to meet his case. However, when he came before this House, and this House was asked to put a judicial construction on the clause, they held that as he had complied with the spirit and intent of the law, by doing all in his power to divest himself of the position of a local member, he was entitled to retain his seat and was eligible for election to the House. The preamble of the Statute which this House passed, I believe, without a dissenting voice, "declared the laws of Prince Edward Island recognized the right of a member to resign his seat in the Local Legislature, and the said Perry has taken, so far as it was possible for him to do, and in good faith, every step in his power to divest himself of his position as a member of the Legislative Assembly, and that according to the spirit and intent of the Act of 1873, he was not disqualified to be a candidate." Well, Sir, this House having put that judicial interpretation upon the law of 1873, having said that the man who complies with the spirit and intent of the law is not disqualified from being elected, is now asked to turn round and say that Dr. Robertson—who certainly, it must be admitted, has done all that he could do—is disqualified. He has tried to divest himself of his position as a member of the Local House, he has resigned and done all that lay in his power to give up that seat, and if the construction of the law which is contained in the preamble of that Act I have quoted from is the true one, if that is a correct declaration of law, that when a member complies with the spirit and intent of the law, he has

complied with the law itself, then I say he is not disqualified from being elected here. Now, the position in reference to Dr. Robertson's election will be this: The Attorney-General of Prince Edward Island held that Dr. Robertson could resign, the Legislature of Prince Edward Island hold that his seat is vacant, the Lieutenant-Governor has held that he could resign, and he issued his fiat for a new writ. A new election has taken place, a new member fills the seat. Therefore, the party to whom the hon. member for Glengarry belongs will be in this peculiar position; that in Prince Edward Island they have declared that Dr. Robertson was entitled to resign, and that he did resign, and they have filled up his seat. Here they have declared that he did not resign, has not resigned, and will not allow him to sit here. Well, if that is not blowing hot and cold I do not know what it is. The hon. member for Glengarry talked about "heads I win, tails you lose." Why, that is just the very thing they are doing here. They are tossing up the copper, and no matter how it comes down they are to win. If it comes down heads, Dr. Robertson cannot be elected to this House, because he was a member of the Legislative Assembly and could not resign; if it turns up tail, oh! the Local Legislature say, he can resign, and he has resigned, and we will put Mr. Prouse in his place. I will just ask the members whether that is a proper position for the two Legislatures to occupy towards each other. There is grave doubt whether a man can resign or not between the interval after the expiration of one Parliament and the beginning of a new one under that section; but I say that if he could resign at all he has done so. He has done all that lay in his power to divest himself of his seat, and the Local Legislature, the Attorney-General, the Lieutenant-Governor and all the authorities hold he could resign, and we are asked to hold that he could not. But, in the position I take, it is not necessary for me to hold a strong opinion one way or another upon that point, because I hold in the first place that the Act of 1873 does not apply to the case of Dr. Robertson. The hon. gentleman says that Dr. Robertson knew it was legally necessary for him to resign the local seat before he could become eligible for election to the Commons, and that his attempt to resign proves that. But it does not follow Has he never heard of a man taking a step from an abundance of caution? In the case of Mr. Perry, who contested Prince County at the late General Election, I am told he was advised by his lawyer that there was no occasion for him to resign; that the Act did not apply to him. Dr. Robertson resigned as a matter of precaution, and the mere fact that he exercised this caution ought not to deprive him of his seat, if he is otherwise entitled to it. Then comes the question on the main report of the Committee, passing from the amendment moved by my hon. friend: Are we to seat Mr. McDonald here?—Mr. McDonald, who only polled a minority of the votes. They say you are compelled to do it under the law of 1872. Now, I am not going to repeat the arguments I have used already, but I shall refer to the argument of the hon. member for Glengarry, that because the people of King's County had knowledge of Dr. Robertson's election to the Local Legislature, they must be presumed to have knowledge of his disqualification for election to this House; and having voted with that knowledge, they are bound by it. With all respect to that hon. gentleman, I will tell him that he has not informed this House correctly as to the law on that subject. I will show the hon. gentleman authorities that he himself will accept that the very opposite is the law in England. I call his attention in the first place to Warwick on "Municipal Elections in Scotland," and he will find on page 477 the law laid down on that subject:

"In order to secure the absolute nullity of votes given for a disqualified candidate, and possibly to avoid the expense and inconvenience of a second election, notice of the disqualification and of the grounds upon which it rests, should be given to the electors before the vote or poll is commenced."

Mr. DAVIES.

Now, it is in evidence here that no notice of any kind was ever given to a single elector in King's County, alleging the disqualification of Dr. Robertson, whether by letter, by notice in the newspapers, by post, or otherwise. The people voted in the full belief that he was qualified; and it is now attempted, without any notice having been given, and in violation of every decision which I can find in the English courts of justice, to put in the minority candidate. The hon. gentleman will find as many as ten or twelve cases decided in the English courts confirming this law I have read from the books. I will only give one—the case of the Queen vs. the Mayor of Tewkesbury—and this very point came out in that case. I call the attention, especially of the hon. member for Glengarry, to this case, inasmuch as he laid down with some emphasis, and with some degree of assurance, a view of the law directly contrary to that laid down by the English Judges. The marginal note to the case reads as follows:—

"At the election of Town Councillors in a borough not divided into wards, there were four vacancies and five candidates. B., one of the four who had a majority of votes, was the mayor, and acted as returning officer, and was, therefore, incapable of being elected:—Held, that the mere knowledge on the part of the electors who voted for B., that he was mayor and returning officer, did not amount to knowledge that he was disqualified in point of law as a candidate, and therefore their votes were not thrown away, so as to make the election fall on the fifth candidate."

Now, here is a case on all fours with the one before the House. The electors had knowledge that Dr. Robertson was elected to the Local House, but it does not follow that they had knowledge that he was disqualified from sitting in this House. In the Tewkesbury case, Mr. Justice Blackburn, in giving his judgment, said:

"Voting for a dead man, or for the man in the moon, are expressions showing that, in order to make the vote a nullity, there must be wilful persistence against actual knowledge. But it does not seem to me consistent with either justice or common sense, or common law, to say that because these voters were aware of a certain circumstance they were necessarily aware of the disqualification arising from that circumstance."

Now, that is the very point. The hon. member says the electors of King's County did know or should have known. I leave him to settle his account with Lord Justice Blackburn, who says the position he takes is not based upon common law or common sense. I think the common sense and common law laid down by Justice Blackburn, and supported by the rest of the Bench, will commend itself to this House and cause it to pause before it commits the iniquity of throwing away the votes of 2,000 people, given for Dr. Robertson, when no notice was given, direct or indirect, and no claim made by Mr. McDonald, that those votes should be thrown away, or that Dr. Robertson was disqualified. But, if we examine the Act of 1872, we find that within its four corners it did not apply to any other Province than those which were in the Union at the time it was passed. The Act of 1873 says on its face that it shall apply to future Provinces. The Act of 1872, as I have said, does not say anything about future Provinces. Where does the hon. gentleman make it apply? It does not apply on its face. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macmaster) said a law was passed, which he calls the Union Act—which is not a Union Act, and the phrase is a misleading one—which he says applies certain laws to Prince Edward Island. I say that the Act of 1873 does not do so. That Act, assuming it to be constitutional, for the purpose of my argument, applies certain laws to the Island, among them "laws relating to the Senate and House of Commons," and the hon. gentleman says that under that language the Act of 1872, and the clauses of it which relate to the eligibility of people to be elected to the House of Commons, and also the clauses which relate to the duties of returning officers, are included. I wish to call attention to the Act of 1872. It relates to two distinct subjects: first, the class of persons who may,

or may not, be elected to the House of Commons; and second, duties of returning officers. They are not cognate subjects, although embraced in the same Act; indeed they have nothing to do with each other. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether a general law, which says that Acts which relate to the House of Commons, shall apply to Prince Edward Island can, by any stretch of the imagination, extend so as to embrace a law relating to the duties of returning officers? I say it cannot. I say the second section of the Act of 1872 cannot, by any force of reasoning, be squeezed into the words "House of Commons." The Act defines the duties of returning officers, which subject, as I have said, has no relation whatever to the House of Commons; and therefore the Act of 1872, neither on its face, nor by any subsequent legislation, has ever been applied to Prince Edward Island. It has no force or effect whatever. That being the case, it is perfectly impossible, without violating all precedents, principles, and rules upon which the decisions of the English courts and the Imperial Parliament have been given, to force the minority candidate into a seat in this House. I was going on to argue that the Acts of 1872 and 1873 were repealed by the Act of 1874; but I need not trouble the House with that point; I believe the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) was correct in stating that the Act of 1873 repealed the Act of 1872; and if it does not, certainly the Act of 1874 does. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) quoted from Maxwell on Statutes, to the effect that one law does not repeal another unless they are inconsistent. No one said that it does; but we say these Acts are inconsistent. The hon. gentleman says a general law cannot repeal a special one. We do not lay down such a broad proposition. It depends whether the general law is inconsistent with the special one or not. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the reports of Scotch appeals, before the House of Lords, he will find the case of Duncan, appellant, the Scottish North-Eastern Railway Company, respondents, a declaration by the House (reversing the decree below) that the provisions in the Local Acts of 1836, exempting the Dundee and Arbroath, and the Arbroath and Forfar Railways from poor rates were in effect abrogated by the General Poor Law Amendment Act, 1845, and by the General Valuation of Lands Act, 1854. Lord Chelmsford said:

"I entertain no doubt that if there were nothing more to be considered than the Act of 1836, the railway company would be exempt from all liability to this assessment. But in 1849 the Act of 8 and 9 Victoria, chap. 83, was passed. Whether, after that Act, the original proprietors of the land acquired for the purposes of the railway continued liable to assessment or not, it is unnecessary to determine. It is sufficient for the decision of this appeal to say that, so far as the railway companies are concerned, the exemption clauses must have been deprived of all effect by the passing of the Act of 1845, because they had no longer any subject upon which to operate."

Lord Westbury said:

"No doubt some injustice has been done to the railway company; but it is probably due to the neglect of the company in not bringing their particular exemption under the Acts of 1836, before Parliament, when the Poor Law Act, and the Valuation Act, were being considered by it; and in consequence of their not having done so, they have entirely lost the benefit of the exemption given them, which is in effect abrogated by the different Statutes."

There the Company had been exempted by a particular Statute of their own, but a general law was afterwards passed which impliedly did away with the exception. Although it did not expressly refer to the particular Statute, the House of Lords held that the general law impliedly repealed it. So the Act of 1874 is a complete Statute in itself, covering the whole duties of returning officers, and all the machinery relating to elections. We must look for a moment at the law with respect to elections, as it stood prior to the passing of this Act. The law of the Dominion had been declared to be the laws in the several Provinces; and I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen who desire to come to a conclusion on the subject, apart

from party feeling, that the local laws were those which regulated the elections of members to this House. This condition of things had been brought about by this Parliament. The only law of the Dominion on the subject was that of 1872, which provided that, in case the candidate having the largest number of votes was disqualified, he was to throw aside the votes cast in his favor and declare the candidate having the next largest number elected, unless the majority candidate is disqualified. This clause gave judicial power to the returning officer. But when the law of 1874 was passed, instead of allowing the returning officer to return the minority candidate in such a case, it was provided that the returning officer shall return the man having the highest number of votes. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) read the Interpretation Act. He will see that the word "shall" wherever used in the Statutes of the Dominion is mandatory, and it is so used in the Act of 1874. It is peremptory and imperative, it admits of no excuse. The returning officer has one duty, and one duty alone, to perform—he has no judicial function, because that has been taken away from him—and that is a ministerial duty, to add up the votes as returned by his deputies, and then return the man who has the highest number of votes. There can be no doubt that the Act of 1874 repeals the Act of 1872, even if it ever was in force in Prince Edward Island. Sir, in conclusion, I may say that I do not know what the decision of the House may be on the question, whether a majority of the members will vote to seat a minority candidate here. I hope and trust they may not, that a majority of the House may be found having greater respect for the rights and privileges of this House, and for the wishes of the majority of the electors of King's County, whose case is now before us; but whether the majority do so or not, I hope and trust that our party, this Reform party, at all events, will remain true to the traditions of our past.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, hon. gentlemen may cheer, but they have been true so far to their traditions of the past. I believe in every instance I have been able to find in the late Parliament of Canada, and I suppose that eight or ten were cited by the hon. member for Huron, that they have in every instance recorded their votes in favor of the return to this House of the man who received the majority of the votes of the people. That, Sir, has been the tradition of the party in times gone by, and I hope that they will be true to those traditions now, and whether we poll the majority of this House or not I am satisfied at least, that we will have faithfully discharged our duty to our constituents and the country at large.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend from Glengarry in the very able and full argument and discussion of this question, with which we have been favored from him to-night, has so fully dealt with the legal bearings of this case, that at this late hour I do not propose occupying time in going into a discussion at any great length of the points involved in it. With the hon. gentleman for Huron, I should have been glad if the decision of this question which he has admitted, and which all must admit, involves legal questions of great difficulty, upon which the very best legal minds may naturally differ, could have been referred to some competent legal tribunal to decide; but I think it must be admitted after the few words of explanation which the leader of the House gave in reply to the hon. member for Huron, that the proposal he made, that it should be referred to the Supreme Court by the Governor in Council, is entirely out of the question. It is quite clear, I am sure, to any lawyer looking at this case, that the Supreme Court Act cannot apply to a case of this kind, and if the Governor in Council were to send a special case upon the subject to the Supreme Court, that court would

be compelled in the discharge of its duty to send it back, as they did on one occasion to the Senate, with the statement that they did not think that the matter referred came within their functions and powers under the Act to give any opinion on. In fact the Governor in Council has no more jurisdiction over this question, and has nothing more to say on it than has the man in the moon, to whom my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has referred. The Governor in Council has nothing whatever to say to it, and it would be impertinent for the Governor in Council to send to the Supreme Court this case for their opinion on this question. If then the Supreme Court cannot decide it, if there is no legal tribunal that can decide it, the decision is forced upon us. I should have been much better pleased if this case had come in the ordinary course of proceedings before a legal tribunal as might have been the result if the members contesting the seat had chosen to resort to it, and let the court pronounce upon it, because I do not feel, as I said when this matter was before the House on a former occasion, that this House is the proper and most competent tribunal to decide a question of this kind. That it has the legal power, is beyond any question; that it has the right to do so, no one can doubt, and that we are compelled to do so on the present occasion is equally free from doubt. We must decide this question, whether we like it or not. We must come to a conclusion and vote according to what we believe is right, and to say, first of all, whether Dr. Robertson is entitled to the seat; secondly, whether Mr. McDonald is entitled to the seat; or, thirdly, whether either of them is. Now, upon the first part of the case, as to whether Dr. Robertson is entitled to the seat, I confess I have no doubt at all in my own mind. I have no doubt that the Acts of 1872 and 1873 apply to the Prince Edward Island election at which Dr. Robertson was a candidate, and that he was, under the circumstances, ineligible to be elected on that occasion. When we come to consider the other question, as to whether Mr. McDonald is entitled to the seat, I think the main difficulty arises, because it is conceded that the only ground upon which Mr. McDonald can claim the seat is the existence and applicability of the second section of the Act of 1872. If that does not apply, Mr. McDonald cannot be entitled to the seat, and then there must be a new election. Many arguments have been advanced to show that it is inapplicable and does not apply, or has been repealed. I am satisfied that it has not been repealed; I am satisfied that there is no express repeal of it, and also that it has not been repealed by implication, and that the second section of the Act of 1872 is still in force, notwithstanding the existence of the Act of 1873 against dual representation, and equally notwithstanding the Act of 1874 in reference to controverted elections. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) who has just sat down, appears to have utterly misunderstood—he certainly misstated the argument of my hon. friend from Glengarry upon that point; and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island quoted authorities wholly unnecessary on this occasion, to show that as an ordinary rule, as a rule of Parliamentary law, and of Election Court Law, a minority candidate cannot be entitled to the seat in case of the disqualification or ineligibility, of the majority candidate, unless that disqualification or ineligibility has been brought home expressly to the notice of the electors. This is a question which no one will controvert, and it was quite unnecessary to cite authorities to prove it as a general question of law. We all know that if a man who gets the minority of the votes, wants the seat, or claims it, on the ground that the man getting the majority is disqualified, he must not only prove disqualification, but also that notice of it was expressly given on nomination day, or at each poll, or in some such way so that the fact was brought home to each elector personally, that the man getting the majority of votes was dis-

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

qualified, and that their votes were thrown away. That is the general law and is indisputable; and my hon. friend from Glengarry admitted that to be the case, but my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island argued as if my hon. friend from Glengarry controverted it. What we say is this: There is the statutory notice given by the second clause of the Act of 1872, that where the Statute comes in and says expressly, as it does, that in case the electors vote for a man who is ineligible, their votes shall be thrown away; the duty of the returning officer shall be to return the man having the next largest number of votes. The law, the general law, the statutory law, gives that notice, which is therefore unnecessary to have been given expressly by printed handbills, or by notice on the hustings, or in any way of that kind. I cannot override that law; and if the second clause of the Act of 1872 is in force, no other conclusion can be come to than that Mr. McDonald is entitled to the seat. I said, when this matter was being discussed elsewhere, that in coming to that conclusion I did so reluctantly. I would have preferred, if I had seen my way as a lawyer and a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and as a member of the House, to come to the conclusion that there ought to be a new election; but being compelled, as I feel we are, to give a decision on this question, according to what I believe the law to be, and if the law is as contended, if Mr. McDonald has a vested right to a seat in this House, we have no right to take it away from him; and the minority, who voted for him, and gave good votes, are entitled to have their member returned here and to take his seat; while the majority, if the Act of 1872 applies, wilfully threw away their votes, and cannot complain, because in the face of the Statute, they have done what the Statute Law says shall cause their votes to be thrown away; but I say although reluctantly, and I feel myself forced to come to the conclusion, that Mr. McDonald is entitled to the seat. The whole question, however, turns on the applicability and the existence of the second clause of the Act of 1872. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, has argued at great length, that the Union Acts of 1872 and 1873, applied to Prince Edward Island; that the Act of 1873, in reference to the Union, when it provided that certain laws of Canada should be applicable to Prince Edward Island when it came into the Union, being passed before the Union took place, was *ultra vires* of the power of this Parliament, and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has argued in the same way; but they both seem to forget this manifest fact—that sitting here we have no right and no power to say that any Act passed by the three branches of the Legislature, the Governor General, the Senate and the House of Commons, is unconstitutional. We have no power to say that it is *ultra vires*. What right have we as one of the component parts only of the Legislative body of this Dominion, to say that former legislation is *ultra vires*. If we say so, the only constitutional way in which we can do so, is by repealing the law; and then if the other branches of the Legislature concur in that repeal, it will cease to be law; but when we have once passed a law, and put it in the Statute-book, and when that law has been assented to by the Governor General, and not disallowed by the Queen, it is law. We cannot, therefore, now say that it is unconstitutional. We may have our own opinions as individuals, but we are bound to admit the Act of 1873 says expressly that the laws on certain subjects shall apply to Prince Edward Island, and included in that definition I have no doubt are the laws relating to the election of members of the House of Commons; but I doubt much whether, in the absence of any provision of that kind, the law of Canada, as it was at the time Prince Edward Island came into the Union, with reference to the constitution of our Parliament, did not necessarily apply without express enactments. I think it did. The moment that Prince Edward Island became part of the Dominion that moment the laws of Canada

in reference to the constitution of our Parliament and matters of that kind, became, *ipso facto*, and necessarily binding on Prince Edward Island. By the Order in Council adopting the Terms of Union, there was a special exception made in reference to the first election, because in the absence of that exception our general law would have applied, and as it was much more convenient that the local law should apply to the first election in the Province, it was declared that it should so apply, but not to any subsequent elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to the case of Mr. Laird, but if that election took place under local laws in November, 1873, I think it took place illegally. I believe that the general laws of the Parliament of Canada applied to that election and to every other election except the one immediately after the Island came into the Union.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. He said that I stated that as members of Parliament we were not obliged to take the Statutes as we found them.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not say so; I understood the hon. gentleman to say that as members of Parliament we were bound to take them as we found them, but the hon. gentleman argued that the Statute of 1873 was *ultra vires* of this Parliament, and in reply to that argument I said that it was unimportant to discuss that question, because we were bound to take it as law. I do not purpose going into a discussion of what I call, and what hon. gentlemen opposite have called, the minor points of the case, as to whether Dr. Robertson was the member elected, and so on, because they have already been fully discussed, and it seems to me that they are really too clear for argument. There can be nothing but very weak and insupportable arguments advanced in favor of the position that Dr. Robertson was not a member within the meaning of this Act—if it applies—and I think that is beyond question. He could not resign at all until the first meeting of the House. If he could, I am equally clear that he did not resign effectually, and in either case if he was a member not being able to resign, and not having resigned, that disqualification clause applies, and he was necessarily ineligible to be elected a member of this House. The whole point of the case is whether these Acts of 1872 and 1873 apply to Prince Edward Island and whether the second clause of the Act of 1872 is in force? It has been argued that it was repealed by the Act of 1873, and the legislation of 1874. I do not concur in this opinion, though I will not discuss the point at this late hour. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) in his very temperate and well reasoned speech on this occasion, I think made one mistake in arguing that such a thing as a minority candidate having been seated was unknown. My hon. friend must recollect cases which are numerous in the books of a member who had been elected by a majority of votes and was returned, was petitioned against on the ground of his being disqualified, and the minority candidate having petitioned and claimed the seat, and showing that he had given notice of disqualification, and showing that that notice was brought home, the minority candidate always got the seat. That is the case here, except that we have no evidence that an express notice was given to the electors. I think it unnecessary to discuss the question of whether there was an implied notice, because there was the statutory notice which dispenses with such a notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not make such a statement, but I said that Parliament had never done so.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Parliament does it on the Report of an Election Committee. I am not aware of any cases which have occurred since the present method of trying controverted election cases. There may be such cases, but I know there were dozens of them anterior to the Con-

troverted Elections Act, where the Committee reported that the man returned was disqualified, and that notice of disqualification was given, and the minority candidate was entitled to his seat, and he got it. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) admitted that if the Act of 1872 was in force, and assuming that Dr. Robertson was not a member within the technical meaning of the term, there was no doubt that the conclusion of the Committee was right. I do not think it is necessary to occupy the time of the House upon this point. It is a difficult point for lawyers, and of course more difficult for laymen to determine; but I thought it was as well, at the conclusion of the debate, that it should be plainly and clearly stated, that that is the turning point of the whole case, and that upon that question must depend any proper conclusion at which we could arrive. The majority of the Committee have arrived at the conclusion set forth in the report. I agreed in that conclusion, and, after listening to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am unable to come to the conclusion that the majority of the Committee were wrong. For these reasons I shall vote for the adoption of the original motion.

Mr. WELDON. I intend to detain the House but a few minutes; but I must say that the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down satisfy me that the position we have taken on this side is right. He says that we have no right to discuss the constitutionality of a law—that all we can do is to repeal it. That would be very true if we were sitting here to debate a bill, but we are sitting here as judges, and if the law is unconstitutional, we have a right as judges to pass an opinion upon it. I am sure that my hon. friend feels that the position we have laid down is correct, and that if he were sitting on the bench, he would not hesitate to express that opinion; and sitting here to act in a judicial manner, and not in a party spirit, sitting temporarily as judges, we should decide this question precisely as my hon. friend would expect the judges to decide it. The hon. First Minister, referring to the Supreme Court Act, said that Act only referred to matters of consequence on which the Crown required to be informed. Now, I will call your attention to some authorities on that point. I will first turn to Todd's "Parliamentary Government," vol. 2, page 625, which says:

"If the matter be one that is properly cognizable by a legal tribunal, it would be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which, by the Act 3 and 4 William IV., chap. 41, in addition to its ordinary functions as a Court of Appeal from the decisions of the courts of law, is empowered (by section 4) to consider any matters whatsoever that the Sovereign shall think fit to refer to it."

For a practical illustration of that I will refer to the English *Hansard Debates* of 1866, volume 184, page 1282:

"Captain STACPOOLE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether, with reference to the pledge that would have been given to this House—that the public and *bona fide* claims against the late State of Oude would be paid out of the revenues of the country—it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to place the Report of the Commission appointed to inquire into those claims, and the decision of the Local Government thereupon, upon the footing of all other reports and decisions affecting the rights of individuals in India, and to allow the same to be reviewed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council?"

"Viscount CRANBOURNE. Sir, these are claims that arose out of transactions that took place about eighteen years ago. They are claims of a moral, and not of a legal character, and they depend, as I am informed, upon proof that falls very far short of legal proof. There is no doubt by the Statute a power enabling Her Majesty to refer to the Committee of Privy Council any matters which she pleases, but I imagine there would be a very great difficulty in referring matters of this kind to a judicial tribunal, and certainly I cannot pledge myself generally to do so. If references are made, it must be on each individual case, on cause shown, and on a full review of all the circumstances."

We find the same doctrine laid down by Donison, on the practice of appeals to the House of Lords, page 21, with regard to examining Judges before that House:

"It was decided in the Wensleydale Peerage case that the House did not consult the Judges on questions other than of law, arising on a claim to sit and vote as a Peer. The Lords have, however, the right to require the Judges to attend and to answer abstract questions of existing

law, without regard to the form of an appeal or the questions raised upon it, or although such questions do not arise out of any case actually before the House; but the Judges will decline to answer a question put to them by the House of Lords if it be not confined to the strict legal construction of existing laws."

There is the proposition put forward by Todd, and in the reply of Cranborne, and implied also in the practice of the House of Lords. It seems to me that all we have heard in this case, and the conflicting opinions expressed by legal members of this House, indicate that the Government should exercise its power to refer this case to a tribunal which should give a satisfactory decision upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no right to say anything, having spoken already, except by the permission of the House. It is quite true that the House of Lords, which is a judicial as well as a legislative body, has the right to examine the judges as officers, and can call upon the judges to give their opinions on matters of law. There is no doubt about that. The clause in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council Act says that the Sovereign may send any matter that the Crown chooses, to the Committee for its opinion. That is quite true; but the Crown has to make up its mind what questions it can send. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that it will be unconstitutional what is going on here; the Crown cannot even allude to what is going on in the House of Commons; there is no way of informing the Crown; it is considered to be a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons for the Crown to intervene. The hon. gentleman will find, if he looks up the special cases referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that all these cases, without exception, have concerned matters on which the Crown, as the head of the Executive, desired to be informed. The special quotation of the hon. gentleman proves that. It related to certain Indian claims against the Crown. Although they were not legal claims the Ministers of the Crown promised to submit to the Judges the question whether there was a good moral claim against the Crown, because if there was a good moral claim it should be paid.

Mr. BLAKE. No; he was objecting to the reference to the Judicial Committee, because the claim was a moral claim, and not a legal claim.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, it was a claim against the Crown, and all these questions submitted by the Crown are for the purpose of the Crown being informed what it ought to do as the head of the Executive. But that the Crown should be made the go-between between the House of Commons, or between the people and the court on the matter of an election, is quite unheard of. I am sure the very idea would be scouted in England, if proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret that I am unable to agree with the hon. gentleman. We are in a very painful position, according to the statements of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). We have been told on repeated occasions, in the discussion of this question, that it was a judicial question, that we were judges, that we were to act as judges, that we were to consider what the law is on this question, and were to decide according to the law. But these two hon. gentlemen tell us that we are judges who will not decide according to the law; that we are judges who—whether or not our opinion be that the particular Act of Parliament which is called in question here is within the constitutional powers of this Parliament, or is a binding law—may not offer to decide as the judges on the Bench would decide; and therefore, we are to decide the law, but not in accordance with the law; we are to decide the law, but in a limited, lame, perfunctory manner; we must be blind as to the system of Parliament, must be deaf to difficulties as to the validity of an Act of Parliament, must be obliged to ignore wholly the fundamental proposition that a

Mr. WELDON.

portion of a free British race are not to be bound by laws which they themselves have not had a part in making. That is what the hon. gentlemen have indicated they believed the Judges of the land would determine to be the law as applicable to this case, but we, the judges in this particular case, they say, are prevented from so deciding, and are obliged to judge against, and not according to, the law. That is not my opinion. I believe that, if we are judges, we are free to judge according to the law. I believe that, this being a legal question, we are bound to decide it according to the whole law. The proposition that a particular Act of Parliament, from its being beyond our powers to apply it to the Island at the time we passed it, does not apply to the Island, is a proof which, as the judges in the case, we are free to decide upon, and affirm or negative according to our conclusion as to what the law would do. If the proposition of these hon. gentlemen be correct, and I dispute it, with the respect which is due to their legal opinion—but I entertain a very decided contrary one—how unfortunate a position is that in which the Parliament of Canada stands at this moment—that within a few minutes we are to pronounce upon this question as judges, not according to, but against, the law. From that difficulty a mode of escape presents itself for those who believe that the difficulty exists; but for all of us who recognize that there are doubts and difficulties as to what the true decision, according to the law, is, there is also a mode of escape. The hon. gentleman interposes and says there is no mode of escape. You, and you alone, are the judges, and you, the sole judges of the case, are here cramped, fettered and limited in your judicial powers so that you must decide against and not according to the law. Why is that? The hon. gentleman says the Crown cannot know what is going on here. It is unconstitutional, he says, for the Crown to know what is going on here, and therefore the Crown cannot refer this question to the Supreme Court. Further, he says the Crown has nothing to do with the election. I admit that, but the Ministers sometimes have. And what right, he asks, has the Crown to submit to the Supreme Court, the question about elections. Nobody proposes that the Crown should, *sua sponte*, without the request of the people, manifested by an application from this House, intervene to provide a mode of obtaining the decision of the highest tribunal of this country, of that tribunal which, if this case had come before the judicial tribunals in the ordinary way, would have been the tribunal of ultimate appeal, which would have had to pass upon it. If that mode could be obtained by the action of this House, as it can be; if following up the motion of the hon. gentleman, the proper course were followed of presenting an address to the Crown, as the medium of communication between this House and the court, to refer their questions to the Supreme Court, they could be referred to that court, and we would be seized of their judgment. I can see nothing unconstitutional, improper, or impossible in a transaction of that description. I am sorry we should be approaching a judgment, such as we are about to render according to the views of the hon. gentlemen to which I have referred. It has been my fortune when sitting among the majority in this House, to have been concerned with the other hon. members, in the settlement of two cases which affected the seats of members in this House—one in which a member of their minority was concerned, the hon. member for Two Mountains, whose seat was attacked, and the other in which the right to sit here of an hon. gentleman, who at that time filled the chair, Mr. Speaker, you now occupy, was disputed. On those two occasions the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in both cases we were able to arrive at an unanimous deliverance, and to deal with them in a spirit which reflected, I think, no discredit on Parliament as a judiciary on those occasions. We are now on the eve of coming to a decision which is not going to reflect credit on

Parliament, if there is going to be a decision on this question, in which party lines will take the place of impartial judgment. I agree with the hon. member for Huron that this case is involved in considerable difficulties. I see that those great difficulties are going to be looked at through party eyes. I am not blaming one or the other side of the House, but am expressing my deep regret that that should be the conclusion of this dispute, and that the visible mode which has been suggested for averting such conclusions, is to be rejected. I had hoped that when these presented itself before the eyes of the House, the opportunity of obtaining an ultimate tribunal, to which, in point of law, this question should have been referred, the House would have been glad to say: We will obtain the opinion of the Judges of the land, and by that be guided. But as that is to be refused, as one hon. gentleman says is unconstitutional, and as other hon. gentlemen have said it is impossible; and as we are told we are to decide as judges, but without having the power of judges; and we are bound to decide not the whole question which the Judges would decide—I suppose the majority will determine that it is out of the question; anxious as they are to get more light, they refuse to get it; and having determined to decide with the limited powers, they say we possess, the result will be, Parliament will give a place in this House to the gentleman whom the people did not elect, but rejected.

Mr. BRECKEN. It is not my intention to delay the House by going into the points presented in this case, for they have been fully argued by gentlemen on both sides. I was not in the House when my hon. colleague spoke, but was informed he had stated to the House that while Dr. Robertson was instructed to resign, another gentleman in exactly the same position was instructed not to resign. I was not in the Island when the local elections took place, but my hon. friend from King's County who sits at my right says, that my hon. colleague is wrong. The facts connected with Mr. Robertson's resignation are before the House. I may now assume that dual representation is prohibited in Prince Edward Island. He sent in his resignation on the 13th June, but it did not reach the Governor's office on the 8th of July. I was not in the Island and know nothing of the circumstances; but there was another gentleman, they say, who was precisely in the same position and on the same side of politics as Dr. Robertson. He was a candidate for the Local Parliament, and was elected, and was also a candidate at the last Dominion Election. I cannot state the fact whether Mr. Perry actually resigned, or to whom he resigned, but I am instructed by my hon. friend on my right to say that he was present at several of the political meetings which took place before the Dominion Elections, and Mr. Perry was interrogated as to whether or not he had resigned, and he said he had. Of course Dr. Robertson is not bound to anything that Mr. Perry did or did not do; but I may state, from the information I have received from Prince Edward Island, I never heard a man on either side of politics who doubted that a member of the Local Legislature was bound to resign before he was competent to be a candidate for the Dominion Parliament. The excuse that is attempted to be made to account for the fact that the resignation did not reach the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor on the 8th of July, was that one of the gentlemen to whom the resignation was sent was absent from the Island. But Dr. McLaren was there, and there was nothing in the world to prevent him from sending in the resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor. I am not in possession of the facts, but I have not the slightest doubt that Dr. Robertson intended to pursue the same course as Mr. Perry. Mr. Perry, as I am informed by my friends here, stated on several occasions that he had resigned, and at a meeting he was interrogated by an elector and stated that he had resigned. Mr. Perry was defeated in the Dominion Election, and he is sitting in

the Local Legislature of Prince Edward Island at this moment voting and assisting to make laws for the Province by virtue of his first election. I do not want to say anything disrespectful of Dr. Robertson; I have known him well when sitting with him in the Local Legislature, when he was a good Conservative, and I am not going to say anything against him as a private member of society, but I must say that it is my firm conviction that his resignation was not *bona fide*, and if he had not succeeded in obtaining a majority of the votes he would to-day be found sitting in the Local Legislative Assembly making laws for that Province. While, of course, I could not state positively that his resignation was not genuine, I believe he made it conditional, and that if he had been rejected at the polls it would have been withdrawn, and, like Mr. Perry's, it would never have seen the light.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived on the following division:—

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Armstrong	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Bain,	Gunn,	Platt,
Béchar,	Harley,	Ray,
Bernier,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (St. John),	Jackson,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Springer,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Catudal,	Lister,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Livingstone,	Trow,
Cockburn,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Cook,	McOraney,	Weldon,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
De St. Georges,	McIsaac,	Wilson, and
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Yeo.—84.
Fleming,		

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Abbott,	Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Allison	Dickinson,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dodd,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi)	Dundas,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Méthot,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Moffat,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Fréchette,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Orton,
Benson,	Gigault,	Quimet,
Bergeron,	Girouard (Jacq. Cart.),	Paint,
Bergin,	Girouard (Kent),	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Gordon,	Pope,
Blanchet,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Richey,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Royal,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Scott,
Brecken,	Hall,	Shakespeare
Bryson,	Hawkins,	Small,
Burns,	Hay,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness)	Hesson,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Tassé,
Carling,	Homer,	Taylor,
Oimon,	Jamieson,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Pictou),
Colby,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Vain,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry,	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Guthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell)
Daly,	McDonald (O. Breton),	Williams,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
De Beaujeu,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westm'land), and
Dessaulniers,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wright.—108.

Amendment (Mr. Weldon) negatived on the same division.

On the main motion,

Mr. DAVIES moved in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "The House having declined to decide that James E. Robertson should have been returned by the returning officer, it is proper that the election of the second member for the Electoral District of King's County, in the Island of Prince Edward, be declared void, and a new writ be issued."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain,	Girouard (Jac.-Cartier),	Pickard,
Béchar,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bernier,	Harley,	Ray,
Blake,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (St. John),	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Keefler,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Laurier,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Charlton,	Lister,	Thompson,
Cockburn,	Livingstone,	Trow,
Cook,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Wilson, and
Fleming,	McMullen,	Yeo.—66.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Desjardins,	McCallum,
Allison,	Dickinson,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Dodd,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	Méthot,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Bell,	Fréchette,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Gigault,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Girouard (Kent),	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Pope,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Blanchet,	Guilbault,	Richey,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Royal,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Rykert,
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Scott,
Bowell,	Hall,	Shakespeare,
Brecken,	Hawkins,	Small,
Bryson,	Hay,	Smyth,
Burns,	Hesson,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Tassé,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Taylor,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Tilley,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Picton),
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Kranz,	Valin,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Coughlin,	Landry,	Wallace (Albert),
Coursol,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wood (Brockville),
De Beaujeu,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westm'land) and
Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright.—108.

Main motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Desjardins,	McCallum,
Allison,	Dickinson,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Dodd,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	Méthot,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Bell,	Fréchette,	Orton,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Paint,
Benson,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,

Mr. BRECKEN.

Bergeron,	Girouard (Kent),	Pope,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Reid,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Richey,
Blanchet,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Rykert,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Scott,
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Hall,	Small,
Brecken,	Hawkins,	Smyth,
Bryson,	Hay,	Sproule,
Burns,	Hesson,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Tilley,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Tupper (Picton),
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Valin,
Colby,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Landry,	Wallace (York),
Coursol,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Cuthbert,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wood (Westm'land) and
De Beaujeu,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wright.—107.
Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Auger,	Gillmor,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Pickard,
Béchar,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bernier,	Harley,	Ray,
Blake,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (St. John),	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Keefler,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Laurier,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Charlton,	Lister,	Thompson,
Cockburn,	Livingstone,	Trow,
Cook,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McIntyre,	Wheler,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Wilson, and
Fleming,	McMullen,	Yeo.—66.

Mr. BLANCHET moved:

That it be Resolved,—That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend the House forthwith, with the return for the Electoral District of King's County, in the Island of Prince Edward, and amend the same, by erasing the name of James E. Robertson, Esq.

Motion agreed to, on the same division.

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery attended, in obedience to the Order of the House, and altered the said return accordingly.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, first, by whose order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is preparing that report at this moment, and then if he is restricting himself to the wording of the motion, which says that the name of Mr. Robertson should simply be struck out in the return?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Have the orders of the House been complied with, Mr. Speaker. I should desire the return as changed in conformity with the orders of the House, to be read. I want to see what the majority have accomplished.

The ASSISTANT CLERK. In obedience to the orders of the House, I have altered the above return by erasing the name of James Edmund Robertson therefrom.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish the return read as altered. I want to see what the return is now.

The ASSISTANT CLERK:

"I hereby certify that one of the members elected for the Electoral District of King's County, pursuant to the within writ, as having received the majority of the votes lawfully given, Peter Adolphus McIntyre, &c.; and I further certify that James E. Robertson"



Mr. BLAKE. Oh, Oh! I thought that this name had disappeared, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is reading what is hardly called for in the return. What is desired is simply the concluding portion in which are the words :

"I further do make this return regarding the said James E. Robertson and Augustine McDonald, known of all concerned."

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a special return ; and of course the formal motion that has been made, would only make nonsense of it, if it struck out the name of Jas. E. Robertson, wherever it occurs. We must try and keep the proceedings of the House regular. The motion is in effect to amend the return so as to make it the return of Augustine C. McDonald.

Mr. BLAKE. The motion as I understand it, which the House agreed to by a majority, is to amend the return by erasing the name of Jas. E. Robertson, and I understand that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has erased the name from the part, which the Assistant Clerk was reading when you interposed, Sir. He proceeded to read leaving out the name. We should have things regular.

Mr. SPEAKER. All relating to Jas. E. Robertson cannot be erased from the return.

Mr. BLAKE. That would have given the return to Augustine C. McDonald. There will have to be another motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the following motion :—

That the said return be further amended, by striking out all the words in the same after the words : "I further certify that" and inserting the words following: Augustine Colin McDonald, of Montague Bridge, in King's County, merchant, is also elected for the said Electoral District, as having the next highest number of votes lawfully given at such election."

Mr. CASGRAIN. I beg to enter my remonstrance against this motion. We are putting words in the mouth of a third party who is not present, and I say that, as a matter of common sense, we cannot agree to do so.

Motion agreed to on the same division.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has attended and made the correction ordered by the House.

#### PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE.

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

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the House adjourns I wish to call attention to the fact that an enormous amount of time is consumed in recording our votes. The first division took about twenty minutes, and altogether with our 211 members about seventy hours and three minutes were taken up in recording our divisions to-night. If we followed the plan which is adopted in the House of Commons in England we would have saved an hour.

Motion agreed to, and (at 1:45 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 26th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### OFFENCES AGAINST PERSONS EMPLOYED IN FACTORIES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in introducing Bill (No. 117) to define certain offences against persons employed in factories,

said: I will briefly state the main provisions of the Bill. The employment in a factory of any child, or of any woman, shall be deemed to be unlawful, and so that the health of such child or woman is likely to be permanently injured if in that factory there is any contravention of the following provisions of this section, that is to say:—1. A child under twelve years of age shall not be employed in any factory. 2. Except as hereinafter provided, a child between the ages of twelve and fifteen years shall not be employed in any factory, unless the employer of such child has in his possession, and produces when thereto requested by the inspector, a certificate signed by the parent, guardian or other person having the legal custody or control over such child, in which certificate the person signing it shall state the date thereof, the age of such child at said date, and the birth place of such child. 3. Except as is herein otherwise provided, a child or woman shall not be employed for more than ten hours in one day, nor more than for sixty hours in any one week. Provision is, however, made in case a mill breaks down, or circumstances occur by which it is deemed necessary that the operatives should be employed over sixty hours a week, that they shall be so employed; but this over-time is not to extend more than six weeks in any year. Every factory shall be kept in a cleanly state and free from effluvia arising from any drain, privy, or any other nuisance. No factory shall be so over-crowded as to be prejudicial to the health of those employed therein. Every factory shall be ventilated in such a manner as to render harmless, so far as is reasonably practicable, all the gases, vapors, dust or other impurities that may be injurious to health, generated in the course of the manufacturing process or handicraft carried on therein. In every factory there shall be kept provided a sufficient number and description of earth or water closets, and urinals for the employes of such factory; such closets and urinals shall at all times be kept clean and well ventilated, and separate closets or sets of closets shall be provided for the use of male and female employes, and shall have respectively separate approaches. A factory in which there is a contravention of this section shall be deemed to be kept unlawfully and so that the health of any person employed therein is likely to be permanently injured. In every factory where it appears to the inspector that there is any act, neglect or default in relation to any over-crowding, ventilation, drain, privy, earth closet, water closet, ash pit, water supply, nuisance or other matter whereby health may be affected in a factory, he may give notice thereof in writing to the employer, who shall, within a reasonable time, take such action thereon as the inspector deems proper and necessary; and, in every factory where any process is carried on, by which dust is generated and inhaled to an injurious extent by the employes, if it appears to the inspector that such inhalation could by mechanical means be prevented or partly prevented, he may direct that such means shall be provided within a reasonable time by the employer, who, in such case, shall be bound so to provide them. A factory in which the provisions of this section are not complied with by the employer shall be deemed to be kept unlawfully and so that the health of any person employed therein is likely to be permanently injured. For the purposes of the two next preceding sections the inspector may take with him into any factory a medical man, health officer, inspector of nuisances or other officer of the local sanitary authority. In every factory all belting, shafting, gearing, fly-wheels, drums and other moving parts of the machinery; all vats, pans, cauldrons, reservoirs, wheel races, flumes, water channels, doors, openings in the floors or walls, bridges, and all other like dangerous structures or places shall be, as far as practicable, securely guarded. No machinery, other than steam engines, shall be cleaned while in motion, if the inspector so directs by written notice. The openings of every hoistway, hatchway, elevator or

well-hole shall be at each floor provided with and protected by good and sufficient trap-doors or self-closing hatches and safety catches, and by such other safeguards as the inspector directs, and such trap doors shall be kept closed at all times except when in actual use by persons duly authorized by the employer to use the same. All elevator cabs or cars, whether used for freight or passengers, shall be provided with some suitable mechanical device to be approved by the inspector, whereby the cab or car will be securely held in the event of accident to the shipper rope or hoisting machinery, or from any similar cause. A factory in which there is a contravention of this section shall be deemed to be kept unlawfully and so that the life of any person employed therein is endangered. In every factory there shall be such means of extinguishing fire as the inspector directs in writing, and he shall have regard to the circumstances of each case. The main inside and outside doors shall open outwardly, wherever the inspector deems it necessary and so directs in writing; and every factory three or more storeys in height, in which persons are employed above the second storey, unless supplied with a sufficient number of tower stairways, shall be provided with a sufficient number of fire escapes; said fire escapes shall consist of an iron stairway with a suitable railing, and shall be connected with the interior of the building by doors or windows, and shall have suitable landings at every storey above the first, including the attic if the attic is occupied as a workroom. Such fire escapes shall be kept in good repair, and free from obstruction or encumbrance of any kind. A factory or workshop in which there is a contravention of this section shall be deemed to be kept unlawfully, and so that the life of any person employed therein is endangered. Whoever unlawfully employs in a factory any child or any woman so that the health of such child or woman is likely to be permanently injured, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to imprisonment for any term not more than —years, or to a fine of not more than—dollars, and in default of immediate payment of such fine, then to imprisonment as aforesaid. Whoever unlawfully keeps a factory that the life of any person employed therein is endangered, or so that the health of any person employed therein is likely to be permanently injured, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to imprisonment for any term not more than —years, or to a fine of not more than—dollars, and in default of immediate payment of such fine, then to imprisonment as aforesaid. These are the principle provisions of the Bill, and I now move the first reading.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state whether there is any definition of the term "factory;" what the general proposition as to factories is; how soon it is proposed that the Bill shall come into operation, and how many inspectors there will be?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a clause defining a factory in the meaning of the Act. We have not decided when the Bill shall come into operation. As to the number of inspectors, there may be one or two, probably one will be sufficient; but that is a matter which we will take into consideration.

Bill read the first time.

#### TRANSLATION OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker. Before discussing the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the Government, or the persons responsible for the translation of the Votes and Proceedings of the House, to the character of the translation of these Votes and Proceedings. For instance, in yesterday's Votes and Proceedings there is a very important report of a Special Committee  
Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

appointed to investigate on Inter-Provincial Trade. This report appears in the worst French imaginable. The fact is, it is not French at all. The first phrase especially is not French. I will not enter into further details relative to this report as translated, which I consider a disgrace to our Journals.

#### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and read the first and second times:—

Bill (No. 118) to amend the Act incorporating the European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Company, limited, and to change the name thereof to the American, British and Continental Cable Company, limited.—(Mr. Colby.)

#### THE GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend the General Inspection Act of 1874, said: Under the Act of 1874 it is provided that Black Sea and Flinty Fife wheat shall in no case be inspected higher than No. 2, and this provision, it is contended by the people of the North-West, is entirely against their interests, as this wheat is the best grown in that country. This is evident from the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway carried that wheat for seeding purposes into that country free of charge, and that it commands a higher price than any other quality grown there. It is for the purpose of removing this objection that this amendment is proposed: "Black Sea wheat and, except when grown in the Province of Manitoba or North-West Territories, Flinty Fife wheat shall in no case be inspected as higher than No. 2." It was also necessary, in order to have the inspection of wheat at all in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, that we should amend another section of the Act of 1874, because when that Act was passed, giving authority to appoint inspectors, Winnipeg was not considered among the larger cities, and consequently not included in the Act. The name of Winnipeg is, therefore, inserted among those of the other cities in which the Boards of Trade have the power of appointing examiners, who will examine and appoint the inspectors according to instructions. There is another short clause which it was thought advisable to introduce, with respect to the inspection of hides. Section eighty-seven of the Act of 1874 is altered by striking out the words "raw hides" when they occur. One of the sections of that law provides that the inspection of raw hides is compulsory, and an inspector is appointed; but the inspection of leather is not compulsory, and while that is clearly the intention of the law, section eighty-seven is so framed as to leave doubt and confusion on that subject. Section ninety-six of the Act of 1874 provides "that the inspection of raw hides shall be compulsory in every place where an inspector or deputy inspector has been appointed, and every raw hide sold, offered for sale, or for export, or laden in any vehicle or vessel for the purpose of being exported, and which has not been first inspected, stamped, or marked as herein required, shall be forfeited." It is proposed that we strike out the words, in the eighty-seventh clause, "raw hides," where they occur, and make the word "weights," when it occurs, in the singular instead of in the plural.

Mr. LAURIER. There can be no objection to the first part of this Bill. I presume that the clause in relation to the inspection of wheat has been rendered necessary by local circumstances. But I see no necessity whatever for the change proposed by the third clause in respect to the working of hides. I understood the hon. Minister to say there was a contradiction between sections ninety-six and eighty-seven of the present Act, and it was to remedy this

contradiction that the Bill was proposed. In my opinion there is no contradiction between those two sections. Section ninety-six merely provides that no raw hides shall be offered for sale unless first inspected. It reads as follows:—

“The inspection of ‘raw hides’ shall be compulsory at every place where an inspector or deputy inspector has been appointed, and every raw hide sold, offered for sale, or exported, offered for export, or laden in any vehicle or vessel for the purpose of being exported, and which has not been first inspected and stamped or marked, as herein required, shall be forfeited, and the person so selling or offering for sale, or exporting the same, shall incur a penalty of one dollar for every hide so sold, offered for sale, or exported.”

It merely says that no raw hides shall be offered for sale unless first inspected. Now, section eighty-seven is not in contradiction with this clause. It says:

“Any person, except the inspector or deputy inspector, who shall stamp or number any of the raw hides or leather above mentioned, and shall expose them for sale, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding twenty dollars; but he shall be at liberty to mark on the said raw hides or leather, in ordinary and legible figures, the weights of the said raw hides or leather, and in such cases the words ‘not inspected’ shall be marked above the said figures, in letters of the same dimensions, and as legible as the said figures; and any person who shall expose for sale any raw hides or leather the weights of which shall be so marked without the words ‘not inspected,’ as above prescribed, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding twenty dollars.”

While this section merely says that no one except the inspector or deputy inspector shall mark the raw hide—that is to say, the weight of the raw hide—unless at the same time he adds the words “not inspected.” It is simply for the guidance of the purchaser. Any one is at liberty to put any figure on any raw hide. We all know that raw hides are always sold by weight; and any one is at liberty to put on the raw hide any figure—50 or 60, for instance—and the purchaser would likely presume that this was marked and inspected unless the words “not inspected” were added to show that it had not been done by an official. This applies to both leathers and raw hides, and I do not see why we should amend in the one case and not in the other. These two dispositions do not conflict with each other. Section ninety-six merely says that no hides or leathers shall be exposed for sale unless marked; while section eighty-seven merely says that no one shall mark the weight on the leather unless at the same time he cautions the public by adding the words “not inspected.” I see no reason why this change should not be carried out in the one case as in the other. By striking out the words “raw hide” you deprive the public of the guarantee they have in section eighty-seven. If the Bill passes, the consequence will be that any one in the market would be at liberty to put any figures whatever as the weight of the raw hide, and he would be relieved from the necessity of adding the words necessary to show the public that the hide is not inspected. Consequently the purchaser will be led into error by the fraud, and he will have no remedy. It seems to me the argument applies as well to raw hides as to leather. If I might venture to say so, I would say that my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that the two clauses conflict with each other. Section ninety-six provides only for inspection, while section eighty-seven refers merely to the marking and the weight. The hon. Minister will see this if he will read carefully the eighty-seventh section. I see no contradiction between the two sections, while it seems to me that the proposed change will deprive the purchaser of the guarantee he now possesses.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, I do not pretend to be more able in legally interpreting these clauses than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He may be right, but I have proposed this change because the question has already been before the courts, and this amendment seems to be necessary. Now, the inspection of leather is not compulsory, but the inspection of raw hides is compulsory. The law does not recognize that a man shall deal with any but

inspected hides, while it does recognize his right to mark his leather. But the inspection of leather not being compulsory, all the law requires him to do is that when he marks it he shall do it in such a manner that the public will not be deceived.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DUNDAS. I could not distinctly hear the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, but it seems to me that the object which the hon. Minister has in view in amending this Bill, is to allow the hard wheat grown in the northern Province of the Dominion to be graded as higher than No. 2 under certain circumstances. I think that is quite right; but I also hold that the same privilege should be allowed to Ontario and other Provinces where the same class of wheat is grown. I was surprised to find that by the Inspection Law that grain, even of a higher class than No. 2, and the most valuable kinds of spring wheat grown in this country, could only be placed in that grade. I cannot think why it is that this distinction has been made against spring wheat, but I can very well understand why the newly-settled districts in the North-West wish to have it removed. I hold that it should, at the same time, be removed from wheat grown in the older Provinces. It is well known that hard, flinty wheat will, to-day, bring in Toronto and other markets many cents per bushel more than ordinary spring wheat; yet, by the interpretation of the law, it is provided that it shall not be graded higher than No. 2. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to this subject, and I ask him to extend the same privilege to Toronto and other markets where this wheat is sold, as it is proposed to extend to Winnipeg.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With respect to the suggestion made by the hon. member, I do not think it advisable to make these changes at present. The change now being made in the Act has been brought about by the representations of the Board of Trade at Winnipeg, of the millers of that country, of the managers of railways, and the public generally, which go to show that the people of the North-West feel the necessity of this change being made. This Inspection Act was passed in 1874. It has been in operation since then in the older Provinces, and no representation has been made asking for a change in the direction indicated, except from Manitoba and the North-West Territory. I do not deny that such a change might not become necessary as regards the older Provinces, but no change should be made in an Act of this importance without very serious consideration, and without receiving representations from the Boards of Trade in the cities to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If the matter is brought before the House by the Boards of Trade in Montreal, Toronto and other cities, even at this late period of the Session, the Government might alter the Bill. Very little inconvenience had been caused from the operation of the Act during the last four years, and the public interest will not suffer much if the Act is allowed to remain in force for the rest of the Dominion, and the amendments proposed to be applied to Manitoba and the North-West, be adopted.

Mr. DUNDAS. I will not press the matter further on the attention of the hon. Minister, but I am quite sure that had it been brought before the notice of the Boards of Trade in Toronto, Montreal, and other cities in Ontario, they would have sought the same change in the Inspection Act as Winnipeg asks for. I might mention, moreover, that I have been told by an hon. gentleman in this House that he is purchasing some of this kind of wheat in the North-West Territory, which is at present prohibited from being classed higher than No. 2, in order to have the pure seed, with a view to introducing it on his own farm. In the district where I reside and do business, a large quantity of this

wheat is grown, and to-day, or any day during the past six months, it will bring from 5 cts. to 7 cts. per bushel more in Toronto than the ordinary No. 2 wheat. Having pointed out this inequality; I will leave the matter with the hon. Minister, and I am sure, before another year has elapsed, the change sought by Winnipeg will be asked by Toronto and other cities.

Bill reported.

#### THE MILITIA OF CANADA.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Caron: That Bill (No. 31) to consolidate and amend the laws affecting the Militia of Canada, be now considered as amended; and the motion of Mr. Ross (Middlesex) in amendment thereto.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Speaker: I may say, in regard to the amendment which is suggested by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that I have looked into, and am perfectly willing, as I agree with the proposition suggested by the hon. member, to introduce it into the regulations which will be the controlling law of the Militia; but I think as it is a matter of discipline that it should not be introduced into the Bill as being a clause which will remain upon the Statute-book. Hon. gentlemen who know the manner in which these matters are regulated, will understand that up to the present time they have been left, and I think rightly left, to the commanding officer, who always took the measures which were required to be taken for the carrying out of discipline in the camps of instruction which were held in different parts of the Dominion. I believe that the result must have convinced the hon. gentleman that so far it has been successful, as we have received no complaints from any quarter as to the manner in which these camps of instruction were conducted; but as I believe that during the time when the Militia force are engaged in their drill, and in their exercises for the purpose of improving their instruction in military matters, they can very well get along without any stimulants like those mentioned in the amendment of the hon. gentleman; and I think that, if the hon. gentleman will consent, and if he considers that the regulations framed by the Department which are always the law under which the Militia is conducted while in camps of instruction, he will see that these regulations will exactly meet what he requires, and thus we will not place in this Bill, and on the Statute-book, an amendment which might at some time or other require to be altered, owing to the peculiar necessities in which the force might be placed; and were this the case, we would have to come to Parliament to have it amended. I am perfectly willing to insert in the regulations the amendment which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman; but I believe, from what he himself has told me, that what I propose will be satisfactory, and will meet his views.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am exceedingly glad to know that the hon. Minister of Militia is disposed to entertain favorably the proposition which I made with regard to canteens. I am afraid, however, that by the structure of clause sixty-four it will be almost impossible for him to provide regulations to meet the matter in point, unless some alteration is made in clause sixty-four. If the hon. gentleman looks at it he will see it reads as follows:—

“The active Militia shall be subject to the Queen's Regulations and orders for the Army.”

Here by the Statute, the Queen's Regulations and orders, not the regulations and orders of the hon. Minister of Militia, are those which control the army—that is by Statute. Now, I cannot see that the hon. gentleman's Departmental regulations would supersede the wording of the Statute; and, under the regulations and orders for the army by the Queen, I

Mr. DUNDAS.

see it is quite within their power to sell beer and malt liquors in camp.

Mr. CARON. Quite right; and it is under that very clause that I have the power, as Minister of Militia, to make any regulations which shall be required for the control of these canteens; and I can say that, under that very clause which the hon. gentleman has just quoted, in the canteens in our camps, instead of selling ale, and what is mentioned there, they have to confine themselves to selling—

Mr. ROSS. Tea and coffee.

Mr. CARON. Not cold water, but ginger ale and anything of that kind.

Mr. ROSS. That is just where I find a difficulty, whether the hon. Minister of Militia had the power, seeing that the Militia were under the Queen's Regulations and orders for the Army, to make regulations which would serve the purpose I have in view. I do not see it myself very clearly; but perhaps some other hon. gentleman, who is more familiar with the matter than I am, may throw light on the subject. The hon. Minister of Militia ought certainly to understand his own power in this matter; and if my object be fully carried out in that way I would not have the slightest objection. All I want to get at is the prohibition of beer in camps; and that I know I can get at. I think that the opinion of the House will sustain me in the proposition I have made, as the opinion of the hon. Minister of Militia does sustain me; but I want to be sure, doubly sure, that this opportunity which is afforded me is not allowed to escape.

Mr. CARON. I cannot say anything more than I have already stated; and if the hon. gentleman is not willing to accept my statement, and what I am now telling the hon. gentleman—that I am included in those regulations—

Mr. ROSS. All right then.

Mr. CARON. Does the hon. gentleman accept that? I am anxious to carry out and include his very amendment in the regulations which will control the camps; and that I undertake to say I will do.

Mr. ROSS. I will accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman, and I am exceedingly glad that he is disposed to entertain the proposition which I made. I believe it will add to the comfort of the soldiers in the camps, and add to the facilities with which the officers will control the men; and I think it will also raise the active Militia in the estimation of the people. What I was afraid, very much afraid of, was, that many of our young men going into camp, would there be brought in contact with the drinking usages of the camp, and become demoralized; and, on that account, many are not disposed to allow those over whom they have control, such as grown up sons, to join the Militia force, just because of the dangerous associations. The assurances of the hon. Minister of Militia will raise the force in the estimation of a certain portion of the community, and I am sure it will encourage those who are endeavoring to raise its moral standard in this respect very much.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the Government will agree, but I know of two hostile camps, not very remote from here; and if they would apply the same principle to those camps and go a little farther than the little sustenance they now have.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) withdrawn.

Mr. CARON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Mr. Speaker: Before the Bill is read the third time I want to call attention particularly to the new portion contained in clause twenty-one of the Bill. From the tenor of the debate in this House, as well as from conversations with many interested in the Militia force, added to which I may state my own convictions, I am satisfied

that the change which the hon. Minister of Militia proposes in clause twenty-one is a change decidedly in the wrong direction. The proposition of the Bill is to increase very largely the Department of our Militia expenditure, which, in my humble judgment, is sufficiently large at the present time. If I rightly understand—speaking as a civilian—how the Militia force can be made effective, I would say that the best method of rendering the Militia force effective would be through the drill and the training of the active force. We are spending largely, as I have already said, for Military instruction at the present moment, and the amount expended on military instruction is, in my judgment, out of all proportion to the amount of money spent for drilling the active force. For instance, we spent, last year, on "B" Battery, \$65,648; on "A" Battery, \$50,516; on the Military College, \$58,937; on drill instruction in Military Districts, \$38,471; and on Military Colleges, \$5,317, or a total of \$218,942. This was the amount expended last year for instruction, and these facilities for instruction are not confined to one portion of the country. We have a battery at Quebec, and another at Kingston; we have military schools at Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, and St. John, and we have Wimbledon teams, and so on—all expenditures for military instruction. Let us contrast the liberality of the Government in this respect with the amount they have paid for the drill of the active Militia. The amount paid the men for drill last year was \$227,255. We have scarcely spent more than about \$9,000 more in drilling the whole active force of the Militia than we have spent on instruction in "A" and "B" Batteries, the Military Colleges, and elsewhere—instructions which are not extended to the active force. We had in the Military College, last year, seventy persons; in "A" Battery, 105; in "B" Battery, 193, or a total of 368, and the greater portion of the \$218,000 which I mentioned, was spent for the instruction of these 368 men, whereas \$227,000 was all that was distributed amongst the 20,000 men of the actual Militia force. The hon. gentleman will see that by adding \$200,000 more to the amount which is spent on instruction, he is spending that money in a direction in which the expenditure is already exceedingly large. I think it would conduce much more largely to the success and efficiency of the Militia force—if the hon. gentleman is bound to increase the expenditure—that he should spend it in drilling the men, instead of adding still further to the expenses for instruction. If he were to call out the men to drill sixteen days a year if necessary, or if he were to procure for them more efficient drill, I think he would add much more to the efficiency and usefulness of the force than by spending the money upon an additional troop of cavalry, or an additional battery, or increasing the number of the infantry. It will be noticed, besides, that the charge which the hon. gentleman is providing for by this Bill, will be a permanent charge, and not one which the hon. gentleman can easily relax at any moment. He establishes a battery at British Columbia, and the Department of Public Works will be at some expense having rooms and barracks and other accommodation provided for the battery; more men will be appointed for the necessary instruction, and there will be an addition to the permanent military staff in British Columbia as well as in connection with the troops of infantry to be enlisted at other points. A permanent charge will thus be imposed upon the country which will be difficult to remove hereafter. I would also like to ask the hon. Minister what object he has in enlisting permanently 750 men in addition to the present force; I do not see that this addition is absolutely required. It may be necessary for us to keep up "A" and "B" Batteries in order to protect the people in a time of civil commotion. It might even be necessary to have a nucleus of a Militia force in British Columbia; but, as hon. gentlemen will see, the expense to which the country is put at the present moment ought to be sufficient to meet

all these objects. But to add an expenditure of \$200,000 in enlisting 750 men, and taking them from active industrial pursuits when there is no present emergency, is something which I think the hon. gentleman would not have proposed if he had consulted the interests of the whole force, if he had consulted the public opinion of the country, or if he had consulted his own Major-General. The Major-General calls attention in his report to the small amount of drilling the men receive, and the small number of them that are trained. Let the hon. Minister of Militia adopt such reforms in the service as are in the directions suggested by these experienced officers—reforms which every one connected with the service would appreciate. In order to place my views on record, I move the following amendment, which I hope will command the approval of the House. That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be

*Resolved*,—That by Clause 21 of the said Bill it is proposed to authorize the enlistment for continuous service, in addition to the existing Batteries "A" and "B," of a third Battery of Artillery, a Troop of Cavalry, and three Companies of Infantry which will involve an increased permanent charge upon the Revenue of over \$2,000,000, in connection with the Militia,—That in the opinion of this House, if any increase in the charge for the Militia is to be made, the efficiency of the Force and the public good would be promoted by better provision for the training of the Active Militia, than by the proposed enlistment of a Battery of Artillery, a Troop of Cavalry and three Companies of Infantry, - and that the said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same, by omitting the provisions for the said proposed enlistment.

Mr. CARON. The manner in which my hon. friend has dealt with military matters since he began to devote attention to them, indicates the necessity which exists for getting up training schools, where the different branches of the service will be instructed in an efficient manner. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the manner in which he has taken to military life, because, from his first speech, one would have thought that he took no interest in military matters at all. I am glad to see that he is getting quite efficient, and I have no doubt that if he continues to qualify himself as he has been qualifying himself in the past, the Department will be ready to give him a certificate for his knowledge of military matters. But when he speaks of consulting the public opinion of this country, or the opinion of this House, I should like the hon. gentleman also to allow me, as Minister of Militia, to consult men who know what the Militia force of Canada is, and what is required for that force. If there is one clause in this Bill which is indispensable to the efficiency of the force it is this very clause which the hon. gentleman wishes me to strike out of the Bill; and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will say so himself, when he advances a little further in his military studies. When the Bill was up for the second reading every hon. gentleman who could express an opinion about the force was in favor of this clause. The hon. gentleman says that we now propose to enlist 750 men. He does not consider that the 750 men mentioned in the Bill included "A" and "B" Batteries. We are not adding 750 men; nor is the force to be, as some papers and some hon. gentlemen have stated, a standing army. It is to be an instructional corps, for the purpose of giving to the militiamen of Canada instruction in matters connected with infantry drill, such as "A" and "B" Batteries have given in connection with artillery drill. The Minister of Militia is not trying to get up a standing army for Canada. I believe it is no menace to any military nation in the world to say that Canada wishes to give to the infantry branch of her Militia service the same instruction as we have given to the artillery, and to every other branch of the service; and if there is any one clause in this Bill which is more important than another, it is this very clause twenty-one, which the hon. gentleman wishes to drop out. The hon. gentleman might just as well ask me to consent to the withdrawal of my Bill. This is, of all the clauses, the most indispensable for properly training the Militia force of Canada, as you, Mr. Speaker, as a military man, will acknowledge; and as no

other gentleman has objected to it other than my hon. friend opposite, who has commenced his military studies within a very short time, and who is doing uncommonly well, I have no doubt that after a little more time, he will see that this clause is the whole Bill, and that it is, of all the clauses, the one which we require to make the Militia force of Canada efficient. Without this clause, I can say that the expenditure for training purposes, though not entirely useless, would not produce those results which the Parliament and people of Canada would expect from the amount of money expended. But when we have these training schools established, hon. gentlemen will see that they will produce, for the infantry, exactly the same results which the artillery schools have produced for the artillery all over the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am quite aware that it is the duty of every Member of Parliament to support the Government in every effort to improve the defence of the country. I should be sorry, indeed, to criticise adversely the propositions of the Government respecting the force, unless I was thoroughly satisfied that the propositions were wrong. Now, it has been admitted for years that all we require in a Militia force is the nucleus of what would be required in the event of disturbances occurring on our borders, such as have occurred, or in the event of the Mother Country being unfortunately plunged into war in which we would have to take some part. The view I have always held is, that we ought to keep our military establishment in such a position that we should have a thoroughly trained corps of officers in the first place, and the means of training non-commissioned officers in the second place, so that we might be able at a day's notice to place competent men in charge of our volunteer force. Anything approaching the status of a standing army has not been thought necessary or advisable in this country. When "A" and "B" Batteries were established, it was contended, and I think very properly so, that however rapidly we might succeed in training the infantry force for service in the field, it would be next to impossible to train an artillery corps in sufficient time to be of practical service in the field. The establishment of these two batteries, therefore, while they have sometimes been criticised somewhat hostilely, I have always looked upon as necessary for the maintenance of order in the country, or the maintenance of order in the North-West. I think there was a general consensus of opinion that it could best be accomplished by a force of police; and if there is anything required for the maintenance of order in the older Provinces, it seems to me that it should be in the direction of a police force rather than a military force. What the three corps of infantry are established for, I am bound to say the hon. gentleman has not explained very satisfactorily. They are, he says, to give to the infantry similar training to what is given to the artillery; but the two cases are entirely different—there is no similitude between them whatever. As I have pointed out, the training of artillery is a difficult matter, and requires time, while the training of an infantry corps is a rapid process. The system of drill is changed, and is now much easier than it was formerly; the conditions are entirely changed. Now, I have not been able to see the necessity for the establishment of these three infantry corps, or for raising a troop of cavalry. The cavalry forces in recent wars have not been of material service, or of so much service as the mounted infantry, who perform the part occasionally of cavalry and occasionally of infantry. Their services are now limited to rapid movements, by which a small body of men may be transported quickly from one point to another. No one dreams now of anticipating another Balaklava charge in the face of an artillery fire; and during the late war in the United States the cavalry was of comparatively little use. But we do not anticipate any state of war, at any rate; and why this cavalry troop is to be raised is really more than I can com-

Mr. CARON,

prehend. What their duties are to be, where they are to be located, how they are to be maintained—nothing of that has been laid before the House; and I am bound to say that for these considerations I have the strongest possible sympathy with the motion made by the hon. member for West Middlesex. Besides, I do not think the subject has been brought before the House fairly. If it was the intention of the hon. Minister and the Government to create what is practically a standing army—it may be a small one, but still it is a standing army—they should have so informed the House; but the hon. Minister informs us now, that while the measure was called a Bill to consolidate the Militia Law, it is really a Bill to create a standing force, for he has told us that if this clause is struck out he will drop the Bill altogether, for he says that is the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill. Now it seems to me that a fair way to deal with this House would have been to have intimated the determination of the Government to increase the standing military force of the country, and to have given the reasons for so doing in introducing the Bill. But the Bill has been introduced apparently for a different purpose, and this clause which now turns out, by the confession of the hon. Minister of Militia, to be the real principle of the Bill, was introduced as a mere incident of the Bill. That is evidently not fair, and I trust the hon. gentleman will forego his intention at present of establishing this force, unless he is able to show us cogent reasons why our standing army should be increased.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite appreciate the remarks of the hon. gentleman, because, although we happen to disagree on political questions very frequently—more frequently than I would like—I have always found the hon. gentleman true to the principle that every country worthy of the name should have a force adequate to protect itself, to protect order, and to assume its position as a country. I have listened, therefore, to the hon. gentleman's remarks with great pleasure. I do not think, however, he has quite understood the purport of my hon. colleague's remarks. The Bill is a consolidation of the Militia Law. That is the principle of the Bill. My hon. friend most candidly stated, when introducing the Bill, that he considered those amendments of primary importance, or if not of primary, of the very greatest importance. My hon. friend who has just spoken has shown that he appreciates the importance of our having an efficient Militia. But an efficient Militia can only be obtained by efficient training. In days of old our Militia force had before them the example of the British army. We had large military forces at Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto and London, and the whole Militia body of Canada, the whole people of Canada, had an opportunity of seeing what soldiers were, and what soldiering and discipline meant. We have lost all that now, except the garrison at Halifax; we have no standard to work up to, and when this resolution admits that it is necessary there should be a provision for the training of an active Militia, it points really to the only mode, in my opinion, in which efficient training can be obtained. We have not the advantage of this standard to work up to. More than that, we have not the advantage of having in the country non-commissioned officers, trained soldiers, fit to train our Militia. Now it was one of the great incidental advantages of having portions of the British army stationed in Canada, that they left the most deserving men of their regiments in this country, men who had risen from the ranks by their intelligence and their soldier-like qualities, to be non-commissioned officers; and these men, seeing the advantages of settling in Canada, saved up their money in order to buy their discharge, or their friends in Canada bought their discharge, and we had a competent body of non-commissioned officers throughout Canada able to train our Militia. That advan-

tage is all gone, and when the hon. gentleman in this motion admits that we must have an active Militia, and that an active Militia is of no value unless trained—who is to train them? They cannot train each other. That would be the blind leading the blind. We must have drilled and trained men. It is quite true we have a Military College and the two batteries. Those train a certain number of officers able to take company command, or perhaps subaltern command, but the main-stay of any army, that upon which its efficiency depends, is the efficiency of the non-commissioned officers. Why the British army in the whole of its Peninsula service depended for its efficiency, as the Duke of Wellington admitted—that magnificent army which he said could do anything or go anywhere—upon the non-commissioned officers. These men cannot get their training by intuition of 16, 18 or 24 days in the year. They may in that time learn a little drill, but they cannot learn discipline, nor organization, nor the knowledge which will enable them to govern men. The proposition in this Bill is simply to have a training school for non-commissioned officers. The short service system which has been introduced in England by Mr. Cardwell, now Lord Cardwell, has been very successful in the sense of making the army popular, and inducing a great number of young men to join for three years who could not afford to give seven or twenty-one years to the service. But while it has been beneficial in that sense, it has failed to a wonderful extent in not supplying the requisite number of efficient non-commissioned officers, and the military authorities are now at their wits end—I have occasion, as a matter of curiosity, to read all their reports—to get a sufficient staff of non-commissioned officers. The commissioned officers are all well enough in their way. They are all absolutely necessary, but still not all the skill from the commander-in-chief down to the ensign will be sufficient to make an efficient army unless you have a well-trained efficient staff of non-commissioned officers. It is for this purpose, in the absence of the supply we used to get from the British Army, that this small additional expense is to be incurred. It is in order that the young men of the separate infantry corps should be trained here, and when they leave supply in the different sections of the country what is absolutely necessary, a non-commissioned force to manage company training. The basis of all military organization is company training, and you cannot have efficient company training unless you have well-trained non-commissioned officers to carry out in every-day life, in camp, in barracks, in drill, the commands of the commissioned officers. At this small expense it is proposed we will have a small troop of cavalry using to a certain extent the cavalry horses which are required by the batteries, and where will be trained the non-commissioned officers required for cavalry movements, and the same with respect to infantry corps. Just as the hon. gentleman established—I must say against my opinion—the Kingston Military College—and I am not too proud to say that college has been a success—to train commissioned officers, we propose to have a body of trained non-commissioned officers to command our Militia; and, if the expense were double what it is, it would not be too great to secure the object to be gained by it. Just as the Military College is to furnish the commissioned officers, so these three infantry schools and this one troop of cavalry are to give a perpetual means of supplying non-commissioned officers, sergeants and corporals, to train and drill our Militia. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we undertook this matter, the main attack that was made—and there was some foundation for it, perhaps a good deal of foundation for it—was that too large a proportion of money was expended on the headquarters staff, or on the district staff, and that a sufficient sum of money was not given for training the soldiery. Well, this is a step in the other direction. Ever since we have taken hold of it the Government has been, my hon.

friend has been, his predecessor has been, reducing the expense of the staff.

Mr. CARON. About \$11,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The number of District Adjutant-Generals has been reduced, the number of Brigade Majors has been reduced, and this is an attempt to make the Militia really efficient. The annual vote that Parliament can afford to give for training the Militia is in the discretion of Parliament; but this is an attempt to carry out the idea that the active Militia shall be trained by efficient non-commissioned officers. And how are they to be supplied, unless you have some school for them? Suppose you have no such school, you have no army, you have no means of getting a supply of sergeants and corporals. You call out a number of young fellows to form a company. One looks at the other, the other looks at the third, and not one of them knows anything about drill. Their officers may be young men coming from the Military College; they know their drill, but they see that they have only civilians before them, who do not know anything about soldiering, and how can an officer select the proper men to be non-commissioned officers? But the moment the colonel knows that he has got within his battalion a certain number of men who have been trained in these infantry schools, or in this cavalry troop, and who have left those schools with a good conduct certificate as being good soldiers and good men, then he knows at once that he has got the means of bringing the men into active and efficient drill. I cannot fancy any proposition more efficient in its way, and less expensive. But you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are scarcely doing our duty to England by the amount we have hitherto expended. My hon. friend from East York remembers that, in 1865, a certain arrangement was made. I was one of a party that went home on behalf of the Government, and his former leader and great personal friend, and my colleague, Mr. Brown, went with us; and it was then understood that the then four Provinces should expend not less than \$1,000,000 a year in keeping up the Militia force, an auxiliary force, in the then four Provinces. Well, Sir, we have not spent that sum yearly. Some years it has been \$800,000, some years less, and some years a little more; but we never have really worked up to the fair engagement we made with Her Majesty's Government in England, when they handed over all their fortifications and all their ordnance lands to Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. What of the Mounted Police?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh! The Mounted Police is a different affair. It arose afterwards, it arose out of our own ambition to get the western country. That was not involved in the discussion with Her Majesty's Government. The Mounted Police was formed for Canadian purposes, and not with any view of carrying out the arrangement made with Her Majesty's Government in 1865. Now, with respect to the cavalry. My hon. friend opposite objected to our paying a troop of cavalry, because cavalry had not been so powerful for warlike purposes as it had been formerly. Well, that was the current idea until the Franco-German war; and it is now known and admitted, not only by German and French military men, but by disinterested writers in England and other countries, that if there was one thing more than another that contributed to the successful advance of the German armies into France, it was the Uhlans, or the eyes of the army, who paraded the whole of France, who scattered and opened out as a lady would open out her fan. They were the eyes of the army; and in this country, in case of war, just such a force is needed—not a solid and heavy dragoon service, but a cavalry like the Uhlans, or the mounted infantry, which are like cavalry in fact—men carrying light arms on light horses, and good shots, being carried to a particular point in a very short period of time, and then at once, either firing from the saddle or dismount-

ing, become infantry again. Now, all that training we can have, and at a very small expense indeed. I really do hope that there will not be any objection to this provision, which is not expensive in itself. There have been very considerable savings in the staff that will go far to contribute to any additional expense that these schools and this troop of cavalry may involve, and it will insure efficiency, because it will give you the eyes of the army, really the main-stay of the army, and an efficient body of non-commissioned officers.

Mr. VAIL. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the right hon. Minister. This subject is not a new one, but it has been discussed from time to time, even so long ago as when I had the honor of being at the head of the Department. I remember that the Inspector of Militia mentioned the subject at that time; it was mentioned in this House, and there was such a noise made in the House and out of the House about it, and in the press from one end of the Dominion to the other, that we found it was useless to think of such a thing, or to do anything which had at all the appearance of creating a standing army. I agree with a great deal which the hon. Minister has said, and, among other things, I entirely concur in the view that the back-bone of a Militia force, or standing army, is the non-commissioned officers. There can be no doubt about that point; and if I can be convinced that we have not the schools of sufficient size and accommodation to educate those men in their duties, I would say, at once, that the hon. Minister of Militia was perfectly right in introducing this clause, and providing for additional schools. If this proposition had been brought forward when I had the honor of filling the position of Minister, I think we would have had a much better excuse than the hon. Minister has at the present time, because at that time the batteries were full and we could not provide for the education of the men applying. In several instances applications remained over from month to month before we could provide room in the batteries for them, and, therefore, we might have been justified at that time in providing additional schools. But if I am correctly informed—and I think the report of Lieutenant-Colonel Irwin will support my position—the position of the batteries at the present time are not such as would warrant additional expenditure of this kind. I observe, from the returns, that pretty much all the men trained in the batteries last year, particularly in "A" Battery, were all short-course men. Colonel Irwin, in his report, says:

"To carry on these schools of military instruction successfully, the average intelligence of non-commissioned officers and men should be of a high order. At present, at Quebec, owing to the want of men to carry on the unavoidable duties, it is found necessary in many cases to enlist recruits, some of whom can neither read nor write, and others whose general education is so defective as to prevent their ever being employed to instruct others."

There are other references in that officer's report which are calculated to convince that the schools are not at all full. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has stated the reason infantry instruction in the batteries is not necessary, but at all events they are infantry schools to a certain extent. I am rather disposed to think that those batteries can instruct the men who will require to receive instruction for the next eight or ten years to come, at least, and provide accommodation for them. If it could be shown that the accommodation was less than was required, there would be very good reason for the proposal, and I would be very happy to support the hon. Minister, because my desire is to make the force as perfect as possible; and I feel a little diffidence in opposing any proposal of this kind, for fear that it may be supposed that I desire to throw impediments in the way of the hon. Minister in his efforts to improve the force. There never, however, was a time in the history of this country when we required additional military schools

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

less than at the present time. This is an unnecessary expenditure; it is an expenditure which will be fastened on the country for three years at least, and until the Act is repealed we shall have a standing army to all intents and purposes. The cost is said to be about \$200,000. We know what that means; we know that it is impossible to fill up the rank and file in British Columbia, for example, at 50 cts., or 60 cts. a day. That is an expensive place to live and wages are high, and if a battery of artillery is to be established there it will prove a very expensive corps and next year, probably, the hon. Minister will come down with an estimate for an additional sum of \$50,000 or \$60,000. I should like to support the Bill, but under the circumstances I will have to vote for the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) negatived on the following division:—

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Anger,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Béchar,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bernier,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Innes,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (St. John),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Keefer,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Watson,
Davies,	McMillan (Huron),	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Wells,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—60.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudrenil),
Allison,	Dickinson,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Dodd,	McDougald,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	McGreavy,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Massue,
Barnard,	Farrow,	Moffat,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Orton,
Benson,	Fréchette,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gagné,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Giguault,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Pope,
Blanchet,	Girouard (Kent),	Ray,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Richey,
Bourbeau,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Rykert,
Brecken,	Haggart,	Scott,
Bryson,	Hall,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hawkins,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hay,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hesson,	Tassé,
Carling,	Hickey,	Taylor,
Caron,	Homer,	Tilley,
Casgrain,	Hurteau,	Tupper (Pictou),
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Vain,
Coetigan,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Wallace (Albert),
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Landry,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Lesage,	Williams,
Daoust,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Westm'land),
De Beaujeu,	McDonald (Cap Breton),	Wright.—113.
Dessaulniers,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not rise to move a motion, but to ask the hon. Minister of Militia a question. Will the hon. gentleman tell us about what time the annual camps will be held this year? And while I am putting this question, I would like to urge on the hon. gentleman the import-



ance of giving to the battalions that are to go out, as ample notice as he possibly can, so that the rural companies can be got together in advance of the day for going out, which will aid them very materially when they get to the camp.

Mr. CARON. I can tell my hon. friend that the day has not yet been fixed; but the time when the camps will be held will be selected so as to meet, as far as possible, the convenience of the force, and at a time when it will be easiest to get the force together.

Mr. THOMPSON. If I might just suggest, I would say that not earlier than the 18th of June would suit Ontario better, as there is likely to be a very backward spring.

Bill read the third time and passed.

### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

39. Salaries of officers and contingencies of Library. \$20,260.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Please explain the increase of \$800.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under an arrangement made a year or two since, it was provided that the Library officials should have the statutory allowance of \$50, in common with civil servants.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is this in accordance with the last report of the Library Committee?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is in accordance with the report which was made last Session, or the Session before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But a report was made this Session recommending some special increases.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, that was not brought up since the Estimates were prepared; if there is to be any addition, it will appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the Government do not intend to accept the recommendation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has not been under consideration in Council yet.

40. Printing, binding and distributing the Laws. \$12,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Under this head, I think that the Government should reconsider the mode of distributing the Statutes. I believe it is expected, or intended, that every magistrate in the country should have a copy of the Dominion Statutes. I know, however, that there seems to be some difficulty in getting them to their destination; but I am not sufficiently familiar with the rule adopted in distributing them, to criticise it properly or intelligently. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance could tell us, or we might get that information at some future stage. I know I am frequently applied to by magistrates for copies of the Statutes, and I want to know under what arrangement they are distributed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think that they are supplied to every magistrate, but I cannot state the mode of distribution. I think, however, that they are sent from the Department of the Secretary of State, in cases, for distribution to the different Provinces or the different cities, as the case may be; but I will enquire. Still, I do not think they go to every magistrate. If they do, I think the number would increase enormously every year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The mode formerly in vogue under the old Province of Canada was to send a copy of the Statutes to the clerk of the peace of the county for each magistrate, to be by him distributed. My impression is that we have never sent them to the magistrates of the country generally, but only to the chief officers and libraries.

Mr. BOWELL. That is all.

Mr. ROSS. May be the hon. Minister of Finance will bring down, on Concurrence, some information on that point, which will, perhaps, save hon. gentlemen opposite and myself some trouble.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. An Order of the House requires that the distribution be placed on the Table within fifteen days of the meeting of the House. If this has been complied with it will show the distribution; but I am afraid it has been neglected of late years, though formerly it was brought down regularly.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think that we have had such a report.

42. Salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery... \$2,100.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is an increase of \$100. This officer has been receiving \$2,000 for a number of years, and as he has been faithful and efficient in the discharge of his duties we thought he was entitled to this increase.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the services of this officer last night were such as fully to deserve the increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not object to make the increase \$200 for so worthy an object.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say the hon. gentleman has expended considerable more money than that to secure a member to support him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ah, that is not fair.

44. Miscellaneous printing..... \$2,000.00

Mr. ROSS. I have already called the attention to the anomaly of having two items for printing—one for printing, and the other for miscellaneous printing; but I see the item is repeated in this year's Estimates. The greater portion of the item, I believe, is devoted to printing the Budget Speech of the hon. Finance Minister, but it might as well be taken out of the other vote.

45. For the purchase of law reports required by the Supreme Court..... \$1,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. I think that it is important that we should know the policy of the Government on this subject. The vote is a new one, and I had supposed that it had been put in a little inaccurately, and that it was intended to supply text books and such of the reports as are not supplied under the present arrangement. I should be glad to know whether it is proposed in future that current reports shall be supplied by the vote of the House as connected with the Supreme Court library, and also current text books, in which case the wording of the item should be changed. Our proposition was that a strictly Law Library, comprising the reports and text books, should be kept down in the Supreme Court room, and I presume this sum would be sufficient. In the Law Library of the Province of Ontario, the expenditure has been, for the last four years, about \$9,000, or a little over \$2,000 a year; but as we pay a duty on the books, that takes away a considerable portion of the annual sum, so that I should suppose that between \$1,500 and \$2,000 would be adequate for the purpose of keeping the Law Library in the thoroughly efficient condition in which it should be kept. Therefore, I do not object to the vote of \$1,500 in the first instance to try the experiment; but it is important to know what the policy of the Government is with regard to this vote in the future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that the Government have seriously considered their policy on the subject; but I think the recommendation of the report of

the Library Committee is a sensible one. I have no objection, if the hon. Minister of Finance has not, to change the item so as to make it read law books.

46. For binding newspapers, &c..... \$1,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This was formerly paid out of the vote for the Library, and it is expended by the librarian in stitching and binding the papers which are received and kept for the use of the House. The Committee recommend that a specific vote should be taken for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. The Library Committee are specially anxious that the vote of \$2,000 should be specially allocated to the purpose to which we propose to devote it; and I would suggest that we make the vote for the Library generally \$9,000, and \$1,000 for the binding, which would make \$10,000 altogether for the Library. In that case the \$2,000 might be put in the Supplementary Estimates for the American volumes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; we can do that.

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

### After Recess.

47. To meet expenses in connection with care of Archives..... \$6,000.00

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I see that there is an increase of \$1,000, and, in looking at the Public Accounts, I find it very meagre as to how the Archives are cared for. I noticed that last year \$2,500 was paid to Sir A. T. Galt for disbursements, and \$1,500 to J. C. Taché. Will the hon. gentleman explain this increase, and for what purpose the appropriation was made to Sir A. T. Galt?

Mr. POPE. This money was paid out by Sir A. T. Galt to parties engaged in copying documents in London.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, the whole of this money is practically paid for copying?

Mr. POPE. No; I will explain. The increase is because we found that the former appropriation was insufficient. A considerable portion of this money is spent here in collecting old records of the early history of Canada; the largest part is spent in copying. We have now over 3,000 volumes, which we have collected from the different Provinces, and I am sorry that we did not copy more of the early records than we did in Quebec, and we ought to have more than one copy of these documents. The increase of \$1,000 is for the purpose of obtaining copies of some records in Paris.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I believe the Archives are under the care of Mr. Brymner. In his report he calls attention to the catalogue, a very admirable one, indeed. I see that the archivist complains of the want of room. I have not had time yet to visit the place where the Archives are kept, and I do not know how much room he has at his disposal. It is very unfortunate that we have not room in the Library for these Archives. It is somewhat inconvenient, when one wants to refer to a certain book of reference, to have to go to another building for it. I do not know whether there is room in the Library or not, but I think it is unfortunate that our literature cannot all be kept in one building, where it would be easy of reference.

Mr. POPE. Of course there is no room in the Library for them. These records, however, ought to be kept in a fire-proof room. I hope we shall have very soon a better and more accessible room than we have now. The hon. gentleman knows that these records are more for the historian than they are books of reference for gentlemen attending Parliament, and, therefore, I think it is better to keep them in a fire-proof room than in the Library.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

48. To meet expenses in connection with *Patent Record*. \$8,500.00

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I should like to ask whether the printing of the *Patent Record* is done by tender, or whether it is always given to the Burland Lithographic Company in Montreal. I see that \$7,257 was expended last year in publishing this paper. I am strongly of opinion that that is money wasted; I do not think the work is worth one-quarter of that amount to anybody. This year it is proposed to take an additional \$1,300 for the work. I think the hon. Minister might investigate that matter, and bring about a reduction.

Mr. POPE. I can say to the hon. gentleman, it is not a foolish outlay of money. People engaged in this line all over the country think a great deal of this publication, and the hon. Mr. Mills said it was one of the best things he knew of. In 1872, I arranged with Mr. Burland, who was then the only man who could have done this work, to publish it for \$4,000. In 1876, the number of patents had increased very largely, and the late Government increased the amount to \$7,200. I do not think it is a very extraordinary price. This year the work is made double size, and the drawings are much larger and plainer than before. The number of extra copies that have to be printed is very large, indeed; more than enough to cover the cost of the increase. There are very few who will agree with my hon. friend that this is of no consequence.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I never could see any practical utility in it. I think the paper has no circulation at all. Has the hon. gentleman any subscribers to it? Or is the public charged with the whole expenditure? If the book is as valuable as he says, surely it will have some subscribers. I believe the *Canada Gazette*, which is absolutely necessary as an official means of communication, has a few subscribers, and almost every journal connected with any particular trade or profession has its subscribers.

Mr. POPE. We pay this whole amount for the number of copies we get, and Mr. Burland sells other copies. We do not peddle them, and believe we are acting in the interests of the country in getting this publication.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How many copies do we get?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say just now.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think each hon. member of the House gets two copies—that will make about 400; the members of the Senate get some—say 600 in all, for which Mr. Burland gets \$7,257, and, besides, sells so many more copies. Thus we place him in a position whereby he makes something in the form of a casual advantage out of a publication for which we pay.

Mr. BAIN. I am aware that these records are distributed to us regularly. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us if they are distributed to any institutions, or to patentees.

Mr. POPE. They are not distributed to patentees. They are distributed to institutions of the country. Whenever called for we try to accommodate the public with them, and at the end of the year they are bound and remain on record.

Mr. BAIN. Are they sent to the Mechanics' Institutes?

Mr. ROSS. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It would be desirable that the hon. gentleman should see that the Mechanics' Institutes get them. Some sort of record is no doubt necessary, but there might be a cheaper method of obtaining it—by keeping it, for instance, in the office.

Mr. ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman, on Concurrence, give us a statement of the number issued and the mode of distribution?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. PICKARD. The copies I have received I have always sent to manufacturers, and I know of different establish-

ments to whom I have forwarded these books that had not before seen the patents and purchased the patent right, and now manufacture the articles.

49. To meet expenses in connection with preparation of criminal statistics..... \$4,000.00

Mr. ROSS. Can the hon. gentleman tell us whether, in this volume, there will be a comparative statement of the statistics in this and previous volumes? Comparative statements is what gives value to statistical works.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is quite right, and I will see to it.

50. To meet expenses in connection with Census (revote \$20,000)..... \$45,000.00

Mr. ROSS. When are we going to get the next volume of the Census? It is now two years, or more, since the Census was taken, and we have been furnished only with a small volume—not a very heavy thing for a Department such as that over which the hon. gentleman presides with so much dignity and ability. I am surprised that the arduous labors of the Department should have produced such little results in so long a time. The United States took their Census in 1880, and their volumes are complete by this time.

Mr. POPE. No. The first volume is just out.

Mr. ROSS. A large, ponderous volume, containing more than ten times the amount of statistics which are contained in the hon. gentleman's first volume, has been issued by the United States Government. Here we are anxious to make comparison as to the progress of manufactures and trade, and we have no information by which to do it. I think some of the newspapers gave us advanced reports of a few cases; but besides these we have had no information of the progress of industry in this country. I think the hon. gentleman, who is getting \$50,000 a year, and even \$100,000 some years, ought to put on a little more pressure, and let us have these Census statistics when they are fresh. In another year they will be stale and uninteresting, and the data on which comparisons might be made will have become useless.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in respect to the United States Census, which was taken a year before ours. The first volume has just been issued, and they have as large a staff, comparatively, as we have. This year our staff has not been heavy, because I thought we could do it cheaper and still have it out in good time. It was my intention to distribute this volume some time ago, and I have pressed it as hard as I could. It is already printed, and in the hands of the binder, and I presume it may be distributed to the members of this House in a week or ten days. We have been largely delayed on account of the pressure of work upon the Queen's printers, otherwise it would now be ready.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the Census contain comparisons with the results of the Census of 1871 and 1861?

Mr. POPE. The last volume will contain such comparative statements, but not the first volume. We hope to have the final volume out during this year.

Mr. CHARLTON. With reference to the question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that only the first volume of the United States Census, taken in 1880, has been distributed, I may say that all the information contained in that Census has been issued as a compendium, being a ponderous volume of 1,500 pages. Several volumes have been issued, but the compendium contains all the information in an abridged form, and contains comparative tables of the Census of 1880 and the Census of the three previous decades. With reference to the Census of Canada, the value of such a work is greater almost immediately after it is taken, than after a lapse of years. There are many things

in connection with that Census that we want to know almost immediately after it is taken, and to oblige us to wait two or three years before we can obtain any information, is a grievance that ought to be remedied. For instance, in discussion this year we had no means of ascertaining what the productions of the manufactures of Canada were. That was something we ought to have known within twelve months' time of the return of the Census schedules. That information we ought to have had before now; and I hope the Minister of Agriculture, if he should be in his place when another Census is taken—which I cannot say I really wish should be the case—I hope he will give us more prompt work than he has done this time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We must all agree in the remarks of the last speaker, and without desiring to find unnecessary fault, it does strike me that the hon. Minister of Agriculture could have pushed forward this third volume that he determined to take up, before the second volume, in order the sooner to give us the information it contained, with more despatch than he seems to have exercised. I think it ought to have been in our hands prior to engaging in the last Tariff discussion. We were very much in the dark on account of the information that was withheld. Now, he has given us in his report a few facts gleaned from that volume, and they are most startling in their nature, when we look at them, and it seems to me it would have been of great interest to the country, and that we might have all derived much profit, if we had even had a few weeks ago these tables that are now before us in the hon. gentleman's report. For instance, let me call his attention to this fact: In the comparative statement he gives us between 1871 and 1881, he tells us correctly that in 1871 the manufacturing industries of this country had \$77,764,020 invested, and that the product of that investment amounted to \$221,617,773, or, in other words, under the Census of 1871 every dollar of capital employed had a product of \$3 representing it. Now, we have added to that capital during the past ten years by \$80,812,161, but have we produced \$3 on every dollar invested? No; the hon. Minister of Agriculture gives us as the product of this extra \$80,000,000, only an amount of \$78,122,339. There is a little error in making up the figures, as I have found the exact figures are \$81,122,339. Now, I think there is something rather startling in that. The capital employed in our manufacturing industries in 1871 had a product of \$3 for every \$1 invested; while the extra \$80,000,000 added in the past ten years has only a product of about \$1 to every \$1 invested. The hon. gentleman has omitted in this table, while giving us comparisons of the capital invested, and of the values, to give us the number of hands employed. I think he might very well have given us that; it would have been of great use to us in discussing the questions that we have discussed. I merely allude to this in order to point out how desirable it was, and how desirable it must have been in the eyes of the hon. Minister himself, if he had given us that in this third volume that he took up before completing the second one; and I am afraid that even now we shall not have this third volume in time to be of any use to us this Session. Another point he gives us, which is of still more interest, and that is with reference to the comparative increase of population in the cities and in the rural portions of our country. We find that the total population has been increased by 689,780, and the population in our cities and towns of over 5,000 has increased in that period 229,997, or one third of the whole increase of the population of the Dominion is to be found in some thirty-seven cities and towns of over 5,000 inhabitants. Now, it seems to me that there is a lesson for us in these figures, and that they invite us to look forward a little and to ask whether this is a common danger in the undue tendency, which perhaps is being unduly stimulated, of our towns drawing

not only from the rural population, but from those who newly arrive on our shores. All this is very well as long as capital is remunerative, as long as industries are fully employed, but should stagnation in business occur, we are not in a position, and they are not in a position, to stand it as well as they would have been able to stand it if they had been engaged in other pursuits. There are two pages of information that the hon. Minister has compiled in his report here in order to show that something has been done in the compilation of his third volume. It was, above all things, unfortunate that this volume should have been in our hands before the discussion on the items took place. No doubt there are other important facts to be gleaned from the Census, and I will not charge the hon. Minister with anything in the direction of supposing that he would not be able to strengthen his position by having the volume in the hands of members. But I do not hold the hon. gentleman entirely blameless, for he did not use sufficient diligence in endeavoring to place this volume, in question, in the hands of members at the opening of the Session. If two years had not elapsed since the work was entered upon, my complaint might be thought unreasonable; but having arranged to place this volume in the hands of members at the opening of the Session, an addition to the staff by the hon. Minister would have been approved by the House.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. member for Brant were conscientious in the statement made, and had looked back at the history of past Censuses, he would have given credit to the hon. Minister of Agriculture in connection with the present Census. More valuable information has been given to the country, within little more than a year, than has been given in the history of Canada before. The hon. member for Brant is unfair when he says the hon. Minister did not discharge his duty, because he discharged his duty, not only expeditiously, but satisfactory to the country in this respect; and, except from the two hon. members who have last spoken, we have not heard any such charge made either in the House or in the country. The hon. gentleman has not given fair consideration to the fact that increased capital was invested in our manufacturing industries during the last two or three years. He has endeavored to show that the \$31,000,000 of capital invested in our industries ought to have been distributed over ten years, when he knows that during the seven years preceding the Census no extension of our investments of capital took place, and that it was not until 1880-81 that any real increase occurred.

Mr. PATERSON. The capital more than doubled in that time.

Mr. HESSON. I venture to make the assertion that the whole increase of investments is attributable to the introduction of the National Policy. There is no denying that fact, and no hon. gentleman can substantiate any statements to the contrary. No capitalist would invest between 1873 and 1879, and there was no extension of capital in that period.

Mr. PATERSON. The capital doubled in ten years.

Mr. HESSON. The capital has doubled within the last three years.

Mr. PATERSON. The returns for the last three years do not appear in the Census.

Mr. HESSON. I repeat that the increased investments have been largely made during the last two years. The hon. member for Brant knows that, and no town in Ontario proves the fact more than Brantford. When the hon. gentleman spoke of the increase in population, he mentioned that one-third of the whole increase was concentrated in cities and towns, and the hon. gentleman would seem to desire that there should not be any great centres of population from which beneficial influences might extend to other parts of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the Dominion. He would seem to desire that there should not be any central point where people might invest their capital and surplus earnings. Did the hon. gentleman mean to say that the rural population in the county of Brant are suffering in consequence of the concentration of capital in Brantford, or that the people of Brantford and the rural population are in a worse position than formerly? The hon. gentleman knows that is not so, that the rural population are in a better position than they were ten years ago, and more especially has that been the case during the last three or four years. If the hon. gentleman does not know that, he should know it. I do not know a farm unoccupied, nor does the hon. gentleman know one, and this is due to the National Policy, and the value of the farms has increased in consequence of that policy. I know it is so in my own county, which adjoins the hon. gentleman's county. The hon. gentleman should act fairly, and give credit where credit is due. I must say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has made greater efforts to give information within a reasonable time than has ever been done previously.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman might be satisfied with knowing that his own town has declined in population since the National Policy was brought into force. The principal manufactures which flourished there before, have since ceased to exist.

Mr. HESSON. I may say this: that Stratford has doubled its population in ten years, and I do not think the hon. member for East York should complain because cities and towns should double their population in ten years, but the fact should give him pleasure.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not say it had doubled its population, but that its population had decreased under the National Policy, and the hon. gentleman knows it perfectly well.

Mr. HESSON. It has not decreased under the National Policy. It has increased very largely.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It has decreased.

Mr. HESSON. I deny it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not only had the population decreased, but the manufactures which flourished there before, have since stopped; and yet the hon. gentleman is not fair enough to state the facts in regard to the matter.

Mr. HESSON. I challenge the hon. gentleman to state a single case in my town and county where the population has decreased, or where a factory has closed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can give the hon. gentleman cases in his own town.

Mr. POPE. I will not enter into a discussion of the National Policy; but I will say this: that the hon. member for Brant has not put the case fairly. He has complained because he did not get the population of the cities until now.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not complain.

Mr. POPE. I will allude to one point, and it is this: that I have labored under some little difficulty during the last year. My deputy, a most valuable and most efficient officer, one of whom I cannot speak too highly, and whose loss I feel is almost irreparable, has been unable to be in the office during the whole of last year. These things have thrown more work on me and others; and has required stricter care on my part than would have been the case, had that gentleman been there. I depended very much on him in regard to the Census—and in fact entirely—together with one or two others under his direction. I have been deprived of his services, and I think there is no reasonable cause for complaint. The Census has been got out considerably earlier and with much

less expense, although we had a much larger territory to go over, than was the case with the Census of 1871; and if it is got out earlier, and a year or two in advance of the former Census, I do not think that the hon. member for Brant has very much to complain of. I hope that we will be able to complete the Census by October. I feel quite sure that the next volume will then be completed, and if so, I think that the period is reasonable. My hon. friend from North Norfolk knows very well—if he knows anything at all about it—that what he said about the American Census is not correct, and but one of its volumes has appeared. Advance sheets have been issued from the office in Washington, it is true, but only one volume is now published, there is no doubt about that fact; and their Census was taken in 1880.

Mr. PATERSON. I am sure that I, in common with everyone else, will regret very much, and am disposed to make all allowance for, the unfortunate illness to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I had overlooked that matter and forgotten it, but still we feel that the work must go on, and our business is to ask that it proceed. I will not take up much time in attending to the hon. member for North Perth, because I think that, perhaps, the Minister of Agriculture is still Minister of Agriculture, and I have fancied that notwithstanding that several claimants have set up for his position, I believe he is quite as capable of explaining anything that requires explanation in his Department as is the hon. member for North Perth. The hon. gentleman may feel a little irritated of course, because in his party journals his name is not mentioned as the coming man for that Department, and he may have taken this means of advertising himself. I have seen the name of the hon. member for Centre Wellington mentioned; in fact, I believe a paper in my own town has the credit of first suggesting his fitness and capacity for it, and since my hon. friend from East Huron demonstrated to a conclusion that hens lay more eggs and cows give more milk since the National Policy, the hon. gentleman is mentioned in this connection; but I have not heard that the hon. member for North Perth has any of the press favoring him so far. I have no doubt that his loquacity of expression, and thought to-night, and the able manner in which he discussed the question, and the clearness with which he took his position, and the accuracy which he displayed in all his statements, and the infallible correctness of his reasoning, were something beautiful. You remember he laid down that I was very unfair. I knew very well that no capital was invested and we could not expect any capital to be invested, in Canada, during the ten years preceding 1880.

Mr. HESSON. The seven years.

Mr. PATERSON. This was a moral impossibility; I spoke with reference to the increase of capital during precisely those ten years when it precisely increased a little more than double; and I am sure the hon. gentleman will, at any rate, have to know a little more of the subject he is talking about, before we can accept him as a worthy successor of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who did not venture on such a line of statement. He prepared the tables and gave them to us. I know well that \$77,000,000 in round numbers of capital were invested in 1871, and \$158,000,000 in 1881, during the ten years when the hon. member for North Perth says there was no capital invested, and when no one could expect it to be invested. The hon. gentleman says that the increase of capital took place during the last two or three years, showing lamentable ignorance on the part of the hon. gentleman, because we could not possibly discuss that increase of capital which could not possibly be found in a Census compiled at a date prior to those years. With wonderful clearness on a point which I have only touched, the hon. gentleman discussed this subject; and I must say I will award the palm to the hon. member for Centre Wellington

if there must be a change, because I was unable either to accept the convincing logic and statement of facts of the hon. member for North or East Huron the other night any more than to accept the statements and explanations and alleged facts given by the hon. member for North Perth. The hon. member is very fond of rising and lecturing hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and he occasionally alludes to his conscience. He speaks of hon. members on that side of the House as if all the conscience was located with the pure and immaculate hon. members of his side of the House, and he seems to have the opinion that no one on this side of the House possesses conscientious feelings; but after indulging in that strain he failed to point out the slightest inaccuracy on the part of any hon. gentleman whose conscience he impugned. That has been his course, however, and I suppose that it will still continue to be his habit. There seems to be something uneasy within him, impelling him to rise, and take a hand in, if I may use the expression, on any subject, whether conversant with it or not. Of course, I am able to stand it; and I am quite willing to do so on this occasion because of the free advertisement which he gave to my own town. I am free, and glad to confess, that it never prospered so well as is now the case, and any one who says I found fault because the population of our cities and towns are increasing, is misconstruing my words. I simply pointed to it as a lesson, and a matter of information that did contain a lesson, which was worthy of thought and consideration; and I pointed out, that no danger was to be feared, as long as the good times existed; but that there was some danger in times of depression, of having over crowded cities and towns instead of having the people scattered through the rural parts. And when I tell hon. gentlemen that this is to-day engaging the attention of the Labor Council of the Province of Ontario, that they have represented that for every mechanic or artisan coming into the country, another must go out of it, it will be seen, at any rate, that their view is that we are increasing the population of the cities and towns as fast as is desirable in the interest of the great class of mechanics and laborers, and of those who earn their living by their day's work. In that regard I simply alluded to a fact, and illustrated it as one of the reasons why I pressed for an early return of this volume, whose lessons, contained in every page, might be taken up and learned, and turned to good practice and use by us.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman's reasoning is probably clear to himself, but so far as I am personally concerned, allow me to say I am not at all ambitious to succeed the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Whilst the hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for Centre Wellington is a more likely candidate for that position than myself, and that I was not mentioned, I would first desire to say this: The hon. gentleman does not lead the press of this country, and in my own town I am happy to say that my organ supports me, and names me for that position.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman takes it back and begs my pardon. I am perfectly satisfied to have given him now the knowledge which he would have possessed if he had read the public press generally; but as he reads only one side, I can easily understand that he does not know all that is going on in the country. The hon. gentleman reads me a lecture as to my presumed knowledge of the matter under discussion; but I think I have a right to assume that I know as much about it as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I have been as long in the country as he has, and I have had as much experience, not only as a farmer, but as a business man. I know his intention was to insinuate that the hon. Minister of Agriculture had been negligent in the discharge of his duties, and had not given information to the country at the

proper time. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show how it was possible to give that information sooner, and I challenge him to point to any past period in the history of the country when information was given so readily, and so freely, as it is now given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. No hon. gentleman on this side of the House would at all like to see the hon. member step down and out of his present position, and the hon. gentleman may reconcile himself to this fact, that so long as the hon. Minister of Agriculture looks after his Department as carefully as he does now, he will not fall under the censure of the country, and the people will be satisfied that he is doing his duty. The impression which the hon. gentleman tried to leave upon the minds of hon. members was that the concentration of population and business in the cities and towns was an injurious thing, and should be taken into serious consideration. I take issue with the hon. gentleman upon that point, and I think other hon. members will also take issue with him. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there is not a single farm which is fit to work in Ontario which is not occupied, or a single farm unoccupied now that was occupied before; and he knows also that the tendency at the present time is to have farming done on a very large scale. This being the case there cannot be so large a rural population as there would be otherwise, but still he cannot say that the rural population has fallen off in Ontario, because he knows perfectly well that while the increase has been in the towns and cities, the rural constituencies have not lost. If we are to have great hearts of population and commerce, from which the pulsations of trade are to flow out through the country, hon. gentlemen will congratulate themselves and the country that the population of our cities and towns is increasing.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, since we are to get the third volume of the Census in a short time, when we are likely to get the second volume, and if there is to be any change in the second as compared with the first? I notice that the Census is compiled in a way that makes reference difficult, as the counties are not alphabetically arranged as they are in the United States. Again, I find that there is a table near the close of the volume giving the villages and towns, but they are not alphabetically arranged, as I think they should be. In preparing our Census, and sending it abroad, it would be more creditable to the Department, and add distinction to the hon. Minister himself, that the population and other statistics should be arranged and compiled upon the most approved system.

Mr. POPE. It is the second or last volume to which I have already referred as being likely to be completed in October.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will that volume contain any information as to the number of immigrants who have left our country? We have positive cognizance of that emigration, but we have not the negative. There are a large number of French Canadian citizens who have left for the other side, and the population of that race in the United States has gone up to 700,000, which is one-half the entire population of the Province of Quebec.

51. To meet expenses in connection with the Dominion Exhibition ..... \$10,000.00

Mr. ROSS. I see there is an increase of \$5,000 in this vote, and I do not think the House has been put in possession of any information as to the benefit of that expenditure. I am not opposing the expenditure, but I would like to know what its results have been, and why there is an increase. On page 12 of the report of the hon.

Mr. HESSON.

Minister he makes the following short statement about last year's exposition:—

"A Provincial Exhibition was held at Kingston in the fall of 1882, to which, as in previous years, a Dominion character was given by the vote of Parliament, last Session, of \$5,000. The stormy weather prevailing at the time it was held, interfered somewhat with its success, but the industrial and agricultural exhibits, as well as those of live stock, were very creditable."

Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how he intends to expend the money, whether as prizes for live stock or cereals, and also where the next Dominion Exhibition is to be held.

Mr. POPE. When we had a smaller vote we used to give \$1,000 in order to procure a fair show of Manitoba products, as the people up there found it very difficult to secure this without such assistance. The balance of the money was handed over to the board of agriculture in which ever Province the exhibition was held, and they expended the money in giving additional prizes. It has been found, by experience, that this expenditure has produced a great deal of good, and for my part I am only sorry that the vote is not larger, and that we could not do more for the farmers of this country in enabling them to compete at the different shows without their sustaining absolute loss in sending their stock and other articles to these shows. I think in a country like this which is made up largely of agriculturists, \$10,000 is a very small sum to give for such a purpose. A centennial exhibition is to be held at St. John this year. I think every hon. member will feel satisfied with our attempts to call out these farmers and bring them together at these exhibitions, and to enable them to keep up the interest and the competition at these exhibitions.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is the merest buncombe to say that this is being done for the farmers. It is impossible to have a Dominion Exhibition in a country so extensive as ours is from East to West. How many farmers does the hon. gentleman know, went from Ontario to Halifax last summer? Does he know of any that went? Does he know of a single animal that was sent for exhibition there? The thing is preposterous. We have no evidence before us to show the benefit of this exhibition, and one is strongly inclined to ask, when \$10,000 is taken for the exhibition at St. John, who the representative of St. John is. The vote is for no other purpose whatever. The hon. gentleman says that except for \$1,000 for the Manitoba exhibition, he always handed over the balance to the managers of the fair. I think the first exhibition for which a Dominion grant was made was held in this town, and, if I am not misinformed, the hon. gentleman held the control of the entire \$5,000 in his own hands.

Mr. POPE. My hon. friend is quite right. I now hold the control; I insist on their giving me a copy of the prize list, and I insist on the prize list being a proper one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. So the money is not handed over. My impression is that the hon. gentleman holds entire control of it, and that it is made payable to himself, and not to the managers of the fair.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, once we have initiated this system, it has to be carried out, at any rate, until there is one grand round. There is no doubt, having voted money to give what is called a Dominion character to an exhibition, we must mete out the same justice to all the Provinces. But I must say I am disappointed with the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the application of the fund. It somewhat differs from my understanding on the subject last year. I ventured to suggest that the only way in which a practical result could follow from this vote, such as its name imports, was to see that the money was used in reducing the cost of the transport of goods for exhibition

from distant parts to the place at which they would be exhibited; but the hon. gentleman has said that out of the vote of \$5,000, \$1,000 was used for the purpose of assisting in the transport of goods from Manitoba, and the rest was added to the prize list, subject to his looking at the prize list.

Mr. POPE. My hon. friend is quite right. I did insist upon a portion of this money being given to assist people to bring their goods to the exhibitions, and the balance was disposed of as I say.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman carried out what I understood was intended, and what I think is the only way of making a genuine approach to an exhibition of a Dominion character. Whether you can do it in that way or not I doubt. You cannot do it with regard to live stock, because it will not be sent on a long journey. We have had a good deal of experience of that in our Province. We find it difficult to get exhibitors to send their stock from one end of the Province to the other, and to induce them to send their stock from one end of the Dominion to the other, is, I fear, out of the question.

Mr. POPE. At Montreal we had a very excellent display from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BLAKE. You may have an occasional exhibit; but it is not the general rule. I want to know why it is proposed to double the grant for St. John, and whether any different administration of it is proposed? What proportion of the \$10,000 is intended to be expended in cheapening the transport from other Provinces to St. John, and what proportion is to be placed at the disposal of the managers of the exhibition as an addition to their prize list?

Mr. POPE. I cannot give the exact proportions; but I do intend that a portion of this grant shall be devoted to assisting in the taking of stock from distant points to St. John. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not overlook the importance of having an exhibition of this kind.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree that an exhibition, at which the articles of one Province could be shown to the people of another, would be a very important object; but with regard to many classes of articles, I do not think much can be done. I was about to make another observation, which I made in another place, in the presence of my hon. friend from St. John, namely, that I think it is important to encourage the visitations which these seasons produce. I think it is of consequence that the Government should make extremely liberal arrangements with the railway companies and over the Government railway, for the carrying of persons and goods to this exhibition. There is no little interchange of visits between the people of the different Provinces, that, as we are marking this exhibition in a peculiar manner by doubling the vote, I believe is an occasion on which it would be a judicious thing to make some liberal arrangements indeed, so far as the Government railway is concerned, and I have no doubt the other railways would find it to their interest to join with such a scheme, so as to enable the people from Ontario and Quebec to visit the city of St. John, and the Maritime Provinces generally. I attach much more importance to that than to the amount of direct good which the hon. gentleman's vote will do in the way of exhibits. I think it is of great consequence that our people should learn to mingle more with each other than they have done in the past.

52. To meet expenses in connection with health statistics..... \$20,000.00

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I see that there is the very large increase of \$10,000 in this item. It is only a short time since the item first occurred in the Estimates, and I approve most cordially of an appropriation being made to this purpose. I see, from the report of the hon. Minister, that

the appropriation is divided among the boards of health of the different Provinces according to the sizes of the different cities. Montreal getting \$1,800, and smaller places getting less amounts. I fancy the proposition of the hon. Minister to co-operate with the local boards of health in securing the vital statistics of the country, but I fail to see in this report any return of the results of previous expenditures. Now that the hon. gentleman is publishing statistics generally, the House should be put in possession of the information this money is supposed to secure. Perhaps the hon. Minister will see that next year we have more evidence as to what is done with this money, and he may be able to give us some information now as to what benefits he expects to derive from this additional grant of \$10,000. In Ontario there is a Provincial Board of Health, and last year they were anxious to receive the co-operation of some Dominion officials representing themselves as the Dominion Board of Health, but I do not think they received that co-operation as readily as expected.

Mr. POPE. No proposition was made to me from the Ontario Government about any united action, nor from the Ontario Board of Health that I know of. In this particular question I am not very well versed and depended very much on the hon. Minister of Railways who has taken a very active part in this, but who is unable to be present to-night. Up to the present there has been no preparation of statistics or expenditure of money, further than the getting up of an organization for this purpose. We adopted a plan of taking such cities as had boards of health and using their officers as ours for doing this work. Some forty or fifty gentlemen met here in order to devise some scheme, and we paid some of their expenses. Various schemes were suggested; but at last, at the suggestion of my deputy they decided to try this one, of using the health officers of cities as our statistical officers. The expenditure for organization was shown in the returns, and amounts to \$746. That is all that has been spent of the vote of last year. My own impression is that the figures fixed will be found barely sufficient to do the work expected of these men, but we will make the trial. The reason we ask for a larger vote this year is that we expect the different towns and villages will co-operate with us, and gradually appoint health officers, and thus the work will extend. If it does not extend we will not expend all the appropriation; but I think it will be found that the cost of carrying out the work properly, will be larger than most people will admit.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I confess to a very great deal of disappointment at the statement of the hon. gentleman. He has not given us information as to the work that is to be done. He speaks of these parties doing the work, but what is the work? Are there to be new regulations independent of the local authorities altogether? Are these people to be medical men, and are the statistics to be vital alone?

Mr. POPE. They are to be mortuary statistics and sanitary statistics.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As to mortuary statistics, I am sure that in Ontario \$20,000 will not enable the hon. Minister to obtain the information now available. When we abolished the system of registration of statistics in Nova Scotia, we decided it was not in the province of the Dominion to undertake the collection and publication of vital statistics. Ontario adopted a system in which two or three times the amount asked for here is expended in the collection of vital statistics. Now the Dominion proposes to step in with a new system, or rather with no system at all. Since the hon. gentleman approached this question, some years ago, there has been no plan devised or system pursued, and we are now asked to vote this large sum without knowing where one dollar of it is to go. Is it to pay officers that

may be appointed by Local Governments? Are there to be collected rural as well as city statistics? Is it a suburban as well as an urban arrangement? We ought to have some information on these points. I think it a great mistake to undertake anything of the kind here. In the first place, we could not force the collection of vital statistics. It is for the Provinces to undertake that. Without having any method fixed we are called on to vote this sum upon the wildest speculation. I hope the Government will retrace their steps, and not interfere with matters which the Provincial authorities have perfect right to deal.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for East York states that this question is not of sufficient importance to induce the Dominion Government to take an interest in it, or give any money for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not say it was of no importance. I said it was not in our province.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say we were not doing right in appropriating this money. We have just passed votes to keep up exhibitions, or to carry out agricultural shows, and to aid in many other schemes in which the Dominion and Provincial Governments co-operate, which individual Provinces would not be in a position to carry out alone as successfully as if assisted by this Government. We must all regret that our late lamented friend Dr. Brouse is not with us to-day, for he took a lively interest in this matter, and for years endeavored to promote some means by which we could get vital statistics. I regret the hon. Minister of Railways is not here, because he took an active part in it. When this subject was under discussion last year, we must all remember that it was then deemed especially important to co-operate with the Provincial Governments in endeavoring to get this information. I know it takes time to mature a scheme like this. This subject has been under discussion since last year, and circulars have been addressed to medical men, asking for suggestions how the object could best be accomplished, with the least expenditure. I think the very fact that diseases of a dangerous nature are making extensive ravages throughout the country, and that they appear to be attributable to causes that might be materially controlled if we had proper statistics to enable us to watch the progress of those diseases, to ascertain their nature, and to keep a record of them, I say that so long as we believe they can be controlled, I think it is of great importance to the people of this country that sufficient steps be taken to make that control effective. I am also glad to find that there is an increase in the Estimates this year for that purpose, because the amount voted last year was of little or no use. It was rather for the purpose of organization, and I was not surprised that the Minister of Agriculture did not give a definite statement of the expenditure required, because the thing has not matured yet. I think it is impossible to expect the Provincial Government, to get this information, and it is not altogether reasonable to expect that the Dominion Government can get this information alone, but where the two Governments co-operate they will be able very effectually to secure the information required. I believe, that after this experiment has had a fair trial it will warrant this House in doubling the amount next year, and if this scheme is successfully carried out it will render the greatest benefit to the people of this country, and will materially lessen the ravages of several diseases that are now depopulating our country at a rapid rate in many parts of it.

Mr. ORTON. I must congratulate the Government and the hon. Minister of Agriculture upon the stand he has taken with reference to this question. I hold, and it is held by leading men in this country, that there is no more important question than that of the public health. We spend from year

Mr. MACKENZIE.

to year thousands and hundreds of thousands in bringing people to this country, while we pay little regard to the health of those who are born here and live in our midst. Now, Sir, it is known that there are diseases prevailing in this country that can be easily prevented, if the public are only made aware of the simple means of doing so. I presume the object of this item is the collection not only of vital statistics, but to acquaint the people what steps should be taken to prevent the spread of these serious contagious diseases. I am very glad indeed that this matter has been taken up by the Government. I had the honor of being present last autumn with a deputation of medical men from various parts of the Dominion in reference to this question, and I was very happy to see the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Agriculture receive the deputation in the friendly way they did. There are considerable difficulties surrounding this question. In the first place, we are all aware that many of our municipal institutions are under the control of the Local Governments, and the council of every municipality are, by virtue of their office, a health board for that municipality and under the control of the Local Government, therefore it is important that this House should invite the co-operation of every Local Legislature in this Dominion in this very important work. The collection of vital statistics is of small importance compared with the results that should accrue from the people being made acquainted with the peculiar diseases that prevail in their midst, and with the means of arresting their progress, for I believe, that many of these diseases now destroying hundreds, aye, thousands of our people, might be arrested. If statistics were kept in reference to various diseases that prevail and a record kept of them, these statistics might be made available to the local boards of health, and these in turn might take the simple sanitary measures necessary for the purpose of preventing the spread of those diseases. I apprehend that the object of this vote is to begin a great work with the ultimate result of affording information to every board of health within the Dominion of Canada. Another point worthy of consideration is this: we have had various journals established in Canada for the purpose of informing the public upon these simple but very important sanitary matters, and these journals should be in the possession of every board of health and of every municipal council in the Dominion of Canada, and some encouragement might be given to them by the Government. I think that if a carefully revised report of the sanitary condition of the various portions of our country were issued under the authority of this House, even if it were only once a year, a vast amount of valuable information would be given that would lead to great and beneficial results to every portion of our people. I congratulate the hon. Minister upon increasing this amount. So far as my knowledge is concerned, I consider that even \$20,000 is totally inadequate to the necessities of the case; however, it will go a great way and will accomplish a great deal of good.

Mr. BLAKE. We passed a vote last year for this purpose; would the hon. Minister state whether that sum has been or is to be spent this year, and how?

Mr. POPE. It has not all been spent. As I mentioned a moment ago, only \$700 or \$800 were spent, mostly in organization and in connection with the meeting of those medical gentlemen in Ottawa.

Mr. BLAKE. In having a good time.

Mr. POPE. Yes, at my expense. I hope they all had a good time, and I was very glad to see them and to ask them back again. But I do not think the hon. gentleman will seriously complain of that. I could not expect those men to come here without having their expenses partially paid—I mean their railway fares partially paid, because while here they paid their own expenses. In the first place,



I asked some medical men from Ontario and others from Montreal, and these met together, and after completing an organization invited about fifty other medical gentlemen from all parts of the Dominion to meet here consider this important subject. I suppose during this year we will spend \$5,000 of the \$10,000. It is intended that these reports should be monthly, and that they shall be tabulated so as to show the public the diseases prevailing in the country.

Mr. BLAKE. When the vote was proposed last year the hon. gentleman was unable to give us any statement whatever as to the plan on which the money was to be expended. He said that it was an experiment, and asked us to trust him with the vote. He told us, further, that the Dominion Medical Council had made a proposal to the Government, that they would submit a plan for the collection, by them, of health statistics, and that they could do it much cheaper than the Government, which perhaps was quite correct. He said, further, that the plan would be submitted, and if approved would go into operation. Did they submit a plan?

Mr. POPE. They did. The Medical Council submitted a plan which was not approved by the gentlemen who met here, and was not believed in by medical men generally. I forget exactly what it amounted to, but it amounted to very little indeed, and it was decided by the gentlemen who met here, and by medical men generally, that it was not a feasible plan. I asked the co-operation of these gentlemen, and obtained their suggestions. I did so as an experiment; I have experimented to the extent of \$700. If I am able to show, at the end of the fiscal year, that not more than one-half of the vote has been expended, and that money has been saved to the country, there will not be much cause for complaint.

Mr. BLAKE. That depends entirely on what the hon. gentleman may have done with the half of the vote. If he has accomplished nothing, we shall have grounds for complaint. Upon the last occasion I indulged, it appears, in a little prophecy. I asked: "Will you promise not to ask for another \$10,000?" The hon. gentleman replied, "No, not till I give you a good reason." Now I want the reason, for he is asking for the other \$10,000—he is asking for \$20,000 instead of \$10,000. Will this be the last time of asking? The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) says no, the amount is altogether inadequate, and a great deal more will be wanted. The hon. Minister told us last year that it was experimental, and that a plan had been proposed to him, and that if the plan was approved, the money would be spent, and if not approved, the money would not be expended. The plan turned out not to be practicable, and the hon. gentleman invited medical men here and expended on them \$700. Did the hon. gentleman procure from them a plan? If the newspapers spoke correctly, which I believe they occasionally do, it was announced by the hon. Minister of Railways, who attended the gathering, partly in his official capacity, and partly in his professional capacity, that there was a constitutional difficulty in complying to the full with the request of those who were thus assembled. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Agriculture was there, but the newspapers said it was pointed out that the Government had not the constitutional power to do all they might ask, and suggested an amendment of the Constitution in order that larger powers might be obtained to carry out measures which the public health requires. Is there any proposition of that kind involved?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. We are to limit ourselves to the constitutional power we possess and to the scheme proposed, which will involve an expenditure of \$20,000.

Mr. POPE. I think about that.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the scheme been approved by the Government?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What seems important is that the matter has now passed the experimental stage.

Mr. POPE. Not entirely so.

Mr. BLAKE. To a considerable extent. Whereas last year the scheme had not been submitted to the Government, now a scheme from another board has been approved by the Government, and we should know what the scheme is, so that we may understand the matter in which it is proposed to expend this money. It is no longer a vote of credit; it is a vote to carry out a definite proposal of the Government. Last year, on Concurrence, the hon. Minister said: "I have no further information than what I gave when the item was first brought down. The Medical Board said, that if a certain allowance were placed at their disposal they could collect health statistics much cheaper. They will submit a plan for approval." That failed, and another plan was submitted, and approved. The hon. gentleman should have brought down that plan to the House, for we have no intelligent information respecting it. I believe a thoroughly accurate investigation into the subject of health statistics may produce important results, but I have a very strong impression that no useful results can be produced for any such amount as is proposed to be voted. A very much larger sum would be required to produce any useful results, and the hon. Minister should fully consider that point before he proposes to throw away—for I believe it will be throwing it away—\$20,000. Whether we can afford the sum necessary to procure useful results, is a question which can be only answered when we see the hon. gentleman's plan. This is as much a vote of credit as the item was when it was first proposed.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to offer a few remarks in regard to the plan referred to by the hon. Minister. Having been a member of the deputation of medical men appointed on the question, I think it is proper that I should state what that body suggested. Medical men from all parts of the Dominion, from Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, and other cities and towns, assembled here, and they found the Government were not prepared to enter into a very extensive plan for collecting vital statistics, and establish what we desired, a bureau of vital statistics of Canada. But the Government were prepared to meet them half-way, and a resolution was passed to the effect that where recognized boards of health were established in the cities and towns of the Dominion, they should participate in whatever sum the Government might think proper to vote to commence this important work; and the Government, through their representatives, who met the medical men—the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Railways—agreed to the proposition, and it was decided that health officers in cities and towns should receive a certain amount of money in proportion to the population of the city or town for the purpose of collecting vital statistics therein; and it was generally agreed by medical men, though they did not get all they asked, that this was a step in the right direction, and a sincere and earnest commencement in this great and important work; and I think that as far as that is concerned it is simply a question of how this money is being spent.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the matured Minister whether the statement of the embryo Minister is correct? Here is a direct statement made by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, as to certain proceedings that took place, which the Minister did not communicate to the House; and I simply desire to know whether that state-

ment is correct, because it develops some sort of plan, at least, which the hon. gentleman did not mention to us?

Mr. POPE. I believe it is correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It should have been stated by the hon. Minister himself, I do not think that this House should be treated discourteously.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think this is a very important matter which deserves the serious consideration of the Committee. If anything can be done by the action of this House to improve the public health, it should be cheerfully done. I would like to obtain from the hon. Minister of Agriculture the basis upon which he proposes to expend this money. Does he propose to appoint a health officer in each of the cities and towns, in order to collect and tabulate statistics for the information of the Government, so that these statistics may become available and useful to the public generally? How is this report to be distributed? I would like to have some information from him before the vote is passed, on these grounds. If the money is granted and nothing is done, the money may possibly be mis-spent, and we would like to know, and I, for my part, would really like to know, in the interests of the country, how this matter is to be arranged; what machinery is to be called into existence; what officers are to be appointed; what statistics are to be collected; and how they are to be collected? I trust that the hon. Minister will give this information.

Mr. POPE. I have done so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman stated about the appointment of officers, or where they are to be appointed. There is no doubt that the attention of Governments to these matters in other countries, has resulted in the public benefit; and if it is done in other countries, I do not see why it should not be done here; and if it is possible to preserve the health of the people and to increase the healthfulness of the people, this vote is in the right direction and has my support. I recollect, some years ago, that a Committee was appointed in this House to get information connected with the ventilation of this House, and sanitary matters connected with it. It went into an exhaustive research of all questions relating to this subject; and it found that the ventilation of the House was at that time in a very deplorable condition. I believe that, by the labors of that Committee, a remedy was found, and that the ventilation and the sanitary condition of this House has been very much improved by the results of its labors. If that was done in this House, it can be done in other houses; and if the people only know what means are to be adopted in order to preserve the health of their families, it will be a step in the right direction. If means can be adopted by the hon. Minister, in order to get information of this kind, it will improve the general health of the people, and the hon. gentleman will be doing a good work for this country. If he does not do so, it is quite possible that the agitation which has been begun to have him removed and a medical man appointed in his stead, will be very likely carried on; but, seriously, I consider that full information should be given to the House as to the mode of the expenditure of this money. There is a great deal of difficulty in carrying out the operations of the local boards of health. A good deal of opposition is given to them by the people, who are reluctant to give information to these boards; and I would like to know what powers those appointed will be clothed with by the Government, in order to fully carry out and maintain the usefulness of the grant which this House gives for that purpose.

53. For collecting and compiling Agricultural, Industrial and other Statistics in Manitoba and the North-West Territories; and also for collecting and compiling such Statistics elsewhere  
(Revised) ..... \$20,000.00

Mr. MACKENZIE.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How was this appropriation expended last year? I have searched in vain in the Public Accounts and in the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, to find out.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That vote is for the current year.

Mr. ROSS. We will probably learn from the hon. Minister of Agriculture what he proposes to do with the vote of \$20,000 for the next year.

Mr. POPE. Not one dollar of the \$20,000 was expended last year. It was intended to collect all statistics relating to the North-West, and I believe that every hon. gentleman in the House saw the importance of this, so far as agriculture is concerned; but it was pretty late in the season before I could get at it. I employed my agents, as far as I could, to collect the statistics which are found in my report; and I also induced the railways to give us statistics. I supposed at the time that I could make an arrangement with the municipal authorities of Manitoba in this relation; but the negotiations were delayed until I thought it hardly worth while to expend the money last year. My intention this year, if I make arrangements with them—and they have made some propositions—is to get this information regarding the North-West and its produce, to be placed before intending settlers and the people of this country.

Mr. ROYAL. I believe that the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to avail himself of the existing system inaugurated by the Provincial Government of Manitoba for the collection of statistics of this kind, will succeed in his object. The Department of Agriculture of Manitoba was reorganized last year, and I think that it is now in a most efficient state. The Minister and the Deputy there, Mr. Burrows, are very efficient, and are collecting, all over the Province, most valuable and most correct information with respect to industrial and other statistics. Vital statistics are also being obtained of a special character. The Deputy Minister, Mr. Burrows, is a very active and intelligent and clever man who is giving to this very important matter all his attention, and I am sure that, with very little expense, the Minister of Agriculture here will be able to get these statistics from the Provincial Department, and to complete them by the statistics which he will get from his own agents. I am glad to be able to point out to him the existence of that reorganized Department in Manitoba.

Mr. ORTON. With reference to the collection of agricultural statistics, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the character of statistics which I think would be useful, and to say be depended upon—the obtaining of statistical information properly collected, on good authority, with reference to the amount of grain brought into the markets of Europe and Great Britain—not only by Canada, but other countries with which Canada has to cope or compete. In the future this will be, more than now, a country which will be largely interested in supplying the people of Europe and Great Britain with breadstuffs, and I think it is important, that the imports into these countries from India, Egypt, and other countries, which compete with us, should be kept on record in the Department of Agriculture. It would also be important to have the yearly statement of the market value of agricultural products in the leading markets of Great Britain, Canada, United States, and those countries which compete with us in supplying Europe with breadstuffs. Another important point to which I desire to call attention, is the necessity of providing our farmers with good seed. I am sorry to find that a duty is charged on seed imported for the purpose of improving the grain sown by our farmers. We all know the serious disadvantage which has accrued to Manitoba and the North-

West, from the Mennonites having a class of seed which was not adapted to the climate. I trust it may be within the power of the Minister of Agriculture, to devote some of this money to encouraging the importation of the best kind of seed adapted to our climate.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman proposed this vote last year, I stated that I was glad that attention was being called to the special necessity of procuring statistics of this kind, though I objected to his bringing it forward without proposing any plan for collecting such information. I still support a proposition for the collection of such information. I think it is of great importance to Canada at large that some special attention should be given to the procuring and publication of reliable statistics as to Manitoba and the North-West. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Royal) has stated that the Local Government of Manitoba has re-organized this Department, and that it is now in an efficient state; so I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Agriculture will cease spending money in trying to get, through Dominion officers, what is efficiently collected by local officers. Assuming that the local Department is in the condition which the hon. gentleman has stated, there yet remains the North-West Territory, and I think it is very important that we should point out the progress and settlement of that part of the country, and give reliable information as to the character and extent of its crops. But I stated on a former occasion, and I now desire to repeat, that it is of great consequence that we should obtain accurate yearly information as to the settlement in the country, and for that purpose I have ventured privately to suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should perfect arrangements with the railway companies in order to obtain information which, by his own action with reference to the supposed exodus he deems important, as verifying calculations with reference to immigration. I think that full and reliable information as to the period at which the ground was fit for tillage, the period at which the crops matured, and as to the crops which come to perfection in the various parts of that territory are points to which we have not paid sufficient attention, and, as the hon. member beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) suggests, the meteorological phenomena of that country might be included in the same category. I think we can well afford to spend, and to expect a large return from the judicious expenditure of money in this direction. But I regret that the hon. gentleman has not prefaced his application to the Committee for this vote by giving us some details as to his proposed mode of operation, and I invite him now to tell us—having had a year to mature his plan—in what way he purposes expending this money.

Mr. POPE. I think I told the Committee last year that I proposed to get the information, as far as possible, from the Local Governments, but that it was impossible to get it from the North-West in any such way, so that in that part of the Dominion it is the intention of the Government to collect this information as far as they possibly can. The hon. gentleman says the Local Government of Manitoba are reorganizing their bureau, but I do not suppose they will give us this information for nothing. I have been negotiating upon that matter. I found them pretty well disorganized last year, and I saw that I could not make the arrangements which were needed without a larger expenditure than I felt justified in incurring. I do intend, however, making arrangements with the Local Government of Manitoba, as well as with those of the other Provinces where such information is collected, but I am particularly anxious to get information about the North-West. I want to be able next year to lay before the House the number of acres under cultivation this year and last, the amount of land broken up, the averages of the crops, and what crops the country is capable of producing. But I want to get this

information without an unduly large expenditure of money. With regard to the statistics from the railway I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, but I never have considered that these figures were absolutely correct, though I do think they are an approximation. That information I will try to lay before the House next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It would be very important for the promotion of immigration that, not only should the general time for ploughing, seeding, and harvesting be given, but that individual cases should be mentioned. It might be stated that in such and such a district land was ploughed on a certain day, the seed sown on a certain day, and that the crop was reaped on a certain day. If the figures of a few farms a few miles apart were given in this way, it would give a better idea of the country to the people of Great Britain than any general statistics.

Mr. SPROULE. The course suggested last year with reference to statistics could be accomplished admirably this year, if the Local Government would only co-operate with the Government here, viz.: to have the assessors, in going around among the farmers, obtain from them information as to the number of acres sowed, the amount reaped, and the vital statistics.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I only alluded to the North-West in what I suggested. Of course we cannot interfere with the assessors of the Provinces.

Mr. WATSON. I approve of the means that the Government intend to use in order to obtain information in the North-West. As has been said by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), the Local Government of Manitoba have a very efficient Deputy Minister of Agriculture, but, unfortunately, the money they have to spend is too limited. One-third of the amount appropriated is required to pay the salaries of the officials. I think it would be well for the Dominion Government to make an arrangement with the Local Government to obtain the statistics from them. It would be very interesting to persons from other Provinces to have reports from farmers in different sections of the country, as to the seasons of the year at which they cultivate their lands, as to the yield, the best crops, the best quality of grain, &c. The plan adopted last fall, of getting statistics from the railway officials, was very unsatisfactory. In some cases the reports greatly exaggerated the amount of grain produced, and in other cases they did not give more than half, but if the Government co-operate with the Local Government, I think the statistics may be very successfully obtained.

54. To meet expenses in connection with Immigration and Quarantine.....\$518,721.00

Mr. POPE. Hon. gentlemen will see that there is an increase of \$50 a year in the salaries of agents; but in the cases of the agents at Toronto, Hamilton and London, the increases are greater, and, considering the importance of these points, I do not think the agents are over-paid. We propose to have an agent at Qu'Appelle at the same salary as is paid to the agent at Brandon; there will be another agent in the North-West at some point west of Regina; and it is proposed to remove the agent at Duluth to Prince Arthur's Landing. The salaries paid at the London office are exactly the same as they were last year, except \$100, which is added to Mr. Dickson's salary. There is an addition of \$1,200 in the salaries of agents in Europe, which is for an agent who has recently been appointed in Norway. Now I come to the increase of \$200,000 for general immigration purposes. I believe the only way to secure a large immigration is to place within the reach of the largest number of people the means of coming to this country. Many people would gladly come here who have not the means to do so. For that reason we have contributed to assisted passages, for which we expended last year \$83,722,

The expenditure for publications last year was \$56,144; the expenditure for transport to Ontario was \$40,095. Two years ago the Ontario Government, who had previously paid two-thirds of the cost of passage from Quebec to any part of Ontario, declined to pay any part of it, and hence this very large increase. We have not paid it all; we have only done so when the people could not pay it themselves. For transport to points in Quebec we paid \$13,000, and to other places in the Dominion, \$36,000. We also paid for delegates' expenses, \$2,244; for colonization expenses, \$3,553; for meals for immigrants, \$8,630; and we expended at Point Levis for sheds, \$6,831.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are colonization expenses?

Mr. POPE. Placing immigrants. Of course there are other expenses. For repatriation we have paid something like \$2,000, being at the rate of £1 a head. That with other smaller expenses amounted to \$346,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that paid to agents or to the parties themselves?

Mr. POPE. To the parties themselves on arriving at Winnipeg. We offer, as we did last year, £1 per head for all German immigrants coming into Winnipeg, and when they get to Winnipeg we pay it on presentation of the last coupon. We also pay for immigration from Great Britain; for instance, some girls come here at £2 10s. per head, payable upon arrival at any port in the Dominion. Farmers come here for £3 sterling per head, and others for £4 per head. We pay something on the servant girls and something on the farmers—\$1 per head. While 112,000 came in last year, we shall, this year, have 150,000 coming to Canada. Of those I calculate 75,000, formed of our own people and Europeans, will go to the North-West. So far as the North-West is concerned, I do not induce people without some means to go there. The only way we can get German immigration is by the direct lines to New York, and I have entered into negotiations with an agent in Germany and Scandinavia to have those people laid down in Manitoba, and upon the last coupon of their ticket being presented to us we pay them \$1; after we find they are settled and located in the country we pay the amount to the ship. The hon. gentleman will see that I am quite within the mark if we get the immigration I have every reason to expect we will. I know there will not be this year anything like the German and Scandinavian immigration that there was last year, but the last mail brings me word that we are going to have a larger immigration from those places than last year. We made great exertions; brought out delegates, sent them to examine our North-West, and are now paying £1 per head to the agents of the steamships, whenever these people are laid down in Manitoba. We want to establish a nucleus of that immigration there, knowing that those settled will induce their friends to follow. We cannot, to any reasonable extent, do too much to settle that great country, which has such a bearing on the future of this Dominion, and we do not believe that the land in its natural state is worth a single dollar to us. I have looked at this question from many points of view. I have looked to see what is the result of the immigration we had last year. We will take it at 100,000 people. They cost us in round numbers, \$350,900 for all the agencies and expenses, or \$4 per head. If those people were raised in this country, it would cost for every one of them raised up to 16 years of age, \$800 to raise them; and if we get them for \$5 per head, we make a good bargain. This is not all; there is not a man in this House who will not admit that every man we bring in here, will pay into the revenue at least \$5 a year. Supposing it is only that, that is the interest on \$100, and if you multiply that by 100,000 immigrants, you will see I have made for you \$10,000,000. I am making this large amount of money, and my hon. friend the Finance Minister is reaping the benefit.

Mr. POPE.

I am satisfied by this year's operations, that the coming year will bring to this country 150,000 people from Europe, and I am satisfied that the figures I have given will not more than cover the disbursements I shall have to make. Under these circumstances I ask the House to have a little confidence in me and vote this large grant.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the expected distribution of this large vote?

Mr. POPE. In exactly the same proportion as last year. I ask for the larger amount because the number of immigrants will be much larger.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no alteration in the plans or the system of the Department. Merely the expectation that a larger expenditure will be required because of the larger immigration.

Mr. POPE. Just so.

Mr. BLAKE. Of the 75,000 expected to go into Manitoba, and of which a portion will be from this country, what does the hon. Minister expect will be the proportion of Europeans and Canadians?

Mr. POPE. It is impossible for me to tell accurately. The hon. gentleman will find by the newspapers that a very much larger proportion of German immigration is destined for Manitoba than formerly. We may safely say that we will get 40,000 European immigrants into Manitoba this year.

Mr. ROYAL. We see by the papers that 5,000 Irish families, assisted, will be directed this year to Manitoba. Will these 5,000 families, which will amount to 25,000 individuals, get any assistance from the hon. gentleman's Department?

Mr. POPE. No. I do not think, as I said before, that it is profitable to Manitoba or useful to the country that we should put any men there whom we may have to assist very largely. It is better we should assist them to come to Canada where they can find employment and learn the ways of the country, and after a time, if industrious, they will earn money to go further west. It is in the interests of the country that we should not fill it with people requiring to be assisted. Requests are very numerous this year for laborers, and even half-a-dozen members of this House have spoken to me on behalf of their own constituencies where help is very much required. In some cases the very Irish families are being sought for. In Japanese provision has been made to settle and employ some of these people, and so we find it all through the country. We think it better for them and better for Manitoba that men of some means, men who are able to keep themselves, should go there, while these immigrants can find employment in this part of the country among our farmers. I have urged many of them to remain in the older Provinces, as being better adapted for them than the North-West. If I do send a man to the North-West I want to send a man who is able to take care of himself.

Mr. HESSON. I am sure it is most gratifying to this Committee to learn from the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that he expects such a large immigration to this country, and the North-West, at an early day, and I am especially glad to know that he expects a large part of these to be of the Scandinavian and German races. We know the value of these people, and I am glad the hon. Minister has devoted some attention to that particular class. But I rose for the purpose of calling the hon. gentleman's attention to another point. The Government have agreed upon Regina as the capital of the Province of Assiniboia, but I do not see in this vote any item for the purpose of providing shelter for any emigrants there, though I do see an item of \$14,000 to be expended somewhere in the North-West, which may be in the Province of Assiniboia. It is very desirable that peo-

ple arriving here from Europe, and going to the North-West, if they should desire to go to Regina, there ought certainly to be provided some accommodation for them there in the way of shelter for a few days. Now, we know the expense and difficulty of people finding lodging in that country. It is difficult for any one to get comfortable shelter there. It may be said by the hon. Minister, that he has provided accommodation at Qu'Appelle to a certain extent; in fact, he has some \$45,000 for use east of Qu'Appelle, but I am sorry to see no provision made for the town of Regina. I do not say this from any pecuniary interest in the place, but simply from an interest in the people who may go there and find no provision made for them. I have not a dollar's interest in that place, nor in Qu'Appelle, so I am not speaking from any personal consideration. I trust the hon. Minister of Agriculture will make some provision for the protection, though it may be but for a few days, for emigrants who go there. Many families will go from Ontario, and it would certainly be hard for them, after leaving their comfortable homes, to find no place to shelter them on their arrival at Regina. For this purpose some portion of the Mounted Police coverings or tents which are no longer in use, might be utilized; but I think that something even more permanent than that should be erected. When we consider that out of the 40,000 European immigrants the Minister expects to enter the North-West this year, probably 10,000 or 15,000 may make their headquarters at Regina for a few days, the need of protection and shelter for those people becomes very evident.

Mr. POPE. When I said 40,000 Europeans I meant 40,000 people outside of Canadians.

Mr. ROYAL. It is certainly a matter of great satisfaction to the members from Manitoba, to learn that 40,000 immigrants are likely to settle in Manitoba and the North-West during the coming year, from Ontario alone. We are also likely to get a portion of the 75,000 that he expects from Europe, and these, with the assisted Irish immigrants, will make up probably 100,000 settlers in our Province and the North-West Territory this year. This is a most pleasing announcement to make in this Committee, and will very likely carry joy to our distant homes in Manitoba. Now, last year it was calculated that 60,000 people settled in Manitoba, and that these emigrants carried with them a capital to the amount of \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000. If the same proportion of capital is brought into the Province this year, we may depend upon having an increase of capital of from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000. This, I repeat, is very cheerful news to announce to this country, and to announce to our distant Province and to the North-West Territory. Now, I believe that the whole of Canada is interested in this question of immigration, and although this debate may seem wearisome to some members, to our Province it is one of very great importance. Canada has invested capital largely in opening up Manitoba and the North West Territories, and, so far, Canada has invested nearly \$45,000,000 in that country. It is calculated that, last year, the inter-provincial trade amounted to nearly \$18,000,000. Now, it is evident that to increase our population in the West is the surer means of increasing our inter-provincial trade, and by that means yielding a revenue to the Eastern Provinces for the investments they have made in the West. I repeat that if the expectations which have been held out to this Committee are realized, I believe this year will be one of the brightest years we have seen in this country since the years 1878 and 1879, and I hope, in another year, we will have, instead of 100,000, 125,000, especially if we have presiding over the Immigration Department the present intelligent, clever and patriotic gentleman who is Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BURNS. I have only a word to say, because I can appreciate the value of time. On a former occasion I made

a few remarks on the subject of immigration. I desire to repeat now what I stated then, and that is, that while I favor a policy which will settle the north-western part of this Dominion by the expenditure of even a larger amount than is asked, I also recognize the importance of settling up the large tracts of land we have in the Eastern Provinces. Reference has been made to the benefits that accrue to the Eastern Provinces by the settlement of the North-West, and that has been specially referred to by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. While it may be true that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec derive very large benefits from the trade with Manitoba, the same cannot be said, at all events, with equal application, in regard to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and largely because these Provinces are at a great distance from the North-West, and the item of freight is a very important one in considering the question of trade with the North-West. My idea now is, as I stated before, that in appropriating the amount of money which this Parliament can grant for immigration purposes, each Province of the Dominion should get a share of that money. It is true that the whole Dominion is interested in the settlement of the North West, because the North-West properly belongs to the Dominion. It is quite right, then, that Dominion funds should be appropriated for the purpose of opening up that country from which Canada, as a whole, would derive benefits; but by applying all the money for the settlement of that particular part of the Dominion, you, in a sense, do injustice to the other Provinces which have also lands to settle, and which contribute their share of the amount appropriated for the settlement of the North-West. Under the scheme which was proposed, and partly carried out, some years ago, each Province would receive from the Dominion Exchequer a certain sum of money as supplementary to an amount to be appropriated by the respective Provinces for immigration purposes. I allude more particularly to New Brunswick. I think it was claimed, and it was claimed with considerable justice, too, that the Province of New Brunswick was treated unfairly at that time. That Province was induced to spend a large sum for immigration on the understanding—if not written it was implied—that it would receive from the Dominion Exchequer a certain amount of money for a certain number of years. Acting on that belief, that Province spent a large amount of money, in one year not less than \$70,000 or \$80,000, on immigration purposes. Turning to another matter in connection with immigration: I am not disposed to under-value the importance of bringing Scandinavian and German immigrants to this country; but while I am disposed to lend all assistance I can to promote immigration of that kind, I cannot close my eyes to the fact that there is another country from which immigrants can be brought with advantage to the Dominion, and that is Ireland. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has said it is not desirable to settle up the North-West with poor people. It does not follow that in promoting immigration from Ireland you settle the North-West with poor people. There is in Ireland a large population, not larger than the country can maintain, but there are peculiar circumstances and reasons why the population are not obtaining the living they should get, and for that reason they are removing. I am now speaking of farmers who leave the country with funds quite sufficient to establish them in any country where they might wish to settle. Where are they going? Are they coming to Canada? They are going either to the United States or to the Australian colonies. My business takes me every year, and it has done so for a number of years, to the Old Country. Every year, while in Ireland, at almost every important railway station I have seen people going away by hundreds to Queensland, and not coming to Canada; and they were not poor people, but those who possessed sufficient money to establish themselves in business in more distant lands than Canada is to them. As much attention should be given to

the promotion of immigration from Ireland as to Germany, or Scandinavia, or any other country.

Mr. POPE. There is.

Mr. BURNS. I have not seen any evidence of it. If you take up the report of the London agent, you will find that of the 51,000 people who left Great Britain for this country only 6,000 were Irish, 13,000 were foreigners, 21,000 were English, and about 4,000 Scotch. We know that from peculiar circumstances emigration has been going on from Ireland on a large scale for a number of years, and I say 6,000 is not a good proportion of Irish to the number of English and foreigners who came to Canada; and, therefore, it is desirable to do as much to promote and encourage the class of immigrants of which I speak, to come from Ireland as from Germany or Scandinavia. I am not one of those who believe a statement I heard some time ago, that it is not desirable to encourage a certain class of immigrants. I am not prepared to accept that doctrine. Going back to the Provinces: we have in the Lower Provinces a very large amount of unsettled land. We have in the three counties of Gloucester, Kent and Madawaska, some of the finest farm lands in Canada. These lands are being settled by French Canadians; in my county there are 15,000 Acadians. I would desire to see brought to that county a number of Irish people. If they were poor we would be quite willing to accept them. It is quite true, as the hon. Minister has stated, that the poorer classes are perhaps better remaining in the older Provinces, where they can obtain employment, and where they do not require capital to start with, as they do in the North-West. They could obtain employment in the counties I have mentioned, and settle alongside French Acadians, a people with whom the Irish have always dwelt, in times past, in amity and goodwill. I will refer to a statement made by an hon. member some time ago, and it is this: that the Irish Roman Catholic prefers an Orangeman for a neighbor rather than a French Canadian. I deny that *in toto*. I say it was an unwarranted and unauthorized statement to make; and I am glad I have now an opportunity here to say that the Irish Roman Catholics coming from Ireland will find in the French-Canadian counties of the different Provinces just as much society congenial to them as in any place else. I saw the other day a statement made by some papers that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were about to bring out 5,000 immigrant families. As I understand from the Minister of Agriculture now, that scheme is not part and parcel, at all events, of the scheme of the Government. Whether it is or not, I think it would be very desirable that the suffering population of Ireland should be brought out even in that way; and I think that their introduction into this country, whether they are poor or rich, will be of material service to this country. With respect to the London agency I have this to say: I have had occasion to go in there many times, and while I bring no charge whatever against the management of it, I have to say, that it is desirable, if this is not the case, that the clerks employed there should have a thorough acquaintance with Canada. I do not know whether these clerks are Canadians or Englishmen, but, judging from what I saw, I think they are not the class of young men who are fit to encourage applications being made to them for information. Perhaps it may be that I am over-sensitive, but on every occasion that I went there I found no desire at all events on their part to enter into any conversation with reference to the matters connected with the office. Questions met with civil answers, and information asked for was given, but I did not find in them that enterprising go-ahead-itativeness displayed which is desirable. My idea of an immigration agency is this: the clerks should be on the look-out; they should place posters at the door, if you will; and if they see any person who looks like an immigrant—as I myself may have looked—

Mr. BURNS.

they should go out and say: "What can I do for you, Sir?" I throw out the suggestion with the view of drawing the attention of the Minister to the necessity of spurring up these young men, and making them display more energy in encouraging applications to be made by immigrants at the office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, the Government have no means and no desire to force immigration into Canada. That must be the voluntary act of the immigrants, whether from Ireland, or from Scandinavia, or from Germany. The mass of the immigration has hitherto gone to the United States, and our effort now is, and the effort of the Government under the special auspices of my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, is to change that current both from Ireland, Scandinavia, and Germany, to our own country, instead of to the United States. With respect to all these immigrants, whether from Ireland, England, or Scotland; or from the Continent of Europe, the advantage is the same; the assistance is the same; and there is no assistance to immigration specially going to the North-West. They are invited to come to Dominion ports, to Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, &c., or through the United States to Toronto, so that we may get them into this country in some way. Their passages are assisted, and when you learn from my hon. friend, that these passages vary from £2 10s. to £4, you will understand at what a cheap rate immigrants can arrive on our shores. When they arrive here it is for them to say whether they will remain in the Maritime Provinces, or in Quebec, or in Ontario, or go farther west. I am glad to know and believe that the statements of my hon. friend with respect to the prospective immigration of the year 1833 are correct. They are very moderate, and not at all exaggerated; and I am quite satisfied that we will receive, at our various ports or through the United States, the amount of immigration upon which he has calculated. In stating that he expects 40,000 to go into the North-West during the current year, he has not made any calculation for the 5,000 families, or 25,000 people, coming from Ireland. There is no necessity, I am glad to say, for our going to any expense, as a Government, to assist those people. From the latest information we have by cable, I have reason to believe that satisfactory arrangements will be made, without the transport of these people costing us anything for conveying a large body of people from the west and south of Ireland to Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. POPE. Except assisted passages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; the Canadian Government assists all families coming to this country, under the same rule; and I may say, at the same time, that we also assist the repatriation of the people who have left Canada in years gone by, and are returning in very large numbers, or in very considerable numbers, to Canada again. Some are coming back to the older Provinces, and some are going to the North-West. I understand that the Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Trevelyan, in a speech made a few days ago, has fully committed himself to the principle of assisted immigration to a very large extent. I believe also from the information which I have received by wire, that the Colonial Minister has also—so far as he can individually do so—stated his desire, on behalf of the Government, to assist in the transfer of a very large population—a very considerable population—from Ireland to the North-West. It seems to be now admitted by statesmen on both sides, sitting in the House of Commons of England, that immigration is the chief remedy, and perhaps the only remedy, for the troubles which, we all know, exist now in Ireland. Whether that opinion is correct or not is not for us to say. It is very fortunate, in one sense, that this opinion should prevail among the public men of Great Britain, because the opinion prevailing will, of course, result in an expenditure of

money in sending these people, a most desirable population, to settle in the North-West. We are going to get, we know, a large influx of settlers into the North-West bringing money; they will be employers of labor; they will have the money to do it, and that being the case, the moment these poor people are brought out from Ireland at the expense of Her Majesty's Government, or by a combination of capital or capitalists in Europe, to the North-West, they will find there employers of labor in advance of them, ready to employ them at profitable and, I may say, at high wages. I know, that by a combination—I cannot speak positively, I cannot give specific information to the Committee at this moment, but I believe there is a combination of arrangements between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Hudson Bay Company and the North-West Land Company, to aid in the desirable project of Her Majesty's Government to send a large number of Irish families to the North-West, and I have reason to believe, though I cannot speak specifically as to any final arrangement being made, that Her Majesty's Government will employ the organization which is to be formed of these three corporations, as a means of bringing out and peopling and settling them in the North-West. Everything looks ripe in that regard. As I stated before, we will have a very considerable influx of people with money into the North-West, and I believe we will have a large number of laborers from Ireland seeking employment; and with these two classes going in the same year, into the same country, the result must be a great activity in that country, and the rapid development of its resources.

Mr. DAWSON. It is pleasing to hear that the prospects for immigration are so good—that we are to have so large an immigration from Ireland and other places to the North-West. My hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Burns) stated that there was plenty of room for immigration in his Province, as well as into the North-West. So far as that is concerned, I would say that, in the district which I represent, which is as large as all the Maritime Provinces combined, with Newfoundland thrown in, there is plenty of room for a considerable number of immigrants. In many parts of that district we have a good soil and a good climate, and we grow as good wheat as is grown in the North-West. North of Lake Huron, and in many parts of the country north of Lake Superior, there are considerable stretches of good land, and though I do not regret to see immigration invited into the vast regions of the North-West, where there is room enough for all the suffering people in Ireland or elsewhere, still there is ample space for a good many immigrants in the district to the east of that region, and probably it would be well that efforts should be made to attract immigration in that direction rather than have an unsettled stretch of country between Ontario and the North-West. I rose, however, for the purpose of drawing attention to another matter, which I suppose comes under this head, as it includes quarantine. Last winter there was a very serious outbreak of small-pox among the men employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the district of Thunder Bay. It broke out suddenly, and I think there should be some means taken of imposing quarantine in such cases. As was stated in the newspapers the other day, the people of Prince Arthur's Landing established a quarantine and succeeded in stamping out the disease. I think it is hardly fair that the expense of providing for a thing of this sort should fall upon a poor and isolated community. The people there did all that it was possible for them to do. They employed physicians, they established an hospital in an isolated position, they sent the sick there, and they established quarantine at the different camps along the road for a distance of forty miles eastward from Prince Arthur's Landing. They put guards at the camps which were infected, and they would not allow the people to leave them for fear of carrying the infection to other places. They nursed the sick, they buried the dead, and they succeeded in stamping

out the disease. Now, it is quite evident that all this could not be done without incurring a good deal of expense. The people of the Landing cheerfully bore that expense, though they are a small community. They sent me an account of it, which I laid before, the hon. Minister of Immigration, thinking that, doubtless, it came within his Department. He manifested great sympathy, but he thought that some other Department should deal with it. I then went to the Department of Railways, but they thought that theirs was not the proper Department, and that it should be dealt with by some other Department. They wrote me a letter recommending me to apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway about it, because the men were working for that Company. I sent this letter to the Company, and received an answer from them, the other day, to the effect that they had no funds for such a purpose. The fact remains that a terrible disease broke out, and that if it had not been for these energetic people acting as they did, and stamping it out, the consequences might have been very serious; and yet, it appears, that we have not a Department of the Government ready to take the matter up and deal with it. They all manifested the greatest sympathy with these people, they were exceedingly sorry that they had been put to so much trouble in stamping out the disease, but I could get nothing from them further than extreme courtesy, civility, and a great deal of red tape. Now that the matter is under discussion, I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to these facts, so that he may make provision for such cases in the future. The small-pox has left the place where it broke out, and its ravages are now felt among the poor Indians of Rainy River, whom it is killing off very fast, and there is no saying where it may end.

Mr. SPROULE. I have some knowledge of this outbreak and of the means which were taken to stamp it out, and I fully endorse all the hon. gentleman has said. I think we can scarcely over-estimate its importance, because if the disease had spread amongst the laborers of the railway, it would have been almost impossible to carry on the works around Lake Superior. The people at the Landing who took this matter in hand were not a wealthy people, and they took the most efficient means of stamping out the disease, and these means were successful. I think it is a matter with which the hon. Minister of Agriculture should deal, as it belongs to his Department, and I think he should grant a small sum in order to pay the expenses which were incurred at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be sorry to interrupt this discussion, but I was anxious to get some information from the hon. Minister upon the question of immigration, which we were discussing when this matter came up. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Royal) added the 25,000 expected to come from Ireland to the 75,000 that the hon. Minister calculates for the North-West, making in all 100,000. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if my hon. friend was correct or not. Did the hon. gentleman include the 25,000 in his estimated calculation?

Mr. POPE. My calculation was 75,000, and I did not take those into consideration, because arrangements had not been made at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that; but still the hon. gentleman did expect a certain amount of Irish immigration.

Mr. POPE. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. And I suppose he expects ten or twelve thousand from the United States.

Mr. POPE. I think a good many more. During the winter season, my agents have been employed in travelling in the United States, and working up emigration from that country, and the reports I get are very encouraging.

Mr. BLAKE. So we may, perhaps, count on 15,000 of the 40,000 to come from there. The hon. gentleman also includes in this total of 150,000, the persons who will be repatriated from the United States. Has he any statement as to that?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. BLAKE. They are included in the 150,000, but how many they are he cannot say; and therefore the total figure is reached without any very great information as to how it is reached.

Mr. POPE. I said that. I said that my impression was that we would get 150,000 but it was not based on a very positive estimate, but on the information from Europe and the United States.

Mr. BLAKE. And how many Chinese did the hon. gentleman include in that number.

Mr. POPE. I did not count any Chinese at all. I presume we shall get some.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. First Minister stated that there was an extensive plan, in which the Pacific Railway Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, and another Company, were joined to promote immigration. I saw a brief letter from the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway the other day, in which he stated that his suggestion was not a settlement on the lands of the Company, but on free grant lands. Can the hon. gentleman speak a little more positively or fully as to what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are doing to promote immigration and what they are expending? I observe that the return of the railway, given under the Statute did not mention any specific expenditure in that direction; and some of us have a very lively recollection of promises made to us when we were called upon to assent to the hon. gentleman's railway policy, as to the vast work to be done, and as to the way in which the public revenue would be relieved by the railway company doing that portion of our business for us. They were to pay our immigration agents, and we were to save our money. I do not know how much they have spent; I have seen no account, and I would like to know what they have spent, are spending, and are about to spend for immigration.

Mr. POPE. Of course, I cannot say what they have spent. I know that they have an agent in London, and I know that they have contributed largely by the publication of pamphlets and other literature, which they have distributed throughout Germany, Scandinavia, and elsewhere. If the report is true, as I believe it is, that the Pacific Railway Company, and the other companies mentioned by the hon. First Minister, are going to establish 25,000 people in the North-West, I can assure the hon. gentleman that that means a very large expenditure indeed.

Mr. BLAKE. But the plan is not that the Canadian Pacific Railway will do that, but that the English Government will do it.

Mr. POPE. No; I understand that the English Government will give £5 a head, and the rest will be contributed by these Companies.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement is that the English Government will advance for ten years enough money to put them in the North-West.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It is a pleasing feature of the debate that a few hon. gentlemen have been bold enough to say a word or two for the older Provinces. We have heard so much of the West, and the tendency has been so strong to go there, that we might fear the East would tip up. The remark has been made twice to-night by an hon. gentleman, that there were no unoccupied farms in Ontario. This is quite correct. Such is the soil, the climate, and the abundance of fuel in Ontario, that the lands once made into

Mr. POPE.

farms are not left unoccupied; but a stranger might draw a wrong conclusion from those remarks, and might suppose that there were no unoccupied lands suitable for farming in the Province, whereas there are tens of thousands of acres in the Western Peninsula of Ontario still awaiting settlement, and which, when once cultivated as farms, are worth from \$40 to \$60 an acre. In the attention paid to the North-West, this fact is likely to be overlooked. There are so many individuals interested in the North-West, that it is receiving undue attention. Great quantities of the literature regarding the North-West, which was prepared originally for the Old Country, is distributed in the older Provinces. I have seen cartloads of it being sent to Ontario. Allusions have been made to the Pacific Railway Company, and the efforts it is making to secure immigration. I think the point was properly taken. The Pacific Railway Company own half the land, and all the modern highways, that is, the railways of the North-West, and it is very desirable that we should know whether it is doing its part in the promotion of immigration. The attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture has been called to the necessity of making suitable provision for immigrants when they arrive in the North-West. I think it would be well to protect those immigrants who are not familiar with the country from locating on poor land. It is well known that there are large sections in the North-West that are not suitable for settlement, to which immigrants occasionally find their way, and after spending considerable of their energy and money, they are forced to move. There have been numerous instances of that kind already, and I believe it would be largely in the future interest of that country if some attention was paid to directing the immigrants to suitable locations; otherwise, the effect of our policy will be largely to send immigrants to Dakota by way of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that the general policy of his Department this year is the same as last, as applied to larger figures. I see that last year a portion of the vote was expended in paying assisted passages of mechanics. Is there any proposal to assist the immigration of mechanics this year?

Mr. POPE. Not as mechanics. Attached to every assisted warrant is the certificate of a clergyman, and the declaration of the immigrant himself, that he is an agriculturist, or a farmer, or of something of that kind. But I find very often that a good able fisted mechanic will make a very good agriculturist, and besides there is a very large demand for mechanics in the North-West at very high prices, and I shall try as far as I can to supply that demand to some extent.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not express an opinion on the hon. gentleman's policy, but am merely ascertaining what the policy is.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is one point that ought to be referred to, and that is the references hon. gentlemen opposite have made to the effect of the Canadian Pacific Railway on immigration to this country. When the discussion took place on the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was urged strongly that the effect of that contract would be to largely increase immigration, and that the Company would share largely with the Government the cost of bringing in immigration. We may fairly say this has been realized to a very considerable degree. If to-day we are looking forward to some 75,000 immigrants coming into the North-West, we owe it to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has succeeded with an enterprise that has challenged the admiration of everyone, in constructing the railway over the prairie section of the North-West, and at the end of this year will probably have it completed to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. In no possible way could the Company have contributed more to the bringing in and settlement of immigration in the North-



West than by this work. One of the things we want in connection with immigration is labor, and in consequence of the rapid progress that has been made in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, labor has been offered to people going into the North-West, enabling them to earn wages while actually preparing to make their settlement on the land. Although it may be quite true that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not yet reached the point where they can contribute money to bring immigrants into the country, as the railways of the United States are doing in their Land Department, we have no reason to complain of their operations to this time. Until the railway is completed in the North-West there is no use bringing in immigrants there to any great extent; and by their rapid progress in the construction of that road the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing the best work they can to promote the settlement of that country. Every one will congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the statement he has been able to make as to the prospects of immigration this year. No one could have believed, two or three years ago, when this subject was discussed as a matter of the future, that in the course of a couple of years we would be able to make estimates for the bringing of an immigration of 75,000 into the North-West. We ought to be abundantly satisfied, not only as to the work done by the Government, in this connection, but also with the work done by the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the future, when the road will be completed, this Company will enter more energetically into the work of bringing in immigrants than can be expected of them at present.

Mr. TASSÉ. With reference to a statement made by the hon. First Minister, I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Agriculture what was the assisted passage offered to those Canadians who wished to return to the country?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman may have misunderstood what the hon. First Minister said, or intended to say. We give to the immigrants, going to Manitoba, \$5 a head towards their expenses going there.

Mr. BAIN. I do not propose to deal at any great length with the doings of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-West, because I do not look at their efforts in exactly the same light as the hon. member for Cardwell. I doubt whether the hon. Minister of Agriculture will consider the class of employment they furnish in constructing the railway as likely to draw to us a very desirable class of agricultural settlers. I have generally found that a certain class of men follow that labor as a profession of itself, and when the railway construction is over they pass onward to where other work of that kind is to be found. Any efforts I have been able to see that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made towards a policy of immigration will be more than counterbalanced by the very high rates they impose on everything they carry, and I must say the hon. Finance Minister has not facilitated by his Tariff the procuring of cheap agricultural implements in the North-West by the new settler. With reference to the recent negotiations that have transpired between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Pacific Railway, I have looked over the correspondence in the *London Times*, and the references to them in our own papers, and I must say it strikes me that the President of that Company has not made any tangible proposition in the way of aiding immigration in the North-West. Up to this time his efforts seem rather to have been directed to getting some one else to do the work. I defy any one to point to any tangible offers of aid coming from him. The hon. First Minister told us, two years ago, that the fact of this company having a large interest in the lands of the North West would relieve us of our large expenditure in connection

with immigration. But we find the Railway Company have transferred a very large proportion of those lands to other companies, and they now expect that those companies and the Hudson Bay Company will come forward and facilitate the settlement of those lands by promoting immigration. I confess I have strong sympathy with the sentiment of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he said that he did not propose, except in the matter of assisted passengers, to aid in the promotion of this Imperial Government scheme of immigration from the destitute districts of Ireland that propose to settle at least 5,000 families in the North-West. Now, there is this remarkable thing in connection with Irish immigration. The recent statistics furnished by the Imperial authorities show that the immigration from Ireland for the last two years has been much larger from the Province of Ulster and the peaceable portion of Ireland than from the disturbed Provinces—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because they had more money.

Mr. BAIN. Yes. And it proves that in those sections of Ireland where this difficulty existed, where the population was so dense that the moment the crop fell below the average the people were immediately in want, they were in that unfortunate position that they were really too poor to leave the country, and the consequence was that it was mainly the best portion of the earning and enterprising population of Ireland who emigrated from that country, while the poorer classes remained at home. Now, I doubt honestly the desirability of moving that section of the population from those disturbed districts where they have had the manhood, in a large measure, crushed out of them by years of difficulty and depression, and I fear that any scheme that proposes to move 5,000 families, which would be an aggregate of 25,000 souls, to this country, under these circumstances, and locate them on lands in the North-West—I fear that unless there is a much larger expenditure than our Government or the Home Government are likely to make, the whole scheme will prove an ignominious failure. I agree with the hon. Minister when he says that this class of the population had better be scattered over the older Provinces and mingled with their population, because the fact is patent that in the older Provinces our difficulty is that the best of our young men whom we are most anxious to see remain among us, have gone off to the North-West Territory and located there. Of course, what is the loss of the older Provinces is the gain of the North-West, because I am satisfied that there is no class of immigrants who go into that country who will make their marks as quickly and develop that country so successfully as these young men. I, therefore, concur in the opinion of the Minister that it would be better to scatter those people, who come here comparatively helpless for want of means, over the older Provinces than to settle them in the North-West. It is difficult for colonists from the older European countries to transport to that new country their original associations, and carry with them all the comforts with which they were surrounded at home. I think it would be bad policy to form a whole settlement of families who had no capital and had to be brought to the country at the expense of the Imperial Government. There is one other point in connection with this immigration. My hon. friend from Gloucester remarked that he thought we were not securing our proportion of Irish immigration, and he referred to the large exodus that occurred under his own observation to the Australian colonies. Fortunately we have the records of the Imperial Parliament with reference to that immigration, and I will only quote the figures to show where the Irish population have been immigrating during the last two years. The official returns show that in 1882 a little over 89,000 people left Ireland. Of these nearly 66,000, or 74

per cent. of the whole, have gone to the United States. Canada gets the next largest proportion, between 7,000 and 8,000, and between 10,000 and 11,000 left the sister Isle and found employment in various portions of England. Australia comes in for only 4,600, and when these are added up it leaves less than 2,000 to be distributed to New Zealand and all other parts of the world. Our returns show that we have nearly doubled Irish emigration to this country in 1882 as compared with 1881. We thus compare favorably with Australia and New Zealand, who have put forth excessive efforts to secure emigration to their shores—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. More than the United States in proportion to their population.

Mr. BAIN. So much the better for us. We gather from the statement of our Commissioner in London, that very few go to Australia or New Zealand except those whose passages are entirely paid by the Government of those Colonies, while the large proportion of Irishmen who emigrate to Canada come by their own unaided efforts. It is to be regretted that such a large proportion of them go to the United States, but such is the fact, and there is no use denying it. With reference to the question of German immigrants, I think they are a very desirable class, but when I look at the figures, I do not think they will stand that laudation which the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) and some other hon. members have bestowed upon that immigration. I see in the Estimates for this year, \$6,200 for the salaries of immigration agents on the Continent, and \$7,000 for their travelling expenses. Turning to the report of the Minister of Agriculture I find the reports of agents from this side of the Atlantic, and also from the agents in Ireland and Great Britain, very fully given; the only reference I have been able to find to these agents who are drawing \$13,000 per annum, is simply a couple of lines in the earlier part of this report, setting forth that Dr. Hahn, of Wurtemberg, was our representative in Germany, and a Mr. Marmette our representative in France. I had the curiosity to turn to the analysis of the immigrants who came to Canada last year, to see how much we had secured from these two gentlemen, that were thus specially singled out as being our sole representatives on the Continent. I find that in 1881 we received 530 Germans, and in 1882 this number had increased to 1,024. Of French and Belgians, Mr. Marmette had secured in 1881, 104, but in 1882 he had only been able to secure 50. The great mass of emigrants who have come to this country from the Continent are classed as Scandinavians. In 1881 there were 9,600, and in 1882, 8,274. I think it is an oversight on the part of the hon. Minister that we have no report from the agency which secured that large number of Scandinavians from the Continent of Europe, while we have the reports from agents in other sections representing a much smaller increment, and backed up as they are by 600 or 700 agents of steamship companies in the Mother Country who all receive a direct cash bonus from the steamship companies for every emigrant they secure. Something more will have to be done before we can secure a large increase to our German population. I believe so soon as we can secure, by any reasonable means such a nucleus of German immigrants from the Fatherland as will at once form a point of attraction to those left behind, then and not till then, will we secure a satisfactory mode of drawing to our shores the German population. That is one of the great means by which the United States has secured such a very large proportion of that immigration. We have heard a good deal said about the population we are drawing from the American side of the line, to the North-West. I do not propose to discuss that vexed question now, but on looking at the Public Accounts I notice that one of the agents at Winnipeg has been paid over \$1,000 for assisting immi-

Mr. BAIN.

grants into the North-West from the United States. My observation in connection with the crossing of the frontier is, that the parties generally get themselves over, and I was very much surprised to see this item, because I had supposed that people coming from the United States to Canada, and going from here to the United States, arranged the matter themselves, and travelled as they felt disposed. This is entirely apart from the efforts of our agent among the French population of the New England States to secure immigration to the North-West. In connection with his efforts he draws a salary of \$1,200, with travelling expenses, amounting to \$1,400 or \$1,500 more, and his efforts last season secured between 600 and 700 people to move from the Eastern States into Manitoba and the North-West. I do not suggest these matters in a spirit of fault-finding with the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the administration of his Department. I believe that, after all the expenditure, year after year—and I am not sure but that the hon. Minister has been as severely criticized by his friends as by his opponents—that the steady maintenance of the advantages of this Dominion before the Mother Country and the continental nations which have dense populations, will contribute to our future welfare and the building up of this Dominion, and a good investment financially.

Mr. WATSON. As the hon. Minister appears to have figured out the value of immigrants and claims that a boy of sixteen is worth \$800, and pays a revenue of \$5, perhaps the hon. gentleman has estimated the value of an immigrant in the North-West.

59. To meet the probable amount required for Pensions to Veterans of War. .... \$25,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. Minister inform the Committee how many of the veterans of 1812 are still on the pension list? I think the appropriation for each was about \$25 last year.

Mr. CARON. 800 veterans are receiving pensions from the Government at present.

Mr. ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman propose to divide this grant *pro rata*, or still limit the amount to \$25 for each pensioner?

Mr. CARON. The amount voted last year is being kept up for this year, and I hope the veterans will have a small increase on what was given them last year.

Mr. ROSS. Is it the present intention, as the number of pensioners is reduced, to divide the same amount among the smaller number?

Mr. CARON. Of course I would not pledge myself to do that; but I can say it is the intention, for the present year, to do what I have just stated to my hon. friend.

Mr. AMYOT. Some veterans in Lower Canada do not receive as much as the same class in Ontario, and I would like to know if the hon. gentleman intends, this year, to equalize the distribution.

Mr. CARON. The amount which the veterans from Quebec receive was fixed by the Province of Quebec, previous to Confederation. In Ontario the amount, instead of being \$60, as in Quebec, is \$80; and we could not make any change without interfering with the arrangements which existed previous to Confederation, and which would interfere with the amounts that the different Provinces were paying for that purpose.

Mr. AMYOT. That is all very well for the past; but for the future I do not see any possible objection to equalizing the amount. Some have died, and there is more money to distribute; and I think it only fair that those who remain, who are only a few in number compared with those in Ontario, should receive as much as the latter. This would not disturb the arrangements of the several Provinces before

Confederation, and is only an act of justice to those who remain.

Mr. CARON. My hon. friend will see that if any change takes place, it must occur with the consent of the Province of Quebec. This arrangement was previous to Confederation. It was taken in as one of the assets of the Province, and we could not change it; but I will be very happy indeed on some future occasion to discuss this point with the hon. gentleman, and to see whether it would not be possible to meet his view.

59. Compensation to Pensioners in lieu of land..... \$5,120.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How many pensioners are on the list?

Mr. CARON. They are decreasing every year—at the ratio of about 200 per annum.

60. Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff..... \$19,830.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Here is an increase of \$2,300 and I notice that it arises from the appointment of an Inspector of Artillery and Warlike Stores for the Dominion of Canada, who will receive \$1,800; staff allowances \$500. I think I am not out of order in calling the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to the answer he made to me when the Militia Bill was under consideration. I said, he intended to appoint practically a new officer, an Inspector of Artillery, and his explanation was, that this was not a new officer, but a certain individual, Col. Irvine, who was Inspector of Artillery connected with one of the batteries. I think the intention is to remove that officer to headquarters here, and appoint him Inspector of Artillery, while the inspection he was in the habit of doing before is to be done by officers connected with "A" and "B" Batteries. I was also told by the hon. Minister, that the remuneration for this officer was taken out of the appropriation for those batteries; but I see now that it is to be taken out of another fund, and to be paid in connection with the District Staff. The Inspector of the batteries will then be only a sort of sub-Inspector of Artillery connected with the batteries, and this officer, with an allowance of \$2,300, will be Inspector of Artillery generally. I think I am right, then, in saying that he is practically a new officer; and that other officers will really inspect the artillery connected with the respective batteries; and this officer will be Inspector of Artillery for the Dominion. I do not know whether there is any more necessity or not for a special officer of this kind than there was before.

Mr. CARON. It is not practically a new appointment, because it is practically exactly what I told my hon. friend when the matter came up before. I then told him that the pay of the Inspector of Artillery had been transferred from Ottawa, for the simple reason that he was transferred to headquarters. I then told my hon. friend, and I now repeat, that the gentleman who has been appointed Inspector of Artillery at headquarters was merely removed from the battery, and his pay, that used to appear as he will see—if the hon. gentleman will look there—in the pay-list of "A" and "B" Batteries, is now charged to the staff at headquarters, and is taken out of the amount that used to be voted for "A" and "B" Batteries; consequently, I told the hon. gentleman that it was not a new appointment, and instead of the Inspector of Artillery being paid out of "A" and "B" Batteries, on his being transferred to headquarters, I thought it was only right and proper that this pay should be charged to the account of the staff appointments, and not to the batteries. If the hon. gentleman has looked into the organization of the Militia, he will find that previous to this Inspector of Artillery being appointed, Major-General Strange was Inspector of Artillery; and under him, as under Colonel Irwin, to-day we have sub-Inspectors of Artillery, who are Commandants of the two Schools of Artillery which

we have in Quebec and Kingston. The change is absolutely in transferring the payment from the pay-list of "A" and "B" Batteries to the pay-list of the staff in Ottawa, and nothing more.

Mr. VAIL. Is Col. Irwin only appointed in place of Col. Lewis, who formerly resided in Halifax, and was the Inspector of Artillery?

Mr. CARON. My hon. friend is completely mistaken. Col. Lewis was never replaced, and it is not intended to replace him. Col. Lewis was Inspector of Artillery for the military district comprising Halifax and the Lower Provinces. When the matter was brought before me, I struck out the item, and this enabled me to save \$11,500 per annum in the pay of the staff. Col. Lewis never has been replaced; and when he was Inspector of Artillery, the same organization which we now have, existed, excepting that instead of it being Col. Irwin, Strange, who is now Major-General Strange, was Inspector of Artillery.

Mr. VAIL. But Col. Irwin will perform the same duties which devolved upon Col. Lewis.

Mr. CARON. It is not at all the same. Col. Lewis has not been replaced, and we have made a saving in his department.

Mr. VAIL. What I mean is, that the duty which formerly fell upon him now devolves upon the present Inspector.

Mr. CARON. Yes.

61. Ammunition, clothing and military stores..... \$125,000.00

Mr. VAIL. What is the intention of the hon. Minister with regard to the purchase of clothing? Does he intend to purchase in London, as he did last year, or to have a portion of it manufactured in Canada?

Mr. CARON. Since I have been at the head of the Department I have tried to get manufactured in Canada the greater portion of the clothing which formerly used to be imported from England, and I have succeeded; but, as the hon. gentleman knows, there are some articles which cannot be obtained in Canada. As I stated on the second reading of the Militia Bill, it is our intention, as far as possible, to get what clothing we require to use from the manufacturers of Canada, instead of importing it from the Old Country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to know if the Minister of Militia is doing anything towards providing a better system of equipment. With all our large expenditure of over \$1,000,000 there is not a man in the force so well equipped as actually to be in a fit condition to take them to the field. If it should happen that an outbreak should take place in the North-West, and it become necessary to send up a force to assist the Mounted Police there is not a regiment well enough equipped to go to service. I think it is time that the Government took this matter in hand, and made an annual appropriation towards the proper equipment of the force. I have seen amongst the stores in use by volunteers, belts which belonged to the Irish regiment which dated back, I am sure, as far as 1798. With the new arms which we now use, we require different kinds of cartridge boxes, and when men go to ball practice they have to carry their ammunition in their vest pockets; and I think it is time that some provision was made to supply us with better equipment. I moved, some time ago, for a return respecting the Ordnance Lands, and I think it would be well for the Government to put the \$1,500,000 which they received as a free gift from the Imperial Government into a fund, and devote the interest to the purchase of a proper equipment for the force. It is ridiculous and childish that no appropriation should be made for equipment under our large Militia expenditure.

Mr. CARON. I can only say that the hon. gentleman will see by the Estimates that I have asked for \$10,000 additional to meet the views he has been expressing.

Mr. VAIL. The reason I referred to this matter of clothing was because I stated the other day that I was sorry to see that the hon. Minister of Militia had expended a large sum of money in making purchases in London, the last year or two—a sum very much in excess of what I found it necessary to expend in London when I was at the head of the Department. I was not in the House when the hon. Minister replied, but I judge, by what I see in the newspapers, that he stated that the amount expended by him in London was no larger than the amount expended there in my time. I desire to put myself right on this matter, because I would be very sorry to make a statement of that kind without foundation. I have looked into the figures and I will give them to the House. When I took charge of the Department I found that we were getting our clothing from London, but we changed that system, as we thought it wise that we should at least try the experiment of making our purchases in this country. In 1876, the expenditure for clothing was \$75,000; in 1877, it was \$25,394, or, in the two years, \$100,394. Of this amount there was expended in London, \$6,358.51, and there was purchased in Canada \$94,035.49. I find that, in 1881, when my hon. friend was in charge of the Department, there was expended in clothing \$54,000, and in 1882, \$57,623.71, making for the two years, \$111,623.71, of which no less than \$100,781.90 was spent in London, and \$10,841.81 in Canada. From these figures I think the House will see that the statement I made is borne out by facts.

Mr. CASEY. It appears by the explanation given by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that the additional \$10,000 asked for here for clothing is not to be spent for new clothing, but for equipment, which, I suppose, will include pouches, knapsacks, &c. The fact is that very few of our volunteers have knapsacks, and that they really could not go on service as they are equipped at present. In regard to the item for ammunition, I expected that the Minister would have given us some particulars as to the manufacture of ammunition in Quebec, and the result of any experiments which have been made with it, with a view of determining how it compares with the imported ammunition. In military stores there is an increase of \$10,000. I would like some explanation of what that increase is. I have been informed that experiments have been conducted with the ammunition. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us the results of them.

Mr. CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the factory at Quebec has been, so far, a great success. We have already carried out the views of our predecessors in getting the clothing manufactured in Canada, and we are endeavoring to do the same thing with regard to cartridges. The ammunition which we have been manufacturing does not cost us any more than it used to cost us when we imported it from England, and we have the advantage of keeping the money in the country, and having the cartridges manufactured by our own people, while we avoid the necessity of keeping so large an amount of ammunition in store, as we formerly had to do, which represented a large amount of capital locked up. At present we can manufacture any quantity of ammunition that might be required, at any given moment in case of emergency.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has not answered my question. What I asked was whether there had been any trials of this ammunition, and, if so, what the results were.

Mr. CARON. The cartridges have been tried by the most experienced men in the factory. We have instruments which were imported for the special purpose of trying these cartridges, and some of them have been sent to leading Militiamen; and they have proved to be quite equal

Mr. O'BRIEN.

and in many cases they are said to be superior to the cartridges which were imported.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister deserves credit for bringing about such a result, for it is a result not to be looked for in a small factory in Quebec. I am afraid that his calculations must have been faulty in some respects. It seems hardly creditable that a small factory at Quebec can turn out these cartridges as cheaply as a large factory in England.

Mr. CARON. Still it is a fact.

Mr. CASEY. As to the tests, the hon. gentleman spoke of testing the cartridges in the factory. The only proper test is to shoot them at a target.

Mr. CARON. That is the way we tested them.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman spoke of having imported instruments for the purpose of testing them in the factory. Is it intended to serve out the ammunition this season?

Mr. CARON. Yes; it is being served out now. At the factory we have regular targets for testing the cartridges at all the elevations, and they are also tested by the instruments before they are used.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the hon. Minister will be kind enough to give us some information about the Krupp guns which we heard about last year.

Mr. CARON. The guns which the hon. gentleman speaks of were furnished under the previous Administration by Mr. Gilbert of Montreal, under a contract with the Militia Department for converting heavy ordnance. For reasons affecting Mr. Gilbert's financial standing, he was not able to carry out the contract. The Department took precaution to secure the Government against loss, the bondsmen of Mr. Gilbert being called upon to pay the amount they were bound to pay for the non-fulfilment of the contract.

Mr. VAIL. I wish to refer to what the hon. member for Muskoka has said, as it is a very important matter. I find that lately the Military Department in England adopted Dr. Oliver's new plan of outfit for the men; it is much lighter than the old plan. The hon. Minister should examine into this plan before making these purchases, as I am sure it is better adapted to our force than the present kit.

Mr. CASEY. What is the \$10,000 increase in military stores for?

Mr. CARON. I cannot exactly tell the items, but the hon. gentleman, as a military man, knows what military stores are. I consider this increase is necessary from the fact that our stores are considerably reduced since the last five or six years.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I asked for a return showing the cost of the cartridge factory at Quebec, since first established, the names and salaries of the employées, and the value and quantity of ammunition made. Will the hon. gentleman bring down this return at concurrence? I am strongly impressed with the view that the cartridge factory is not a good speculation.

Mr. CARON. The return, I hope, will be down to-morrow. This is no speculation at all, but a very good investment. The factory at present supplies all the ammunition we require, and is an institution the Government and country should be proud of, besides giving employment to our people and keeping the money in the country.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I do not attach any value to the last remark, but look forward to receiving the return.

Mr. AMYOT. I visited that institution and can declare it is a perfect success from every point of view. The machinery is perfect, and the institution is a very good one for the instruction of officers and non-commissioned officers. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Mid-

dlesex that he attaches no value to the fact of the cartridges being made here, I may say that this factory gives employment to a number of people; that the materials it uses are got in the country, and the profits made go into the pockets of our own people, instead of into those of the people of other countries.

61. {	Allowance for drill instruction .....	\$ 40,000.00
	Drill pay and other incidental expenses connect- ed with the drill and training of the Militia..	250,000.00

Mr. O'BRIEN. This money for drill instruction is paid to the captains of companies, whether they do their duty or not. A certain standard of drill should be established, which each company should be required to reach before the captain would be entitled to this money, as some captains draw the money without doing any work for it. On a battalion going into camp, an officer should put every company through certain sections of drill and decide that a certain number of men are efficient in those sections; and in this respect the captain of the company would be entitled, or the reverse, to the instruction money. This could be done in an hour's time, and this would save the injustice of paying money to captains who may not have drilled their company at all, outside of the annual drill.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to this. I have had the honor to hold a commission as captain myself, and whether my company was out during the year or not, except when in camp, this money was paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You should have returned it.

Mr. CASEY. I had not the chance to keep it, for it went for band purposes. I do not suppose that the officers keep that money; but if it is intended for the band fund, that should be stated. If intended for drill purposes, means should be taken that captains of companies do their duty in that respect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is the duty of the Government to look after the welfare of those who take part in defending the country. The hon. Minister of Militia told us that he endeavored to give the volunteers a national character; and I inferred from that, that each case that deserved the consideration of the Department, involving anything affecting the interests of the volunteers, would receive prompt and careful consideration. I brought before his notice a case which not only affects the persons I mentioned, but affects, more or less, perhaps, the welfare of all the volunteers in this country. No doubt all of them look to the result of the application I made on behalf of those six who took the fever while engaged in drill, and their claims for compensation up to this time have not been requited. I understand my predecessor also brought the matter before the Minister, but nothing has been done. To my mind it is as clear as noonday: they contract the fever while in the service of their country, that they suffered long and serious illness, from which some of them have scarcely ever recovered, and no compensation whatever has been granted to them. Doubts were expressed by the Department that these volunteers did not contract the disease in the service of the country; but to set those doubts at rest and clearly to establish the facts of the case, several letters have been sent me, which I will read to the House. I have a letter which I received since I brought the matter before the House, from the captain of the company in which the disease occurred, and here is what he says:

"I have no doubt that the disease was contracted while at drill. I think it would have told well for the service if the Department had made some compensation to the poor fellows for their suffering and loss of time."

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the item at all; that has nothing to do about drill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The item is for incidental expenses connected with drill; and if this has nothing to do with the item, I am very much astonished.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Go on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have a letter from the doctor who attended two or three of those cases. It is dated, Durham, April 18th, 1883:

"DURHAM, April 18, 1883.

"MY DEAR DOCTOR.—Thanks for the copies of *Hansard* which I received last evening. That affair about the typhoid fever amongst members of the Grey Battalion had slipped out of my mind, and you certainly deserve credit for again bringing the matter before the attention of the Minister of Militia. My views were fully placed before the Department in papers sent in at the time, and I can only now repeat my belief that the cases under my care were undoubtedly typhoid fever, and have no hesitation in saying that the disease was contracted by the men while doing Militia duty, notwithstanding the report of the battalion surgeon to the contrary. The attending physician should be more competent to give a diagnosis than any one who comes along after the men have recovered, and gives an opinion from hearsay evidence.

"As to the statement made that the charges were excessive, and made with the intention of 'making a haul' out of the Government, I can only say that the bills as rendered by me were under, rather than over, the tariff, and I have no interest in them whatever, as the patients themselves are responsible for their bills, and have already settled them in some cases. My only wish is to secure to the men some little compensation for the injury received by them while in the service of their country.

"Yours sincerely,

"D. JAMIESON."

Now, I have a statement made by one of the volunteers himself. I have also a statement made by Mr. Robert J. Disney, and I will read that to the House if the Government will give me their attention. I want this matter put fairly before the Minister of Militia, and I want to find out, and the volunteers want to find out, the position that they occupy in the Department of Militia controlled by the hon. Minister at present. This is the declaration made by Robert J. Disney, at whose place two of the volunteers stayed during the time they had the fever:

"I, Robert J. Disney, of the village of Hanover in the county of Grey and Province of Ontario, carpenter and builder, do solemnly declare—

"That George C. Disney was in perfect good health previous to going to brigade drill at Toronto, in the month of October, 1879, and that when he came to my house from said drill he was sick with typhoid fever.

"That he was sick for six months, and in consequence was not able to work for one year, and that during the whole of that time he was cared for and nursed by my wife and myself.

"That he is still suffering from the effects of said fever, portions of his right leg being still numb, and frequently complains of weakness in that limb.

"That I have procured medical attendance for him during his sickness, and paid the sum of forty dollars for such attendance.

"That I have not received any remuneration for board, lodgings, or for what I paid to the medical attendant.

"That the late Thomas W. Disney was in my employment at the time said George W. Disney was sick at my house, and caught the fever from George, and had several running sores on his body, and died from the effects thereof, on the 10th day of April, 1882, leaving a widow unprovided for.

"That my sister, Sarah Disney, was living with me at the same time, and took the fever, and was sick for three months.

"And that John Hill Bottrell (now a resident of the city of Toronto), who was a member of the same company of volunteers as the said George C. Disney, went to the said brigade drill, and was in good health before going, came back to my place from said drill sick with typhoid fever, and was sick for five months and remained during that time with me, and was nursed by my wife and myself.

"That I received no compensation for the lodging, caring or boarding of the said John Hill Bottrell whatever.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intitled 'An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-Judicial Oaths.'

"Declared before me, at Bentinck, in the  
County of Grey, Ontario, the 19th day } "ROBERT J. DISNEY.  
of April, A.D. 1882.

"JOHN PROCTOR, J.P.,

"In and for the county of Grey,  
and Province of Ontario."

I have another document, made by several leading citizens, in confirmation of the statement of Robert J. Disney. I have also a declaration made by George Disney, similar in

character to the one I have just read. But the statement that I now read as to the credibility of those witnesses is sworn to by the leading citizens of the place—one of them is a postmaster, one a druggist and the other two are business men. It reads as follows:—

"We, the undersigned, do solemnly declare that we did, at different times go to Robert J. Disney's house during the sickness of George C. Disney, the late Thomas W. Disney, Sarah Disney, and John Hill Bottrell.

"That we have heard the declaration of George C. Disney and Robert J. Disney read, and corroborate the statements made therein as relates to the sickness of the said George C. Disney, the late Thomas W. Disney, Sarah Disney and John Hill Bottrell.

"And we make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled 'An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-Judicial Oaths.'

"GEORGE BRIGGS,  
"JAMES BOTTRELL,  
"W. GOODEVE, Druggist,  
"T. S. COPPINGER, P.M.

"Declared before me at Bentinck, in the County of Grey, Ontario, the 19th day of April, A.D. 1833.

"JOHN PROCTOR, J.P.,  
"In and for the County of Grey,"

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the full case which I brought before the notice of the House the other day. I am sorry to trouble the House again with it, but I desire to put myself right, and I desire to see that the claims of the volunteers who contracted illness in the service of the country, are looked after by the country. It is always very well to say that the volunteers are very patriotic. So they are; but if that patriotism is to be rewarded by neglect, by abuse, by loss of time and money, I think that is a very poor reward for patriotism. If the hon. Minister of Militia states that the Militia Department is a loyal department, and if he wishes to make it a national institution deserving the support of both great parties in this House and in the country—and I believe the Militia force is built up from both great parties and that it should be treated irrespective of party—I believe that the claims of those volunteers will not be denied; whereas at the present time they have just reason to fear that they have been slighted and their claims not attended to, and that they are not receiving the support and encouragement from this House and the hon. Minister which they have reason to expect, and should receive. I will submit to the hon. Minister all these papers for his consideration. He can examine them and investigate those claims, and I feel assured that if he divests himself of everything but a desire to do right to members of the force, those claims will not be unrequited for a month, but will be settled at once. The statement was made by an hon. member of this House, that I desired to make a haul in connection with this matter, though there is no hon. member so unworthy, except the one who made it, to make such a statement. He knew perfectly well that if I was called to attend on a volunteer, the volunteer was responsible for the payment for my attendance. It is unworthy of any hon. member, to charge another member with doing what I presume he would do if he had an opportunity. It is unworthy of the hon. member, and every hon. member who desires to see right maintained in this House, well knows I had no interest in those cases, except a desire to see the men who suffered, requited, and those who had lost money while standing in defence of the country, repaid. I felt it was my duty, not only to those few volunteers, but to the whole volunteer force, to lay before the House, and the country, the claims of those volunteers, and to allow the Department to act as they considered best for the future interests of the Militia force of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad this opportunity has presented itself to enable me to make a short explanation in regard to this matter. No doubt every hon. member will remember the invectives hurled at me for the course I took during the last debate on this subject. I was misrepresented

MR. LANDERKIN.

at the time, and a similar attempt is made now. In regard to the statement of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that a member in this House said he had no right to charge such a bill, I deny I said anything of the kind. I said a rumor was afloat to the effect that certain professional gentlemen had sent in exorbitant bills, expecting the Department of Militia to pay the charges, and they would receive some consideration for it. I said exactly what was told me by the surgeon of the battalion, and although I examined the bills afterwards, and I confess that, to my mind, they were not extravagant, still I must say here that a denial was emphatically made on the floor of the House during the last debate, that the hon. member for South Grey (Dr. Landerkin) had made any charge, or sent in any bill, although the bills are in the Department at this day. I have the Debates here, and I find the hon. gentleman said: "I made no charge and sent in no bills." I say the bills are in the Department to-day. I give this explanation because I went with Mr. Jackson, the late member for South Grey, to the Department to assist him in securing for these men that to which they were entitled. I made this explanation also because I have before me a copy of the *Grey Review*, in which I find an editorial, or a piece purporting to be an editorial, which I believe is only a communication written from this House by a member of it who is attempting to pose before the electors of the constituency of South Grey, and to do something which will be injurious to the hon. member for East Grey—I make this explanation because I find in that article it is stated that the hon. member for East Grey has opposed this claim, and has said that those men had not typhoid fever while in the discharge of their duties, and were not entitled to pay. I deny that I ever made those assertions. I said I saw the report in the Department, and it was to the effect that those men had not typhoid fever, that they did not contract fever while in the discharge of their duty, and consequently apprehended the Department were not to blame because they refused to pay the claim after the report of their own surgeon, specially sent to investigate those cases, was to the effect that the men did not contract the disease while in the discharge of their duty. I am glad to have had this opportunity, which enables me to set myself right before my constituents, and those whom I respect, in South Grey. I am as anxious as is the hon. member for South Grey, that every man connected with the 31st Battalion who received any injury, or sustained any loss from the discharge of his duty, should be compensated; but I only rose in defence of the Government, because an unfair attempt was made to charge them with dereliction of duty, in refusing to pay demands which a reasonable explanation would make apparent. I am willing that they should be paid, but I adhere to my statement that the report is in the Department, and it appears that, in the opinion of the surgeon of the 31st Battalion, who investigated the cases, that the parties did not contract disease when attending drill in Toronto, or on the way up and down.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). For how many days' drill does the hon. Minister expect to call out the Active Militia force this year, and how many men does he expect to drill?

Mr. CARON. The drill will not occupy less than twelve days, and it may probably be one or two days additional. We count on about 27,000 men.

Mr. AMYOT. There is a general desire expressed by the force that the pay of the rank and file should increase every year by a sum of 10 cts. or 15 cts. For the first year a man should receive 50 cts. per day, for the second year 60 cts., and for the third year 70 cts. This would give more encouragement to the men to go on with their drill, and it would not amount to more than \$4,000 or \$5,000 additional a year.

Mr. CARON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, who is a distinguished member of the force, and who takes much interest in matters tending to increase its efficiency, I must say his suggestion is a very good one. At the present time, however, in view of the changes which are contemplated and the changes which will be effected when the Militia Bill becomes law, I am not prepared at present to adopt his suggestion; but this is one of those suggestions which must call on the Minister of Militia for future consideration, and there can be no doubt that some day it will be carried into effect.

Mr. VAIL. I am afraid the hon. Minister has not taken into account the cost of drilling 20,000 men. I find that in 1877 we drilled 20,000 men, and I think for twelve days, at a cost of \$125,000; and the whole force, 40,000, could then be drilled for \$250,000.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will find, in making a calculation, that it is quite impossible to drill 20,000 men for twelve days for \$125,000.

Mr. VAIL. Is all of the \$250,000 to be spent in drilling?

Mr. CARON. Yes, if the number of men we expect to have drilled, turn out; otherwise the amount will be proportionately less.

Mr. PLATT. Does the hon. gentleman intend to formulate any regulations regarding the examination of volunteers entering into camp? We know that, according to the regulations as heretofore carried out, a very large number of the volunteers drilled in the camps have been totally unfit to enter the service at all. In many corps, no examination took place. In many instances commanding officers, while making strenuous exertions to fill up the companies, as the camps are held in the busy season, when able-bodied men are earning good wages, take a poorer class of men, those who are too old or too young, or too infirm to work in the harvest field; and in many instances which came under my own observation, men after drilling in the ranks, had to lay off one-half the time owing to their infirmities. It is quite essential to the interests of the country and the force, that a thorough examination should be made, and certificates issued to each member of the force. It seems to me very remarkable that, whereas, when men are to go to the front, they are put through a thorough course of medical examination, we pay, in the camps, for the drilling of men who are totally unfit for service. I think I am safe in saying that 25 per cent. of the men drilled during the last few years were totally unfitted for service, and should not be received into it in case of the country being in danger. I trust the instructions will be given that no one shall be accepted for drill, unless fit for active service. I would also ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to make any change with regard to the medical comforts of the men while in camp. Several years ago, something like a respectable medical chest was sent to the commanding officer of each battalion, for the use of the surgeon; but in the camps which I have attended during the last few years, only one chest was to be found, and it contained nothing more than rhubarb pills and Dover's powders, and you had to send an orderly to get a single potion of medicine when a man was taken suddenly ill. Again, a hospital tent should be placed under the charge of the surgeon, to be used in cases of emergency. During rainy and cold nights, men are often taken suddenly ill at quite a distance from any town, and a very great deal of trouble ensues. I have known poor fellows lying on the cold ground until blankets were loaned them, and I have even taken blankets from my own tent in order to keep a sick soldier from the damp ground. Many cases of serious illness have resulted; and the country has, in consequence, been called upon to pay what might have been avoided had the men been taken better care of, and means been supplied to the surgeons for this purpose in cases of sudden illness.

I trust that these matters will receive the attention of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The corps to which the hon. gentleman belonged must have been very remiss in its duty, for I know, in our battalion, a strict medical examination is made, and we take no man unfit for service. We also always have a hospital tent, and are well provided. Surgeons do make complaints about the medical chest, and I think with reason. A great deal of abuse prevailed in former years regarding the medical examination; but last year, this was effectually carried out, so far as I know—at least, this was the case in my own regiment. The hospital tent is the first thing I would think of pitching.

Mr. TROW. Will any allowance be made to the men who are not called out into camp, if they are drilled by their officers?

Mr. CARON. The city corps drill at headquarters, and of course are paid, and the corps that drill in camps are paid by Statute.

65. Contingencies and general service not otherwise provided for, including grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations, and bands of efficient corps. \$38,000.00

Mr. CASEY. This is a very important item; and I wish to call the attention of the Minister especially to a few points. Of course, the object of the grant is to teach shooting, and this is perhaps the best possible object, for whom money can be expended in connection with the Militia force, the principal thing after all, in modern warfare, is to have good marksmen as soldiers. In order to encourage shooting, it is in the first place necessary to get as many new beginners to commence practice each year as possible, and to see that the money does not go, as it very often does, principally to a few professional shots, and in the second place, to see that it is not wasted by the Association to which it is given. I think, when the Government makes a grant to a local association, they should do so on certain terms, and they should require certain regulations as to the conduct of the matches to be held. They should stipulate that they should be held at certain ranges under certain conditions, and under the management and in presence of an officer of the volunteers properly qualified to conduct them. They should not give the grant unconditionally, but in the form of a payment for results after the match is held. They should stipulate that there should be at least a certain number of competitors, and that a certain score should be made—say that, twenty, twenty-five or fifty men should make a minimum score of so much before any grant was paid, and so much extra to be paid for a certain number of competitors making a higher score. I know that a good deal of money is wasted by the smaller associations from a lack of experience in conducting matches, and the shooting that is done at these matches is no real instruction to the men. There is another point to which I wish to call the hon. Minister's attention. Most of the men who compete at these local matches are either not volunteers at all or have joined for the purpose of shooting the matches or of getting the prizes. In the latter case there is something gained, because it is something better than that these men should join for that purpose than that they should not join at all. I think the Government should see to it that no money goes to these local associations to be expended on those who are not volunteers, and that all who compete should be duly qualified and efficient volunteers. I know it is quite a common thing in many of these smaller places, and in some larger places, to have more than one association in the same place, the competitors of each being really the same men, and each drawing a grant. In Ottawa, I believe, there are no less than three associations, and of course the leading men must be largely the same individuals, and a large amount of money is spent in Ottawa which, if properly distributed, would do a great deal to encourage

rifle shooting in matches. The hon. Minister might prevent this abuse by getting a list of the names composing each association, and if the grant was given according to a system of payment of results, he could refuse to give the grant if it appeared that the greater number of the competitors in both associations were the same individuals. In addition to these grants to rifle associations I think there should be a payment of cash, and prizes in the form of badges or something of that sort to volunteers who attained a certain minimum efficiency while in camp or drilling at home. That is the system in the regular army, and I think it is the system among the English volunteers. A man who attains a certain standard in practices obtains an increase in pay.

67. Drill sheds and rifle ranges ..... \$10,000.00

Mr. VAIL. I think it would be well if some provision could be made by which the men would have an opportunity of drilling in the long winter evenings when they have not much else to do. It is of the utmost importance that there should be drill sheds in the different districts in which the men could drill in the inclement seasons of the year. As the Minister of Militia stated that I had saved money in the Department by allowing the force to run down, I might observe that when I was Minister we completed the military building at Winnipeg; we purchased the land at Hamilton upon which the drill shed was, and we completed the drill shed; we erected valuable buildings at London; we built a drill shed at Toronto, and we put all the Militia buildings in that city in a thorough state of repair; we made a grant for a drill shed here at Ottawa, and laid out the grounds—I say we did all this in addition to what was done in connection with the Military College. I would like to ask the Minister if he proposes to make any appropriation for the settlement of that long vexed question between the city of Montreal and the Militia Department. When I left the Department we had been in correspondence with the city of Montreal with a view of having the matter settled.

Mr. CARON. We have been able to get that matter settled, and a vote will be asked for the purpose of re-roofing and repairing the shed, so that the force may have every possible facility for drilling.

68. Care of military properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government ..... \$10,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What is the cause of this increase of \$2,000?

Mr. CARON. It has been put into the Estimates because last year the Imperial Government made over to us some very valuable Ordnance property in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—the Department has not yet accepted the transfer, but will do so within a few weeks—and we consider that the management of this property will cost about \$2,000.

Mr. ROSS. What kind of property is it?

Mr. CARON. It is land, barracks, forts, bastions, &c.

69. Royal Military College.....\$59,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The expenditure in this College has increased rapidly within the last four or five years. That College was managed in the first year, with a full staff, for about \$30,000, and last year the expenditure was \$58,937, nearly double the expenditure for the first year. There were fourteen officers and six non-commissioned officers drawing salaries in connection with that college last year, and there was paid to the superior staff, \$30,000, against \$13,946 in the first year, although the number of cadets was only seventy.

Mr. CARON. There has been no increase in the expenditure, either last year or the year before; it has remained at \$59,000. Even if there was an increase, the hon. gentleman must remember that when the College was opened,

Mr. CASEY.

the staff was far from being complete, and when the number of cadets increased, it was necessary to increase the accommodation. If hon. gentlemen will look into the matter, I think that they will be convinced that the establishment is carried on as cheaply as is possible in the case of a College like the Royal Military College, which was started by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman will see that the expenditure on the staff is out of all reasonable proportion to the number of cadets. To employ a staff of superior officers and non-commissioned officers drawing salaries to the amount of nearly \$40,000, to teach seventy cadets, is beyond all reason.

Mr. CARON. One hundred cadets.

Mr. ROSS. The report of Mr. Powell says seventy. I have a statement showing that the number of students at University College, Toronto, in the session of 1881, was 351, and that the salaries paid for fifteen lecturers, professors, and teachers, amounted to \$29,900, five times the number of students in the Military College, and a little more than one-half the amount paid in salaries. In the Ontario Agricultural College there were 217 pupils, and the amount expended for salaries and wages, \$10,530, three times the number of students in the Military College, and about one-fourth of the amount paid in salaries and wages. If the hon. Minister is going to load down the Military College with exorbitant and unnecessary salaries he will destroy what we believe to be a valuable institution. I cannot understand the College should require fourteen superior instructor officers and six inferior, I suppose non-commissioned officers, for twenty students. Will the hon. gentleman give in detail the names of the officers and the subjects they teach?

Mr. CARON. The salaries have not been increased, except in a very few cases, since the College was established. The staff is composed of Commandant Col. Hewitt, who gets \$3,163; Staff Adjutant, \$1,250; Professors of Mathematics, Artillery, Fortification and Military Works, Military Engineering and Drawing, Lieut.-Col. Kensington and Lieut.-Col. Oliver; Military Topography and Civil Engineering, Major Walker; Military Administration, Law, History, Strategy, Major Jones; Civil Engineering, Mr. Harris; Chemistry and Physics, Mr. Bayne; English and German, Mr. Dickson; French, Mr. Duval; Drawing and Painting, Mr. Day; Assistant Instructors in Mathematics, Mr. Wurtele, one of the cadets of the college, and Mr. Cochrane, also a cadet.

Mr. ROSS. How many instructors in all?

Mr. CARON. Eleven professors and the two cadets. The hon. gentleman will see that the various branches of instruction must naturally be taught by professors, who, so to speak, are specialists, and whether the College has fifty or twenty-five cadets, if these branches are to be taught, professors must be placed at the head of the different branches when they are taught.

Mr. ROSS. If the hon. gentleman is going to select specialists, he can increase the number of professors indefinitely. I do not see that it is necessary to select specialists when the classes are small and the time limited. Good men could be found with more general attainments, who would serve the purpose equally well. If in the Toronto University specialists were employed on every subject, the salaries would be increased three fold, and the same may be said in reference to the Guelph Agricultural College. I would further ask if the hon. Minister makes any effort to secure the services of the military cadets on the surveying and engineering staff of the Government. One of the arguments used in favor of the establishment of the College, was, that we would have a class of young men who would be exceedingly useful in some of the Departments of the Civil Service, or as engineers. If the country spends \$60,000 for the edu-



cation of these young men, the country should utilize their services. Last year eight of them went to the United States, and four or five received commissions in the English service.

Mr. CARON. If it were possible to find one professor who could teach them various branches, we would be saved much trouble and expenditure. If these various branches were taught by one professor, the examination of the cadets would not compare with those at Sandhurst and Woolwich. I can tell my hon. friend that the staff has not been increased, taking into consideration the number of cadets which have been added to the College. We have only added two or three to the staff, which was originally established at the opening of the College. Fifty-four cadets have graduated in the Royal Military College at Kingston. There are eleven cadets in the public service in Canada, four in New Zealand and eight in the United States. Of these latter two are employed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on a branch of their line of railway which is being constructed in the United States. The employment of the cadets is as follows: Imperial regular army, 11; assistant professors in college, 2; inspector of Mounted Police, 1; civil engineering and railway works, 23; land surveying, 6; agriculture, 1; commerce, 4; Customs, 1; divinity, 1; bank clerk, 1; temporarily unemployed from ill-health, 1; no report, 2; total 54.

Mr. TROW. The hon. Minister has stated the number of cadets who have received certificates for a number of years. I understand these cadets have received the rank of Lieutenant in the Militia. I would like to know if the companies to which they are attached receive the benefits of their instruction.

Mr. CARON. I could not tell; but several of the cadets when vacancies occurred in the batteries, did not apply for any commission from their being employed elsewhere.

Mr. ROSS. I notice by the report of the hon. Minister that six professors on the staff were employed in writing text-books for the use of the staff of the College. Does the hon. Minister of Militia consider it necessary that the professors of the staff should be employed in preparing text-books for the College? Cannot these books be got somewhere else?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that these books are issued to the cadets upon their paying for the books; consequently, the printing and publishing of these books really cost us nothing, because the cost is recouped to the Department by the cadets. These text-books are practically the result of the lectures which are given by those various professors in their different branches.

Mr. ROSS. There is another matter which I would like to see explained. The hon. Minister laid great stress, a little while ago, upon the employment of labor in Canada for the making of cartridges and ammunition. I notice by the Public Accounts, that he has sent \$2,274 to England to purchase clothing for the cadets, and nearly \$400 has been sent out of the country to purchase crockery and glassware for the Military College. Now, why not employ labor in Canada in manufacturing this clothing, and this crockery? Those items are not very large, but if we are to keep Canada for the Canadians, if we are anxious to employ Canadian labor and keep our money in the country, then the hon. Minister should find some means for keeping this money in the country as we keep it in the manufacturing of cartridges.

Mr. CARON. The only articles are scarlet cloth and gold lace, which are not manufactured in Canada.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has given a very clear explanation of the text-book question. He says they are mere synopses of the lectures given by the professors during the

session. Incoming students, instead of studying established text-books, will study the practically narrow range of instruction given by the professors. It is absurd to talk about the necessity of publishing new text-books on mathematics, or even on military subjects; there are already much better text-books than any professor in Kingston College is able to write, and it will be simply allowing them to waste time which otherwise would be devoted to teaching. Time so spent is time wasted, and money paid for that time is money wasted. The Minister has said he had to obtain specialists in order to provide first-class instruction in the College. That is true. He also stated that the same number of teachers is required for five or ten pupils as for seventy. That is true. That being so, we must consider the question whether it pays to keep up the College. It appears to give the highest possible instruction to seventy cadets, which is the largest number it ever possessed. When the College was established by my hon. friends on the other side of the House, it was admittedly an experiment. It is such yet, and if the results are not commensurate it will be a question whether the institution can be continued. Fifty-four cadets have graduated at an expense, during the six years, of over \$300,000, or \$5,500 for each cadet who has graduated. We have to look the question in the face, and ask whether it pays to pass the cadets through the College at that cost unless they can be made of special value to the Militia force of this country. We talk about them being employed as civil engineers, and in commercial life. It is absurd to spend money avowedly for military purposes, to provide civil engineers, because plenty of such are being qualified by Toronto, Queen's and other universities. The hon. Minister has told the House that eleven of the graduates are in the English army, and for their education we have spent \$55,000. Is it proper that Canada should be called on to pay \$55,000 to educate men for the English army, when England possesses ample institutions to educate her own cadets and officers? Such was not the intention when the Military College was first established. Eight graduates have gone to the United States, and they cost this country \$40,000. Surely the hon. Minister, who takes so much interest in military matters, should be able to devise some scheme whereby these cadets would be made useful, not only in Canada, but in the military service of Canada, where their special training might prove useful in training our Militia force.

Mr. BOURBEAU (Translation). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says the Military College at Kingston ought to be abolished. This College, which was established by his friends, does not meet his approval to-day, conducted as it is under the present Government. I think these hon. gentlemen will end by repudiating everything which they inaugurated whilst in power. If the hon. gentleman had gone a little further he might have asked for the abolition of the Supreme Court, which was also established by his friends, and which has been quite as useless as the Military College.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been stated that the dormitory accommodation at the College is inadequate for those at present in attendance, who number about seventy. The hon. Minister, I understand, estimated 100 cadets for the coming year.

Mr. CARON. That is the estimate, but we have not got them.

Mr. BLAKE. If the dormitory accommodation for seventy is insufficient, what will it be for 100? I have also to ask the Minister with respect to the preliminary examinations, and the probable supply of candidates. I have been told that the latter is showing signs of falling off instead of increasing, and that the demand for admission to the college, where I believe an excellent education is given, is weaker than it was.

Mr. CARON. The accommodation is really not what it should be for any over sixty-five cadets. I hope, within a short time, to be able to make additions, so as to make the accommodation comfortable and adequate for the cadets. I am not aware of any falling off in the applications which are made for the preliminary examinations, and I think if we had room there would be even more applications. The number of applications for cadetships is not falling off, and I believe, from letters I have received, that the next examination will show probably an increase from Quebec and the other Provinces.

71. Pay maintenance and equipment of "A" and "B" Batteries, Garrison Artillery and Schools of Gunnery at Kingston and Quebec.....\$125,700.00

Mr. ROSS. I have asked for returns connected with this expenditure, showing the number of officers and non-commissioned officers in these batteries, &c., and the cost per annum of these batteries. It is very important for us to have this information in discussing this item, and if the hon. gentleman will bring it down we will take the discussion on Concurrence.

Mr. CARON. All right.

Mr. VAIL. How many horses have been added to the batteries at Kingston?

Mr. CARON. I am not aware.

Mr. VAIL. I observe \$301.80 charged for attendance on horses and for drugs, and this, for not more than eight or ten horses at the most, is altogether too much.

Mr. CARON. The accounts have been carefully examined, and, if desired, I will bring down the details, which I have not with me.

72. Government aid towards sending a team of Canadian Militia Artillerymen to Shoeburyness, England.....\$2,000.00

Mr. ROSS. This is a new item. We have a Wimbledon team. I suppose that the experiment is a complete success. This is another experiment.

Mr. CARON. It is not altogether a new item, because, two years ago, we gave the same amount to send a team to Shoeburyness, to compete against English artillerymen, and they brought back one of the best prizes. This money is well spent, because the men have to prepare for this competition by going through quite a number of drills; and I think this is only that encouragement to which the artillerymen volunteers of Canada are entitled. The amount is very small, and the men get nothing more, while it creates a spirit of emulation and a desire to excel among the men.

Mr. ROSS. How many men will go?

Mr. CARON. About twenty

Mr. ROSS. How are they selected?

Mr. CARON. Not by the Department at all, but by the Artillery Association, as the Wimbledon team is selected by the Dominion Rifle Association.

Mr. VAIL. I will come to the rescue of the hon. Minister of Militia. I think this is a very proper vote. The money so expended, both in connection with the artillerymen and the volunteers, is very well spent.

Mr. ROSS. I was not objecting to the vote. I approve most cordially of the sending of samples of our best men to England to teach our grannys how to suck a new egg; and to show them where men are properly trained, and know how to do it.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:40 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

Mr. BLAKE.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 27th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORTS OF DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of this House during the present Session, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee.

### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—  
Bill (No. 104) to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.  
—(Mr. Costigan.)

### CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the report of Committee of the Whole (April 25th) on resolution relating to the superannuation of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada, be received.

Resolution concurred in.

### SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—  
Bill (No. 108) respecting the Harbor of Pictou.—(Mr. McLelan.)

Bill (No. 116) to further amend the Act respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific Coast of Canada and Asia.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Bill (No. 101) to further amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. McLelan.)

### DOMINION LANDS BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 45) further to amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned, said: It is important that everyone going into the North-West to be a settler, or desiring to possess lands, should know what the law is connected with our land grant system. It is difficult for lawyers, and practically impossible for laymen, to collate correctly these several Acts in order to understand the bearing of one or another, and I propose we should consolidate them and make what amendments experience has shown to be necessary. If there are any substantial amendments made, I should hope that Parliament would agree to the reenactment of the whole law, so that every person going to that country would have in one Statute all the law relating to the settlement of the North-West and the land-granting system. There are, however, some amendments in this Bill which are important in their nature. I shall mention two or three of them as being important—the verbal amendments can be more properly discussed in Committee. One of the amendments is to provide that parties can get second homesteads. In the United States you cannot get a second homestead; a party once getting a homestead, gets no other. It is, however, found that when a party has gone to that country, and has *bona fide* become a settler by three years' settlement, or, under the provisions of the law, has acquired his patent, that there is an objection to his being deprived of the opportunity of getting a second homestead. In our own

case, the consequence, obviously, will be that if he cannot get a second homestead in our North-West, he may move across the line and get a second homestead—or a first homestead south of the line. Therefore, it is proposed in this Bill that a settler, after having acquired a right to his patent in the manner prescribed by law, so that he has an indefeasible title to his homestead, he can get another homestead subject to the same condition as at first. That is one alteration in the law. At present, as those who are interested in the subject will remember, it is provided that every settler going to the North-West after obtaining this entry, should settle upon the land within two months. That is found to be altogether too short a time, and we extend it to six months. That provision is still continued by the Act with one exception, that the settler who goes up in the fall and makes his selection should not be compelled to go up in midwinter in order to settle upon his lands within the first six months. I have here a memorandum setting forth the reasons for some of these provisions. For the better convenience of the settler, many of whom go up and select their lands in the fall of the year, an amendment is proposed which will give a homesteader recording his entry after the beginning of September, until the 15th of May of the following year, within which to commence actual residence and cultivation. This change will enable farmers from the older Provinces who have determined to remove, an opportunity, after the completion of the harvest, of visiting the North-West at a very pleasant time of the year, when facilities for travelling and for judging of the qualities of the soil are peculiarly favorable, of returning home and finishing up their business in the older Provinces, and making all preparations during the winter and going up for good in the spring, taking with them their families, their cattle, horses, &c. This was the object of the Government in giving, by the amendment of 1880, six months instead of two within which, after the date of entry, the homesteader was required to commence actual personal residence. The benefit, however, was seriously qualified in the case of those making their entries in the fall, inasmuch as they were required to go on the land in winter. This not unfrequently involved some hardship, it being entirely unnecessary, and it is now proposed to be obviated by this Act. Then there are clauses to prevent the jumping of claims. I find that one of the greatest inconveniences that arise in the settlement of the country, and in ascertaining who have acquired a right to a particular portion of the soil, is from the rush; whenever there is a rush of people, some anxious to get good farms, more anxious to make a good speculation, they will rush to a favored portion of the country where there happens to be a boom for the time being. Complaint of this has often been made in the past year or two during which there has been such an extraordinary increase in the demand for land for actual settlement. Those who have not settled in good faith hold homestead entries, and by their failure to comply with the conditions of residence and cultivation described by the law, are retarding the settlement of the country. This has led to a great deal of what is known as homestead jumping. This system has its objectionable features, and especially is calculated to create ill-feeling among the settlers against each other. It is, therefore, contemplated to institute a system of inspection by officers appointed for that purpose by the Department. Persons are not precluded, as has been the case heretofore, from obtaining another homestead, except, of course, for satisfactory cause, through any failure to comply with the requirements of the law. This, I think, is the most important amendment in the law. Another amendment is an attempt to shorten the process by which a patent is issued in the Crown. Those hon. gentlemen in this House who are aware of the constitutional safeguard that surrounds the granting the application of the Great Seal to any document, will understand that it has to be dealt

with great care. The Great Seal covers everything; they never can go behind it except by the action of the Crown itself, or by the consent of the Crown through the courts of the Crown. Therefore, it has always been carried out in all the Provinces of the Dominion, since Confederation. We have endeavored to carry out the great constitutional principle of guarding the application of the Great Seal to any document with all the safeguards that surround it in England. Still it has been found that these safeguards cause practical inconvenience to the settler. He wants to get his patent; he is not satisfied unless he gets his patent; and we have endeavored, so far as we could, by the clause which the hon. members will find in the Act, to shorten the process, instead of going from one Department to the other, by which the patent is to be issued, and to control the issue of the patent by one Department. This will greatly expedite the mere mechanical work of issuing patents, the signature of the head of the Government, or his representative, the application of the Great Seal—the registration of the patent. But even that involves considerable delay. The delay does not exist only in England, but in Canada, which adopts the English principle; and the delay also occurs in the United States, at Washington, and sometimes it takes years before the patent actually gets into the hands of the owner. In the present law it is provided that on a certificate being given by the local agent that the party has fulfilled all the requirements of the Act, he then obtains a *quasi* title. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is too wide and great a power to give to any individual local agent. There are agents and agents. Some who are honest and intelligent you can trust thoroughly, some who are honest you can trust, and some who are intelligent you cannot trust; and it has been found that that there have been certificates given which ought not to have been given. There should be some check on the agents; that no agent by simply giving a certificate that the facts are as stated, so far as he knows, looking at the affidavits before him, which may be true or false, which may never have been sworn to, and got up improperly, as I know was the case in the days of old in Ontario at the time the United Empire loyalists claimed their lands, shall have his certificate regarded as final; and that upon that certificate a person has in fact a title, and that the mere form of getting a title might in fact be dispensed with. At the same time it is of importance that so soon after the settler has performed the conditions under which he acquires his land, he should obtain a title which he can sell, mortgage, and obtain money upon to improve his property. He should have the means of doing so. And, therefore, we propose a mode by which, without waiting for the actual issue of the patent, the person can have a tangible title, and the provision is simply this: That whenever an agent gives a certificate that the homesteader has performed the conditions under which he has a right to claim his patent, and when those papers are sent to the Land Board at Winnipeg, and when the certificate of the local agent is endorsed by the Land Board, or commissioner, then that shall have all the effect, for practical purposes, of an issue of the patent. As was mentioned to Parliament during this last Session, the Government thought the time had come when the Patent Office at Ottawa should be relieved of the duties of the land granting department. It is quite obvious, even supposing that there was plenty of time for all kinds of work to be done, and that the officers were quite ready and able to do it, that delay must be very great. In order to prevent that, a Land Board was established. In the first place a commissioner was sent in the person of Mr. Walsh, who is known to some hon. gentlemen opposite; and there was an inspector appointed to serve under him. Those two gentlemen, the commissioner and the inspector, formed the Land Board.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who was the inspector?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Pearce, an experienced surveyor, who has been in the North-West for some years, and been in the employment of the Government many years, perhaps in the time of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and whom we learned to be an active practical man, having full confidence of the officers of the surveying branch of my Department. He is a first rate surveyor, a good practical man, and has been in the country for many years, and altogether seems to possess all the acquirements which the Government desire in a person occupying that position. The arrangement was simply this: The Commissioners, in the first place, decides summarily any question that arises in respect to claims about settlement. Should there be any doubt, and should the party grumble at the decision of the commissioners, the Land Board, which consists of the commissioner and the inspector, give their decision, which is supposed to be final. Of course, there is an appeal to the Department here, but for all practical purposes it is desirable that the Land Board should be considered a final tribunal. From the experience of the last year the system has been found to be successful. There are complaints, I know, that the Land Board have been too rigid in their construction of the law, and that sometimes they have decided against parties when they should have decided otherwise. Of course, such complaints will always arise. Neither of the gentlemen who composed the Board, nor the two as a Board, have any interest except that of doing their duty and carrying out the principles of the Dominion Lands Act. They sometimes may err, no doubt, and at the last moment there is always an appeal to the responsible Minister, the Minister of the Interior; but, at the same time, I must say that I feel it my duty, as Minister of the Interior, to discourage all such appeals. I take it that when there are two experienced and honest men on the spot, judging the evidence, having no interest except to do what is right, it is more probable that their decision will be right than any decision that the Minister or the officers of my Department, far away from the scene of action, and not hearing the parties, could be expected to give. I mean to say that the chances are that the Board on the spot are more likely to decide correctly than is the Department here. Still, however, we cannot, and do not, desire to ignore that responsibility, and in cases where it is shown that, by a too rigid adherence to the letter of the law, parties have suffered injury, then the Minister and the Department can properly step in and relax the rigidity and stringency of the decision. There is, in the present law, a rather incongruous or inconsistent provision with respect to the school lands. One portion of the law provides that all the school lands are to be set up and sold by auction at an upset price, such upset price not being less than the average value of the lands in the vicinity.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is outside of the Province of Manitoba.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is inside of the Province as well. The school lands have not been handed over to the Province of Manitoba. The school lands in Manitoba and the North-West, outside of the Province, are governed by the same provision—and it is a very proper provision—that these lands shall be very rapidly sold and disposed of for the purpose of forming for all time a sufficient fund for the education of the people of the North-West. Representations have come from the Province of Manitoba, and very naturally from the Government of that Province, that the school lands of Manitoba should be handed over to them for their management. Hitherto the Government have not seen their way to go so far. That Province is large and its population small; and the temptation to deal with that magnificent grant for present purposes to meet present exigencies is very great; and the Government think—and I may here mention that the course of the Government met

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

with apparent approval during the last Parliament—they ought not to denude themselves of this sacred trust, handed over to them as trustee for this great fund for the education of the people in the illimitable future; so that the policy of the Government hitherto has been, in the Province of Manitoba, to dispose of this land, the proceeds of which are funded, as the law provides, in Government securities, and the annual interest or increment is handed over from year to year to the Province of Manitoba for educational purposes. The fund being intact, the fund continually growing, and the interest annually being handed over to the Province for the purposes of education, I think that it is in the interest of Manitoba itself, I think it is in the interest of the great North-West, that this magnificent provision for education should be rigidly preserved; but it is very difficult to do so. These lands in many places are of a most valuable nature, and wherever they are known to be of value, there is a rush to get some real or supposed priority of right by occupation to these lands; and then whenever the Government attempts to offer these lands by public auction, as is provided in the law, there is a complaint of great hardship. "We have built fences, we have broken up so much land and built houses, and we must either be paid for all our improvements"—at their own valuation in fact, or the law must be set aside; and instead of the land being offered at public auction, there must be some valuation put upon them, and these parties allowed to get them. Now, the numbers of these school lands are known; there is no man in the North-West who does not know what is a school lot, and what is not; and, therefore, any person who chooses to go upon a school lot, does so at his own peril, and he must take the consequences of wilfully going upon and taking possession of land which he knows belongs to the school fund, which ought to be sold to the highest bidder, and at the highest price; and when he goes upon this lot, he is deliberately attempting to thwart the purpose of the law, and is deliberately attempting to diminish the fund for the education of the people; and all for the sordid purpose of getting a good lot at a low price. The Government have hitherto resisted these attempts, and they are resolved, if they are sustained by the opinion of Parliament, to continue that policy. There is, however, an inconsistency in the law. There is a provision in one portion of the old Act which provides for educational endowment, which speaks of settlers on unsurveyed school lots as having acquired certain rights; then it goes on further to provide, that all school lots shall be offered for sale by public auction. If all are to be offered for sale by public auction, then, of course, they must be subject to any rights, which those parties may have obtained under this rather inconsistent provision of the law. Of course, vested rights are vested rights, and they must be protected. This Bill does not in any way affect the rights whatever they may be—I desire to express no opinion as to what the rights of settlers on school lots may be on unsurveyed lands; that must be left for judicial or legal decision—but the provision in this Act does not affect in any way the *in quoad* legal or equitable rights of parties settled on school lands unsurveyed under the provisions of the law as it now stands. The amendment to the law, however is, that in the future, after the passing of this Act, no settlement or any settlement on, or claim of any kind to a school lot shall prevail; and that as these parties all know what numbers are school lands, what sections are school sections, therefore they enter upon them at their own peril. There is another amendment, which is of comparatively little importance, and which has been discussed in Committee with respect to military bounties scrip. Then the law as it now stands was passed for the purpose of enabling capitalists, or landlords, or philanthropists, to bring out and settle upon lands

in the North-West people who are poor, and without capital, and unable to cultivate their own land, build their own houses, break up the soil, and become farmers in fact; and hon. gentlemen will remember that the law provides that persons can make an advance to the intending settler who goes on a homestead for the purpose of building a house, and otherwise to enable him to claim a homestead, to the extent of \$500, interest not to exceed 6 per cent.; and the Government undertake by law not to issue a patent to the settler until this advance given to him for the purpose of enabling him to become a settler is repaid; but the law is defective in this regard—that while the Government are not allowed by law to issue a patent until the money is repaid, the loan does not operate as a charge upon the property itself, and it has been found that no person, no capitalist, will advance, or few capitalists at all events—and I have not heard of any—will advance money on such frail security. If a dishonest man gets a house built at the expense of his landlord, or a friend, or a capitalist, or a company, the only restriction in the law now is, that the patent shall not issue until the money is repaid; but the man is in possession of the farm, and he and his family may occupy it for ever, as all that he has to do is not to ask for the patent; so that this does not operate in any way as a valid security to the capitalist; therefore, no assistance is given to the immigrant under these well-intentioned clauses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it not because the interest is too low?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but I know that the rate of interest hitherto has far exceeded 6 per cent. per annum in the North-West. But with new times comes new circumstances; and I fancy, from the rush of people to that country, with the capital which is going into it and becoming accessible to the people every year, money will find its way there very rapidly from the older Provinces. Now 6 per cent. is a fair interest in the old Provinces at this moment. I know there are many lending companies which would be glad to get 6 per cent. on the money they lend, and I should be very sorry to see an alteration of the law in that regard. I think 6 per cent. is as much as we can fairly charge the homesteader who borrows money to build his house, to buy his oxen, and to break his soil. I think that that rate is sufficient for him to pay out of the profits of the land; and I think we will find in a year or two, if not now, that there will be large numbers of capitalists who will be glad to lend their money at 6 per cent. on the cultivated soil of the North-West, if the title and security are good. There is a clause in the Bill to which I invite the serious attention of the House, that is: the clause giving power to the Government to abolish the preemption right. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the country about that right; and because there are what are called a homestead right and a preemption right in the United States, it is supposed that the law is the same. Our law is infinitely more liberal than the law of the United States. We give the homesteader the right to make entry for 160 acres; we give him the right to make, at the same time, a preemption entry for 160 acres more. That is not the law in the United States. They do not give a homestead and a preemption to the same man at the same time. He may, if he likes, enter himself as a homesteader; he may, if he likes, become a preemptor—if I may be allowed to coin a word—and the homesteader may, if he choose, exchange his position as a homesteader for that of a preemptor, by paying for the land. The land is paid for at once, and the homesteader is obliged to work his farm five years before he can get his homestead. With us three years is sufficient; and, in addition to the homestead, the man has the preemption right by paying the

legal price for 160 acres more. Now, Sir, we have occasion to know that the land granting department of the United States is opposed to the system of preemption as it exists there, and they have reported again and again in that direction. Last year—as I think I had occasion to mention before in the House—the United States authorities governing this subject pressed it on the consideration of Congress, and, in connection with the Department of the Interior, they said that whenever Congress could be got to undertake that subject, it was quite certain that preemption would be abolished altogether, as it was the great and fruitful source of all the speculating, land jobbing, land sharking, land grabbing system of which we read so much in the United States, and of which we have some faint, pale reflection from the North-West. Then, Sir, experience has been found to show that it may be necessary and expedient to reconsider that subject. It is found that even 160 acres is more than a person without capital can cultivate. In the Bishops of Ireland's colony I know they are practically proposing to break up the land to eighty acre holdings. I have been informed lately—though without such specific information as to warrant me to make the statement—that even the United States are reducing the quantity of land to settlers who go into that country without money. It is said, indeed, that settlers from Europe—including Ireland and my own country, and especially the Islands of Scotland where the people live close together at home, where they are cottagers more than farmers—that they get actually frightened and appalled at the extent of their possessions when they are placed in the middle of 160 acre farms instead of having neighbors close to them. They are a gregarious people, they assemble together, and the consequence is that various portions of the United States adopt the continental plan—the German plan, and more especially the French plan of having villages—people living close together instead of being scattered in the manner of Englishmen, Americans and Canadians—each man living in the centre of his own property. The clause is merely a provisional one. The Government want to have the power to make these arrangements; but I may state that they think this power should not be exercised until similar action is taken by the Legislature of the United States. We have offered much more favorable terms to the settler than have ever been given in the United States, but we did so advisedly. We knew that the current of immigration was altogether to the United States, whether it be from Great Britain and Ireland, or from the continent of Europe. The immigrant, wherever he went in the United States, found his own relations, his own friends and kindred, his own nationality. We had no nationality, because the country was a wilderness. We had no people there, and we were obliged, as it were, to offer a bribe—to offer superior inducements to immigrants from the European world to come to the North-West. We did so. Our terms are altogether more favorable than theirs; but I think we should not, without great consideration, alter our terms so as to be less liberal. We should be more liberal than the neighboring States; but at the same time we ought not to be so generous, by giving people without means, without capital, more land than they know what to do with—more land than they can cultivate, or expect to cultivate, so that the land would simply be handed over to the first speculator who came along and bought out the preemption. You do not get the 320-acre farmer, but you get the 160-acre homesteader, who is utterly unable to do anything with the preemption right, whilst the speculator gets hold of it and keeps it until he can find a purchaser at an advanced rate. This is a matter in which we are all concerned; in which the whole of Canada is concerned—the adoption of the best system of law, the best land granting system, the best system of settling the immigrant. We may differ as to the mode in

which that object is to be carried out, but we can only have one object. I, therefore, invite the serious attention of the House as a House, to the several points which I have ventured to indicate. There are several amendments of more or less importance with which I will not trouble the House now. Some alterations have been made even since the Bill was laid before the House, induced by communications to myself and my Department. These also are committed to the candid consideration of the House. I now move that you leave the Chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, I may be permitted to make few remarks on the presentation of the Bill made by the hon. First Minister. There can be no doubt of the advisability of consolidating the various laws with reference to the lands of the North-West. The Government deserve the thanks of the country, for the measures they have taken in that respect, and I must cordially agree with the hon. the First Minister that this question ought not to be treated as a party question. It should be the endeavor of the House to frame a Bill in the interests of the country, and not with the purpose of securing any party advantage. The duty of dealing with so vast a domain as the North-West—an empire, in fact—a country suitable to become the home of millions upon millions of people—is a very grave responsibility resting upon this House; and in the consideration of this measure we should endeavor to realize that responsibility, and endeavor to discharge our duties in the interest of the present and of the future. The hon. First Minister has referred to some changes which he proposes to make in the law. I am happy to say, that I believe that these changes, so far as they go, are, in the main, commendable ones; and I think the only exception that will, perhaps, be taken on this side of the House will be, that in some respects he has not gone quite as far as we could wish; but, so far as I have looked over the changes, I think they will meet the approval of the entire House. He refers to the provision respecting second homesteads. That I deem to be an eminently proper provision, and I think it might be advantageously extended. The homestead settler is naturally a pioneer; he is subjected to many hardships, and he is deserving of great consideration from the Government. I see no reason why a homesteader, having settled upon his land for twelve months, having done some work, built a house, and proven himself to be a *bona fide* settler, should be debarred from selling his claim. I think it might be an advantage, if such an enterprising individual, who is willing to press on into the wilderness, should be allowed to sell his claim and go. Then, a person who does not know the country, and is ignorant of the soil, may go in and settle on worthless land. In such cases, with a proper guarantee against fraud, I think the homesteader ought to be permitted to abandon a worthless claim and take up a second one. With regard to the extension of the time for settling after making entry, I think it is a very proper change; and I think the opinion of many settlers in the North-West is, that the change might be extended further. If a settler makes an entry after the 15th of July, it is hardly possible for him to go on his homestead and do any work that year; it is too late to do any breaking, and I think it might be advantageous to provide that a person entering for a claim between the 15th of July and the 15th of December, should be allowed until the first of the following June to enter upon his homestead, with the provision that the three years of duties should date from the occupancy, and not the entry. That would give the settler time, after making his entry, to go home to make his arrangements for immigration, and to come back on the 1st of June. With regard to the jumping of claims, referred to by the hon. First Minister, that is, no doubt, a prolific source of trouble, and many cases of hardship have arisen under the provisions with regard to the forfeiting of claims. The unscrupulous are always lying in wait, and if a homestead

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

settler, from any circumstance, happens to be away for two or three days beyond his time, they are ready to pounce upon his homestead. In such a case, I think the homesteader should receive every consideration from the Government; and it might be right to provide that a homesteader, who has made improvements to the amount of \$2 per acre, should have a chance to enter upon his claim again and fulfil the duties of settlement; and if it were provided, in case a man's claim were forfeited, that the improvements made should be sold for the benefit of the settler, that would at once put an end to all this claim-jumping, and to the perjury that now prevails, because the claim-jumper would have nothing to gain. With regard to the issue of patents, I think there is great force in what the hon. First Minister says. I think the practice in the United States is, for the local land agent to issue a certificate of sale when the purchase money is paid, and a long time elapses before the patent issues, although the certificate is evidence of the sale.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may mention that the law of the United States provides that a party claiming his rights must advertise the fact, and any person may enter an objection. We do not propose to introduce that very cumbersome and inefficient provision.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have bought land in the United States, and I do not know that I had to comply with a regulation of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You were not a homesteader.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; a purchaser. With regard to the school lands, the Government have certainly made a most magnificent provision. Our reservation for school purposes is as large again as that of the United States—there it is only one section in a township, section sixteen—and it has occurred to me, as this provision is so ample, that we might take into consideration the advisability of setting aside a small percentage of those lands for a purpose that I think would be very important in the North-West—that is, for the establishment of nurseries for the introduction into the North-West, of trees from Russia and Eastern Siberia. This is beyond the reach of private enterprise. I believe that in Russia they have apple, pear, and plum trees that stand a temperature of 53 degrees below zero, and bear abundantly. They are planted in groups, like hills of corn. If the Government would set aside, say 10 per cent. from the proceeds of the school lands for this purpose, I think it would be of inestimable advantage to the North-West. I am sorry that we do not see in this measure a provision for sales of land for cash, with conditions of settlement. The credit system I consider a very objectionable one. It was tried in the United States at first, but was abandoned there after experience had demonstrated that it was an improper system; and the cash system was adopted, and has since been adhered to. If we adopted the same system, with some conditions of settlement, I have no doubt it would be found to be very advantageous. The claim that our policy is more liberal than that of the United States, with regard to homesteads and preemptions, has some truth in it. The American Government does not allow each settler to take up a homestead and preemption. Of course, the lands in that country are open for preemption and homestead, but all of it is as well open for sale; and when settlers get behind the land grabber and speculator comes in, so that perhaps our system is a better one in that respect. I do not propose to say much about the measure before we go into Committee. With regard to the proposal to discontinue homesteads it would have been better if we had substituted the words "Act of Parliament" for "Order in Council." We might justly take from the Governor in Council some of the prerogatives that belong to them now, and have them brought within the deliberate and careful

action of Parliament. It will be in the interests of the country to have sweeping changes depend rather on the Act of Parliament than of the Governor in Council.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to say a few words on the Bill before we go into Committee. I am glad to be able to approve of the suggestions made by the hon. First Minister, and the alterations proposed in the Land Bill. I agree with the last speaker that they are all in the right direction. I think, when we come to discuss them more freely in Committee, we may see our way clear to being a little more liberal. I am glad also to hear from the hon. First Minister, that we shall have the fullest opportunity of discussing this question, and that he will be ready and willing to take suggestions from those who have had practical experience in the country. I am sure the desire of the Government and of this House, is to make the best possible Land Bill we can. We should make some of the clauses perhaps a little more liberal than they are at present. In reference to claim-jumping, as has been said, it has got to be a serious annoyance to settlers. They have a great dread of the system that has been inaugurated in the North-West in reference to claim-jumping. It has unsettled a great many people in the country. I am glad the provisions of the Bill will tend to correct this evil. I think we ought to even go a little further in some respects by taking away the inducements to claim-jumping, rather than adopt a system of punishing those who have committed the evil. The system of inspection which the hon. First Minister has proposed is, I think, a good one. I always held the view that our homesteads should be inspected by a Government inspector, as that would do away, to a considerable extent, with the evils of false swearing. No doubt, in many cases, false affidavits have been made, and many settlers have come to grief in consequence. The Land Board, I must say, has very much facilitated land matters in Manitoba, and although there have been some complaints—of course, we must expect that—I believe, on the whole, the gentlemen at the head of the Land Board are fully qualified for the position. There has been considerable complaint of their being a little too rigid in interpreting the law regarding occupation; but I think, on the whole, that the move is one in the right direction. One thing advisable would be that, in some cases, an appeal should be had from the Land Board. Of course, as the hon. First Minister has said, an appeal can be made to the hon. Minister of the Interior, but that is a very big institution, and sometimes very hard to get at. In cases of fraud, an appeal should be had to the Court of Queen's Bench. I see that a case has been brought into court, and Judge Taylor gave his opinion that he had no jurisdiction; but, at the same time, he commented on the hardship to the settler. In reference to school lands, I quite agree with the law as it is at present, but a great deal of complaint has been made, and with some degree of fairness, by settlers who went in there some years ago, before they had an opportunity of being posted as to the regulations of the Land Act, and they have perhaps special claims on that ground. I think, however, that people who have gone in recently and settled on school lands, should abide the consequences. I quite agree with the hon. Minister, that this is a delicate subject to interfere with; but there are some special cases of hardship which are entitled to, and no doubt will receive favorable consideration. As to the advances made to homesteaders, as allowed by the law to the extent of \$500, when I say the interest on that is too low I have no desire at all to raise the interest to the settlers; but I think I am right in saying that this clause of the law has never been availed of, and it struck me the principal reason was that money being worth 10 or 12 per cent. in Manitoba, it was hard for the settler to get an advance of \$500 at 6 per cent.; while he might be able to pay 8 per cent, and could get the advance at that rate, the law allows only 6 per cent.; and it would be well, perhaps, if that rate were changed to 8 per cent. However,

that is only my own opinion. With regard to preemptions, I quite agree with the hon. Minister, on the ground he takes. It is a very difficult question. Preemptions have given a great deal of trouble in Minnesota, and I know they have been the cause of a great deal of fraud. Perhaps we might do away with preemptions, although I am not prepared to say we should, without something in their place. A cultivation homestead in the place of preemption would, I think, do very well and dovetail in with the present homestead law. At the present time, everyone knows it is almost impossible for a man without means to comply with the present homestead regulations, and it is positively wrong to bring people out there with the idea that they can start on a prairie farm without a dollar, comply with the regulations of the law, and retain their land. This has led to a great deal of trouble and to a great deal of claim-jumping. A man who goes in without any money at all is forced either to get employment from his neighbor as farm laborer, or is driven into the towns and cities; and while he is away from his homestead—not having capital to reside there and cultivate it—his claim is liable to be jumped. Of course, I know it will be said that a cultivation homestead entry will open the door to speculating in homesteads; but I think a clause permitting homesteading in this way would also assist the man without capital to homestead under the Act as at present. The plan I propose is to require the cultivation of at least twenty acres a year for five years, and get his patent only on his becoming an actual resident the last year. That would make 100 acres cultivated, besides the building of a suitable house, necessary before he could go into actual possession. I see no reason why he should not be allowed to cultivate a homestead in that way, and we would secure a class of settlers that are very desirable. This would enable the poor man who has taken up the homestead without any capital at all to get employment from a man who obtained a homestead in the manner I have described, and at the same time he would preserve his own rights, and in a year or so he would be able to go on and fulfil the requirements of the law as it stands at present. I make this suggestion, because I think it would work well. I know it is very hard to draw the line between the actual settler and the speculator—in fact, until I commenced to put my ideas, together so as to be able to consider this matter in Committee I only began to understand what a difficult thing it was to frame a Land Act; and although I have had a good deal of experience and a great deal of correspondence on the subject, I find it very hard to come to a just conclusion. I know that in this way the actual settler would be more apt to become something more than a laborer, and the country would not be cultivated as it is at the present time in small patches, the settlers being five, ten or twenty miles apart. I think that the hon. First Minister should consider this, and when we go into Committee we will be able to discuss it more fully. I think it would be a wise provision; at all events it would be a very good substitute for the present Preemption Law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest to my hon. friend to frame a clause embodying his idea.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have already prepared it. I agree with the last speaker, and also with the hon. First Minister, that we should, if possible, offer superior inducements to those offered by the American Government. A great many immigrants coming through that country to our own North-West are lost on the way, and no doubt arguments are used which are scarcely fair; and if we can point to better land regulations in the North-West than exists in the United States, we offer them a very strong argument indeed in favor of coming to our country. Still I do not think we should go too far in giving them more than is absolutely necessary. I think it would be advisable to

make the regulations a little more liberal at least than they are in the United States. The question of a second homestead entry is one that has been very much discussed and a want that has been very much felt. I am very much pleased to see that the clause has been introduced into the Bill, but I think we should go a little further. The Bill says that when a man has obtained a patent for a homestead he can make an entry for a second homestead. I think that if a man has fulfilled the conditions of the Act, he is entitled to a homestead entry then as if he had the patent, because it may be a year before he gets his patent, and he would in reality be performing four years service on his homestead before he would be able to homestead a second time. As soon as a homesteader has received the proper certificate, in accordance with the schedule attached to the Act, and as the hon. First Minister says to be endorsed by the land agent, I think he would then have a perfect right to take up a second homestead.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, the Act provides that the patent must issue; but the other clause provides that the certificate of the land agent, endorsed by the commissioner, is equivalent to the patent. I quite agree with the hon. member, and we will have the clause altered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to the change that has been made from the 15th of May to the 15th of September, I think that upon further consideration it will be advisable to make a change. Perhaps hon. gentlemen here who live in the eastern part of the country do not understand that after the 15th of July there can be no breaking done in the North-West. Of course, it can be done, but it will not answer the purpose. The crop the first year will not be nearly so good, and the sod will not rot in time for back setting the next spring.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A house can be put up.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So far as that is concerned the hon. gentleman will see that in the Act as it is at the present time there is no such thing required. It is provided that he shall reside upon the property, but that has been evaded, and is being evaded every day, so much so that he is really not compelled to put up a house at all. He can live in a tent, as many of them do. You will see tents all over the country, especially the first year, and very often they take their tents away with them when they go away in the winter. In the case of unmarried men they use tents altogether, so that the building clause does not amount to very much as it is at the present time. I was going to say that if this change was made I think it would be an inducement to settlers, and we should do everything we can in that direction. To recur to the point, after the 15th of July, the breaking season, as I have before remarked, is over, and they would have to wait until next year; and I think that all who enter after the 15th of July, and before the 15th of December, should have the privilege of going into actual residence or occupation on the 1st of next June. The 15th of May is a little too early on account of high water in the spring and the difficulty of travelling early in the season—which would keep most of the settlers behind; and I know cases of men who have left here with their families in April and were not able to reach their lands much before the 1st of July on account of bridges being washed away. I think if we said the 1st of June, instead of the 15th of May, it would be better, so that all who take up homesteads after the 15th of July, and before the 15th of December, would be in no better position than if they had taken them up the next spring, because they could really do nothing on their land. The hon. Minister says he could build a house. If they were obliged to build perhaps they would not go at all, because that requires capital. But I am speaking now in the interest of the man who has little or no capital. If he takes up land and goes into possession

Mr SUTHERLAND (Selkirk).

on the 15th June, the homestead residence should date from that time, although he may have taken it up in August. As the clause now stands, supposing a man takes up a homestead on the 31st August, at the end of six months he is in the middle of March, he cannot go on to his homestead then, and so it is obvious that the 15th September will not meet the case, as I have no doubt the hon. Minister intended it should. I know men with small families, who have not been able to take their families with them on account of the six months expiring in the middle of winter, and being unable to get a permit to leave their homesteads to come down here and get their families in the spring, or the opening of navigation, had to remain there, and eat up what little capital they were able to earn in the fore part of the winter. This is a hardship which, I think, should be remedied.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will not trouble the House with further remarks, but I will take occasion to offer some amendments in Committee.

Mr. ROYAL. Mr. Speaker: With respect to the suggestion of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland), I think the suggestions given by Mr. Pierce, the inspector of Dominion Lands Agencies, are more to the point; and I believe, if these suggestions were carried out—for they come from a man who has had actual experience of the matters on which he writes and speaks—the object sought by the promoter of this Bill will be reached more effectually. I have listened with a great deal of satisfaction to the praise which the hon. member for Selkirk has bestowed on this Bill. There can be no doubt that the Bill is a good one; that is to say, it is a consolidation of the old laws, with certain changes introduced that will certainly make it a more perfect law. But I believe this law is still too experimental. Of course, there is a good reason for it. Like our own Tariff Law, which has to be framed to a certain extent to meet the exigencies that arise from the Tariff of our neighbors, in this case our Land Law must, to a certain extent, be framed so as to give our own settlers as many advantages, and more if possible, than are given on the other side of the line. I believe there are some features in this Bill which carry out that object very fully; at least that is my humble opinion. But there are certain other changes which, I believe, the right hon. gentleman might have made in the law, which, I believe, would have done much towards the settlement of the wild lands of Manitoba and the North-West. With respect to the Land Board, there is no doubt that institution is a good one; and if the intentions of the law are fully carried out, we will see, before very long, the Board settling disputes to the satisfaction of the parties, or at least as promptly as possible. In regard to the Land Board, it will be very satisfactory to the people of the North-West if the hon. Minister of the Interior could go frequently to Manitoba and that territory, and be able to convince himself on the spot of the various requirements of the country and the changes and improvements that should be made in the law. We see that the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territory has been spending a few weeks down there. I believe his experience has been most valuable to the Government in more than one respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROYAL. If we had a Minister, or some one responsible to this House who could come to Manitoba, who could take some part in the local administration of these laws, who could listen patiently to the complaints, who could understand the views of the people, and who could go on the spot and see for himself what is actually taking place, I believe this law would be a little more perfect and a little more advanced. There is only one class of settlers to which this law gives the right of homesteading—that is the class



of settlers who have means enough to go at once on their homesteads, put up buildings, buy a yoke of oxen, and commence to break the land and cultivate it. I believe this class is not the most numerous we should have on our lands. I believe that the settlement of the wild lands of the North-West should, as much as possible, be open to all classes. I believe that farmers' sons, of which class so much has been said and written lately, should be given a chance to settle on homesteads without exposing themselves to the charges of having fraudulently made their entries, or having tried to evade the law in some respects, but they should be allowed an opportunity to enter for homesteads themselves. There is another class, and it is the class of poor settlers. Last night, during the debate that was going on regarding immigration, a remark was made that only a certain class of immigrants ought to go to the North-West. I concur, and I think I concurred last night, in that statement; but we must remember that the class of immigrants composed of families who have only money to go there and some few hundred dollars to spare, is by far the most numerous class; and with the law as it stands I do not think this class can take advantage of the law. I submit to the right hon. promoter of the Bill that an opportunity to take advantage of the law should be given to these two other classes. Immigrants can only be secured for our country during six months of the year, while across the border emigrants come in during all months of the year. That is a reason why this law should go a little further than the Americans go, and should give an opportunity to all classes of settlers to take advantage of it. I have mentioned the young men. A farmer may not desire to go to the North-West Territory; his son may, however, wish to go. But if the farmer has not the means to take up a homestead at once, what will be the result? The young man will go somewhere else, or instead of trying to become one of the settlers in the country, he will probably hire himself in some other employment, and thereby we shall lose a good settler; while, on the other hand, if you allow him to take a homestead and require from him a certain amount of progressive cultivation as an alternative for residence, I believe that young man will at once go on a homestead, will make the necessary improvements, gradually and progressively—and this might be subject to an Order in Council—and he would go elsewhere and hire out his labor, either on the railway or some farm, and he would have a great object in view to lay aside his savings in order to make improvements upon his land. At the expiration of one, two or three years, which would depend on the regulations and Order in Council, the young man having prepared himself to go on the homestead, would take himself to the homestead and become one of the most flourishing farmers we could possibly possess. That would be an inducement to our young men not to go over to the United States, but to stick to the old maxim, "Go West: and remain West with us." With respect to the poor class who are deprived, even by taking the most liberal interpretation of the law, of the advantage of going on a farm, it is true the law cannot contemplate that everybody has a right to obtain a homestead; but those advantages are only extended to the farming class. With respect to the poor farmer, if he was allowed to take advantage of the law, a great inducement would be offered to him to save as much money as possible in order to make the improvements required of him as an alternative for residence. The homestead section, twenty-six, in my opinion, is the leading feature of the Bill, because it provides for the settlement of wild lands, and this has been tested; but what have we witnessed? Last year we find, from the reports of the officers of the Government, Commissioners Walsh and Pierce, Inspectors of Agencies, that claim-jumping has been a great source of trouble, and has been going on at a great rate. In fact, the Dominion office in Winnipeg was

almost daily crowded with people trying to jump some other person's homesteads; and if this fact was published and disclosed without any qualification, it would, at first sight, lead people to believe that one-half of our homesteaders had gone to the United States, because these men had relinquished their homesteads according to the declaration of the claim-jumpers, who represented that these others had never been on their homesteads. Fortunately this circumstance has not been used as an argument to show that our people were emigrating to the other side of the line; but it would have been a good argument, and could have been employed with a great deal of force. If so many homesteaders have lost their homesteads on account of their inability from lack of means to go on them and fulfil the requirements of the law, then I say that there must be something wrong in that law, and that it does not go far enough; and I wholly agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk, in his statement that this Bill does not go sufficiently far. We have at the present moment before the House, a Bill which goes very far in extending the franchise; and if this Bill were framed in as liberal a spirit, I believe that it would be nearly perfect. Now, as I have given notice, that I would move that a section be inserted in the Bill when it is discussed in Committee of the Whole, I will say little further. But there is no doubt as to what we want. I do not wish to hold to any system which would not improve this law; but with your experience, and the experience which I have been able to acquire during a thirteen years' residence in the North-West, during which time I have mixed up with the people daily; and judging from my own knowledge of that country, and the experience which has been acquired by those around me there, from the tone of the North-West press, from the disinterested and candid opinions of the homesteaders themselves, and our own settlers, I say that if this clause was so framed as to embrace in lieu of one class, three classes of settlers, the settlement of that country would be much more rapid and would give much more satisfaction. It is true, it can be said we will thus open the door to speculation; but speculation is not such an easy matter after all, and I provide for it in my proposed amendment; besides, I believe that speculation has been greater in the past than it will be in the future, while the speculator who desires to speculate on homesteads has to trust entirely to the good faith of another person, who is placed between his obligation and his employer, and his own interest; and among that class of people, I do not think that much mutual trust can exist, as between the speculator and the tool he employs to attain his objects. I am of opinion that speculation, like other things, has been exaggerated with an object, and even at the risk of some speculation prevailing, which I believe would be very small—and we have land enough to afford to lose a fraction and a very small fraction of it—I think that such good results could be derived from the adoption of this view of the question as would more than compensate, and one hundredfold compensate disadvantages which some may see will follow from the adoption of this section. Returning to some of the changes of which the right hon. promoter of the Bill has given the House notice, I would say that it is a matter of very great and universal regret in our Province, that the Government should allow all this time to elapse without disposing of some, at all events, of the school lands in the Province. Now, what is the result of this policy? It has been stated by the hon. Premier, that these school lands in some cases, are first class, and no doubt some people will, either through ignorance, or owing to other causes, squat on them. This is, of course, against the law, which forbids settlement on school sections; still this will be done, and we have seen school lands squatted on to a very large and regrettable extent in our Province. If some and a proportionate quantity of these school lands were disposed of, as they could have been disposed of say last year,

when certainly they were as valuable if not more valuable, than they are this year, I believe that the school fund would have been begun; and that we, the heads of families there, or the settlers, could perhaps derive some benefit from the interest of the fund. Now, we are the pioneers in that country, and what is the use of having this rich endowment lying unfruitful for the advantage, I presume, of our grandchildren? I must say that I do not believe in such a policy. Of course, great caution and great prudence should be exercised in selecting the school lands to be sold every year; but the Government should commence to create that fund. I do not believe, myself, that these lands should be placed under the management of the Provincial Government. I think that this is a wise provision of the law; and I fully concur in the wisdom of the remarks made by the right hon. the Premier on this subject; but in addition to the common schools, which are and have been entitled to share in this fund, I think that some provision should also be made for higher education. The Manitoba University has been now in existence for some six years. The funds at the disposal of the Local Government are very scanty. They have only a small pittance, and while the wants of the Province are daily increasing, the Government have only a fixed allowance to depend upon; therefore in this, as in many other cases, the Local Government have been placed in the impossibility of doing anything to further the interests of such an institution. The Chancellor and the Council of that University have, on more than one occasion, addressed the Dominion Government in order to obtain some share in this fund, or to be otherwise endowed with lands. I see that in this Act, provision is made for the endowment of a model school farm. Well, Sir, if endowments are to be provided for model school farms, I do not see why endowments should not be set apart for universities in the new Provinces which will be carved out of the North-West Territory. There is another defect in the law which I think might also be remedied. In the oath which the homesteader is obliged to take after his three years' residence in order to get his land, the conditions that he has to fulfil in order to acquire a title are not stated. I believe that the homesteader should know that in addition to his residence there is a certain amount of cultivation to perform on his homestead which the oath should specify. If that were done, the work of the inspector could be much more easily performed, and a good many irregularities would also be avoided. I fully concur with the right hon. gentleman on the subject of the abolition of preemptions. I believe that we will practically dispose of the preemption by giving the homesteader the right to a second homestead, besides it being an inducement for him to remain in our Province, instead of crossing the frontier. In many cases we could gradually dispense with the preemptions, and they would be replaced by the other right of giving the settler another homestead. I am one of those who believe that 160 acres constitute a very large farm, especially for the class of settlers who go into the North-West; and I am not surprised that some of these settlers are amazed at the extent of land which they acquire for themselves in that country. Experience is the great teacher in these as in other matters. The farmers in other parts of Canada were never ambitious to possess 100 or 120 acres, and now we propose to give 160 acres to the farmers of the North-West. I believe the Colonization Land Company are subdividing their quarter-sections, and they are giving only 110 acres or 100 acres to their settlers; and I believe their policy in that respect shows the truth of the remark made by the hon. First Minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Some give only eighty acres.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. ROYAL.

Mr. ROYAL. I do not agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sutherland) as to the giving the right of appeal from the Land Board. There must be a finality in all these cases; if not, what is the use of the Board? The Board is composed of members, eminent by their intelligence, education and experience, in many ways, and I do not see why the Government should give the right of appeal to parties coming before them. I rather believe that the more we get a finality in these cases, the better it will be for the country, because, by giving multiplied degrees of jurisdiction, we will have the same evils which exist, in some cases, in our own administration of justice. I believe the Board should be empowered to finally decide those cases without compelling parties to incur the expense and loss of time of coming here to Ottawa, at the risk of having their cases pigeon-holed for months, and even for one, two, or even ten years. If such a board had been organized in the early days—in 1871 or 1872—I believe that the heartburnings and dissatisfactions which were felt in many cases, and especially the loss of time which has been incurred in these long disputes, would have been avoided. There are some other details upon which, as the right hon. gentleman has said, he will be glad to listen to the suggestions of hon. members, and I shall avail myself of his invitation in Committee of the Whole. I think that, on the whole, the Bill is a commendable one, and that it should be discussed, as an hon. member who preceded me remarked, in no party spirit. We are all equally interested in perfecting the Bill; in fact the good work contemplated by the immigration office cannot be performed without the assistance of an efficient administration of our lands. If a proper system of immigration and settlement is to be adopted, it cannot be secured if one Department is inferior, no matter how well the others may be administered. But if, on the other hand, one system is as well managed as the other, the result will be a large immigration, and an increase of prosperity in the North-West Territories of Canada.

Mr. ORTON. I rise to express the satisfaction I feel at the discussion which has taken place, and the remarks which fell from some hon. members. I had the honor of offering some suggestion to the Acting Minister of Interior, Mr. Macpherson, which were of a similar character to the tenor of those remarks, and I was glad to hear those views endorsed so ably as they have been by hon. gentlemen from the North-West. Having gained some knowledge of the country, I may be permitted to offer a few of the suggestions which I made, and I think it will be seen that they are very much of the same character as those to which we have listened this afternoon. I think there should be some system by which lands should be sold by the Government for cash to actual settlers, and I think this is a very important matter indeed. The people settling in that country find great difficulty in maintaining schools and building roads, and if the Government would sell lands—not more perhaps than 160 acres to one individual upon condition of actual settlement at the preemption price of the district in which the lands are situated—I think it would be a good system. I would also suggest that even a smaller amount of land—say as low as forty acres—should be sold, and thus give an opportunity to those who have not much money to invest in land in localities where there is a considerable settlement, and in which schools and other advantages may be enjoyed. Another suggestion which has been made was the proposal to give the opportunity to other classes of obtaining homesteads in the North-West. I may, perhaps, be allowed to read what I have jotted down in reference to that point:

"That in order to give laboring men, mechanics, and others with limited means an opportunity of taking up a homestead and preemption in Dominion lands, provide that upon the affidavit of the person desiring to enter made before one or more just ces of the peace, or such other responsible parties as may be deemed sufficient, setting forth that such person has such limited means as this clause is intended

to provide for, the land agents shall make a special entry by which said person may be permitted to absent himself for the purpose of earning money for nine months in each of the first two years, but that no permission be allowed to purchase until the end of the said first two years."

That is in order to prevent speculation. I think it would not be advisable to allow them to sell their homesteads after the first year, as homesteaders now do.

"And it shall be incumbent upon every such person to file at the end of each year in the land office of such district, in which the land is situated, conclusive evidence that he has himself actually resided thereon for three months continuously, and has made improvements to the value of \$200 in each of the said first two years, and at the end of the third and last year that he has resided for a term of nine months, upon which a patent may be issued for the homestead and preemption in the ordinary manner."

I think that would give encouragement to a large class of men who go into that country and who have insufficient means to enable them to settle on a homestead in the ordinary way. From the knowledge I have gathered, I can say that it is almost impossible for a man with a family to settle there with less than \$1,000, and we know that many go there without that amount of capital; but if we allowed a man, living on his homestead for three months, and making such improvements as he could with his limited capital, to absent himself for nine months in order to earn money, we would not only be promoting the cultivation of the country, but would attract a large number of that class of people in the United States, I believe, no such inducement is offered, and if some such clause were introduced into our Act, I think it would have a highly beneficial effect upon the settlement of the North-West. With regard to the school lands, although I agree with what the right hon. Prime Minister has said as to the importance of preserving the school lands for educational purposes, I think that the Government should not take the school lands from those settlers who have gone upon them without knowledge, but should have power to settle with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is power reserved.

Mr. ORTON. I am glad to hear it. The remarks that have been made with regard to extending the time between making entry for a homestead and occupying it, I quite agree that it might very properly be enlarged. Breaking cannot be done in that country until about the middle of July, and I see no objection to extending the time. I am also pleased to notice that the Government are taking some steps to remove the difficulty that has been experienced by settlers in ascertaining what lands were entered for; I am pleased to note that steps are being taken by which information will be gathered every week in the various land offices and other public places in the country, so that people going in may ascertain what lands are taken up and what are not.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with almost everything that has been said as to the improvements which this Bill makes in the Land Act. I heartily agree with the remarks of the hon. First Minister with regard to the school lands. A deputation, I believe, recently waited upon the hon. First Minister with the view of inducing the Government to grant these lands to the parties who have squatted upon them, or cultivated a small portion of them, supposing that that would give them a prior right to purchase. If the suggestion of the deputation had been acted upon, a great deal of injustice would be done to the country, because in a great many cases, within my own knowledge, the improvements on these lands are made by persons who have already received patents for adjoining lands, and in some instances I believe the friends of these people have used their influence to have these persons allowed to purchase these lands at the very low price of \$2.50 per acre. A year ago last fall I believe inspectors were appointed to report to the Government upon those lands, and the

improvements made upon them, and I believe that in many instances these inspectors were interested in the lands themselves. I think it is of the greatest importance that these lands should be held exclusively for school purposes. That may inconvenience a few men who expect to get a farm in a well settled district for a mere nothing, but it will benefit the great bulk of the people; and when they are disposed of, they should be put up at public competition. I wish to make one or two remarks with regard to homesteading. I would not advocate strongly the granting of a homestead and a preemption in all cases. I think 160 acres makes a very reasonable farm; but I think that in some cases an exception might be made to the regulation regarding the granting of homesteads to persons under eighteen years of age. In some families there are two or three sons, and it is very inconvenient for them to be obliged to remain on the original homestead with their parents for, perhaps, two or three years, until they are able to go west and take up homesteads for themselves. The consequence is that they are scattered all over the country. I think it would be proper, in the case of families in which there are two or three sons, that they should be allowed to take up a larger quantity of land than the present law allows them, on condition of cultivation. I think that in all cases the Act should require a certain amount of cultivation and a certain amount of improvement on the land before entitling the settler to receive his patent. Probably as regards one-half the patents issued by the Crown, there is not fifteen acres under cultivation on each quarter-section. The provision requiring six months' residence was a mere farce. A great many of the lands that have been patented have not probably \$25 of improvements on them, and as far as the residence is concerned it has been of very little good to the country, and no good to the resident, except what he may have made by receiving the lands for nothing. A young man, for instance, of very limited means, will have to work all summer earning money to keep him on his land during the winter, and the result is, these young men will bury themselves like bears for six months in their homesteads during the winter, when they can do nothing on the land, in order to comply with the law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They should get married, and leave their wives there.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know that that would be good policy, for if the young men are not able to keep themselves on their farms in summer, they would not be able to keep their wives there. It would be well to make the change suggested of not requiring residence altogether as a qualification. I think that cultivation should be as good a qualification as residence; but in no case should one person hold more than one homestead, and we should only grant a patent for a homestead after a cultivation of five years of twenty acres per year. It does not make much difference as to whether the patents are to be issued to the man who actually makes the improvements, or to some other individual; but it would be as well not to extend this to the other Provinces to avoid speculation. I would confine it to the residents of the Province.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A speculation to the residents of the Province.

Mr. WATSON. There are a great many cases of blacksmiths, mechanics, school teachers and others living in the country, who would be very glad to take up lands, and who at their calling make more money than would be required to hire men to work them. By that means the country could be got under cultivation sooner than by requiring actual residence, because a settler requires considerable funds before he can settle on the land; and men working at trades would furnish means to other settlers on adjoining lands to cultivate and improve their own lots as well.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). The Land Bill, I am happy to say, has given a good deal of satisfaction, for two reasons: In the past, great dissatisfaction existed with the land regulations, owing to the numerous changes in the Land Act, which led the settler to believe there was not the security for them they ought to have. The other cause of dissatisfaction is, the want of a second homestead entry, and that in my part of the country was the greatest source of dissatisfaction. In my own constituency I know of two townships that are almost entirely depopulated by people going to Dakota because they could not take up a second homestead; and when it appeared in the North-West newspapers that people were going to Dakota on account of our land regulations, this had a very bad effect, especially on people coming in who were not aware of the true cause of the evil, viz.: That no provision was made for a second homestead entry, as it was generally supposed there would be. Consequently, settlers who had been in the country, and sold out in the expectation of getting a second homestead, were unable to do so, and we lost a number of that most desirable class, who having had three years' experience on the prairie were of greater value to us than new settlers. I am glad the hon. First Minister has seen fit to bring down this Bill, so that we will be able to keep our own people there and not see them go to the United States. With regard to the preemptions, I am sorry the hon. Minister has not seen fit to go further and abolish them entirely. I would not have the preemptions abolished this year, not because people coming from the Old Country come out under the impression that they will obtain a homestead and preemption, but I would have them abolished at the end of six months. Even then we would be more liberal than the United States, where they have no homesteads and preemptions together, but have either the one or the other. We have homesteads and preemptions which can be taken up by the same person; and in addition to them, where a homestead entry is taken up and twelve months' continuous residence proved, the settler, on paying \$250, is entitled to a patent. That is very similar to the preemption in the United States. I think it would be well to call that a preemption, abolish the one we have now, and have nothing but homesteads. There are various reasons for this. One is that in a township in the North-West the alternate sections are railway lands, and every man entitled to preemption takes it because he has only to pay a few dollars, and has three years allowed him to pay the rest, so that there will be only two settlers on a section, and only thirty-two in a township. As most of the young men who go out there are unmarried, it is very difficult to have schools and churches established, especially schools, on account of the children being so far apart and there being so few settlers. Even in the old Province of Manitoba the greatest number in attendance at one school is about fifteen, and if we abolish the preemptions in the North-West and have only the homesteads we will have four settlers to every even-numbered section instead of two as at present, so that the settlers will be brought nearer together. Should a man want more than 160 acres he can purchase from the railway companies or the colonization companies on the alternate sections to the extent of 640 acres adjoining his property. For many a poor man 160 acres of land is a bigger farm than he can cultivate. We have numbers of large speculators in the North-West, it is true; but if there is one class more numerous than another, it is the poor settler. He takes up his second preemption of 160 acres, when he cannot farm really more than five, ten, or twenty acres fit for cultivation. Here he has 320 acres, and he is keeping that for years, and what is he keeping it for? Simply and solely in order that by the time he gets his patent he can resell it to speculators. It would be far better for the country if that 160 acres he holds for preemption were

Mr. WATSON.

given to a poor settler like himself. Then you would have thicker settlements and better schools in the North-West. The man who wants to cultivate a large farm can go and purchase land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—a whole section or more. In the past, my impression was that it would have been far better for the Government to give alternate townships instead of alternate sections. The alternate townships then would be for the man who wants to cultivate large farms, while the smaller lots would be for men of moderate means. The townships would be filled with solid blocks of farms, four on every section, and this would be far better than it is at the present time. Now, with regard to foreign preemptions, if we change this, and give power to the settler who cultivates his land twelve months and resides on his place—if we give power to change that into a preemption, then we have the advantage over the United States; because, in the United States, you have to live five years on your farm before you can get a patent, while here a man will only be obliged to live three years. Now, I would go further in the matter of liberality than the United States, in some other directions. With regard to this continuous residence there has been a great deal said: and I admit there is great difficulty in framing a section so as to benefit the honest, straightforward poor settler. The great difficulty is the first year only; after that I would like him to take his chances the same as anyone else. A man settling on a quarter-section is in an entirely different position the first year from a man who settles on a wood farm in Ontario or any other Province. It is true, that in the last he cannot cultivate the first year, but he could cut down trees, and build a house, and prepare his firewood; whereas in the North-West he can only work on his farm during certain months of the year. He can put up a house, but after that he can do nothing until spring. Under this section of the Act to compel him to live on his place six months in the year, when he cannot do anything on it, is a hardship which will deter many young men from attempting it. Many of these young men, who are taking up homesteads in the North-West, are mechanics, men who have gone there from Ontario, or the other Provinces, men who have served their time here as apprentices at their trade, and have gone to the North-West to better their position. I think they should be permitted the first year to leave their homesteads after breaking up a certain quantity of land and building a house. Two or three months is all the time they can spend the first year on their farms with any advantage to themselves. Then the second year I would make him live there six months, because then he can do some breaking, then he has got his seeding and his reaping to do, and to provide his winter firewood. The second year there is not the same occasion for giving him extra time, but the first year we should be very liberal indeed with settlers going into that country. A great deal of the cause of this claim-jumping is owing to this very fact. Young men saw it was useless for them to stay on their homesteads so long a time, and so they went off to Winnipeg, or other places, and put in their time making a little money, or went to work for some farmer in the neighborhood. After doing this for three years they considered they had put in their six months' residence. After spending a certain portion of their time each year on their farms, they considered themselves justified in making an affidavit that they had lived there the prescribed time. They doubtless did that in good faith, but they may not have lived on their farms the first year, during six months of continual occupation. The consequence was that people went around and discovered a flaw in their title and found that they had not put in a continuous residence as required by law. As a result many of them lost their places, or they were obliged to sell their farms at a loss. All this difficulty has been owing to this six months' continuous residence the

first year, and I think it is highly desirable that we should make some change in this respect.

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

### After Recess.

### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 105) for granting certain powers to the Canadian Electric Light Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 112) to amend the Act to incorporate the North Western Bank.—(Mr. Beaty.)

### DOMINION LANDS BILL.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). When the House arose at Six o'clock I was about to remark on the provisions connected with the school lands. I find here that the Government have taken power to sell these lands, where they are desirable for a town site or town plot, or anything of that kind, but the Government only give to the school fund so much as actual farming lands bring in the township in question. It might be that the town site in the school section would be the only land worth anything in the district, and the other lands be worthless for farming lands; but I think that, under such circumstances, the school fund should receive more than the sale of ordinary farming land would bring, and some benefit from the sale of the section for a town site, in the same manner as the Government. It might not be allowed one-half but it should get one-quarter, or some increased benefit. The Government should also make some provision for squatters on school lands, who are there now, or were there previous to 1881. Since then, however, I do not think that any provision should be made for them; but some forty or fifty who settled on these lands before 1881 should receive attention. They then could not get land surveyed in the neighborhood; it was very difficult to go further west, owing to the hardness of the roads, and there being no railway, and they consequently settled on lands near Winnipeg and Marquette. They are prepared, I believe, to pay for these lands all they are really worth as farming lands. They have made certain improvements, put up buildings and fences, and cultivated the soil; and it will be a very great hardship, if the Government sell these lands by auction, compelling these people thereby to pay for their own improvements. If provision were made that the Government could, by Order in Council, or by reference to the Board at Winnipeg, allow these cases to be adjudicated upon, and have these parties compelled to pay as much for these lands as ordinary farming lands there bring, it would be wise; but I would not, in the future, encourage people to squat on school lands, as these are set apart for a special purpose; and, as far as I am concerned, I believe that the people of the North-West think that the Government should preserve these lands intact for school purposes. In the past, people were under misapprehension as to what the Government were really going to do with these lands, or as to what the law really was, and it would be well for the Government to take power to deal with those special cases. I see that the Government have taken power with regard to the sale of land, either odd or even-numbered sections; and I understand that a sale is to be made, in a short time, in the Turtle Mountain District and along the line of railway. In my opinion, it would be a very wise provision if the Government would see fit to take power to deal specially with lands in certain special cases, for instance, along the line of railway; and improvements should be made part of the conditions of sale, for this reason: If you now go along the railway for a mile on each side the land is reserved for

actual settlement, and the Canadian Pacific Railway have also reserved their lands; and consequently the country seems to be a regular waste from one end to the other. Persons travelling on the railway and seeing no improvements, and no field of wheat except in old settlements for hour after hour and day after day, have a very poor impression of the country. They do not understand why so much land is not improved and cultivated; but if the Government would sell these lands and make settlement and actual cultivation of one-third or one-half in three years a condition of the issue of the patent, selling the land at a certain price with these conditions attached, I believe it would be the means of advertising the country. I have seen people who returned from the West last year, and who informed me that they saw no fields of wheat except at Portage La Prairie, and at one or two other points, and they had not made up their minds that wheat could be grown successfully in the North-West. If what I suggest was done, I am satisfied that it would be a completely paying investment to the Government and the country, as it would tend to get the lands into cultivation as rapidly and as speedily as possible. One provision of the Bill is a very wise one, and I think an addition might be made to it: where a settler has gone on land in unsurveyed territory, and made improvements, and two years afterwards the survey is made, or two and a-half years afterwards, he can make his entry and obtain his patent three years after actual residence and cultivation. But it says: "In the section previous to the survey thereof." Now I know of certain cases where even after survey, some delays occurred on account of the surveys not being returned by the surveyors in charge of certain townships, so that the lands were not thrown open for settlement for one or two years after. I think that provision should be made for such cases, and even after the survey is made, and people have occupied surveyed lands, they should be enabled to make an extra entry after three years of actual residence and cultivation, when they should be entitled to their patents for their lands. A very slight addition to this section would cover that point. I know of two or three townships in Manitoba where surveys were made two or three years ago, and where the settlers went in after the surveys were completed, and to this day they have not been able to fulfil the provisions relating to settlement, because the surveyors who made the survey did not give sufficient notice to the Government to entitle them to place the lands on the market; and those settlers are in the position of not having made their entry except very recently in the case of one township. I agree with the remark made by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Royal) with regard to the school fund. I think that fund should not be dealt with by the Local Government. I believe it is better to leave it in the hands of the Dominion Government. It might be advisable to appoint the times of selling the lands by the advice of the Land Board, with the concurrence of the Board of Education, for the Province of Manitoba. I think that Board would be a good authority to consult as to the advisability of the sale of these lands for school purposes. I have nothing more to say than this: that I am much pleased with this Dominion Lands Act, and with the consolidation which has been made of previous Acts. I am certain that in the North-West it will make a great change in the feelings with which the land regulations have been regarded. There has been in the past a great feeling of insecurity owing to the changes which have been made from time to time; but if the Bill is made as perfect as we in our wisdom can make it, I feel certain that it will produce a feeling of security among the settlers of the North-West, which will be a great advantage to the country. Settlers coming from the Old Country to the

North-West, who are told that the land regulations are of a certain kind, but who afterwards find that changes have been made, are very much dissatisfied. On the other hand, if they find the law and the regulations unchanged from year to year, a greater feeling of security is produced, and they rely with greater faith on what the Government is going to do. I think, therefore, it would be well to put in the Bill that preemptions are to be done away with at a certain time; because if it is published in the *Gazette* that the preemptions are to be done away with in a certain number of months, the immigration agents of the United States will use that information to produce a certain amount of insecurity in the North-West country. On the other hand, if this provision is inserted in the Bill, and if it is known that it is to come into effect—I would not say for this year's immigration, but for next—the agents of the Dominion of Canada in England, and on the continent, can assure the people that are coming here that they will get homesteads but not preemptions; and then there will be no difficulty whatever. If, however, the impressions get abroad that these settlers are to get preemptions as well as homesteads, and they find that they cannot do so, there will be a feeling of dissatisfaction, and as there are persons in the North-West who act as agents for the United States Government, and the United States railway companies, they will use this state of things to induce the people who have gone into the country to return to the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. I fully concur with many of the remarks which have been made by the other representatives of Manitoba, with regard to this Bill. I believe the consolidation of the various Lands Acts, and including with them the various Orders in Council which have been passed, will be beneficial to the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. It is quite true that in the past three or four years very great difficulty has been experienced by settlers in the Province of Manitoba, owing to the frequent changes of the land regulations. In the older Provinces of the Dominion it is a very easy matter to promulgate new ideas, and new information; it is an easy matter to give world-wide publicity to the new regulations; but in a new Province, such as that of Manitoba, without railway communication, or telegraph lines, it is almost impossible. I know very well that in many cases Orders in Council have been passed changing the land regulations, and for six months they were not known to many people in the outlying districts of the Province. I believe that this will meet a great want, and so soon as it becomes known that frequent changes will not take place, just so soon will the people have less cause of complaint, and they will become correspondingly satisfied. With regard to the homesteads, I agree with the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland) that the time should be extended for location till the 1st of June. Those living in that Province know that it is almost impossible for the people, in the earlier part of the spring, to go to the outlying districts, and I have no doubt that the Government will see that the Bill will be so amended. Such a change will be to the advantage of the country, and there is no doubt that the Government have no object in view other than to frame a Land Act such as will meet all possible requirements of the country. With regard to the homesteads, there is one clause which I would like to see inserted in the Bill, and that is a clause to make provision for farmers' sons. We know that in the North-West many men, in fact all who go into the country, go there not for comfort, but to better their condition. Many of the farmers who live in this country sell their farms with the object of benefiting themselves and their families; and we know that a parent who has one or two sons gets them to take up a homestead for themselves, while he himself takes up the adjoining homestead. And yet the

Mr. Ross (Lisgar).

sons are compelled to reside on their own homesteads for the six months. I believe that if an exception were made in such cases, allowing them for the first twelve months to do their settlement duties without actual residence, it would be a real benefit. With regard to second homesteads, I, for one, have always been in favor of them, and so has almost every one who has lived in the Province. The Government were rather slow in adopting this system, feeling no doubt that they might encourage something which would not entirely be honorable on the part of the settler. I believed then, as I believe now, that the poor settler who locates on a farm for a number of years and sells it for a considerable sum is in a better position to take up another homestead and does more service to the country than he otherwise would have done. The Government last July wisely allowed the second homestead entry; and the second homestead can be procured, not as the hon. member for Selkirk has stated, after the patent for the first has been issued, but, as he will see by section thirty-eight, as soon as the patent has been recommended by the local land agent, and countersigned by the Commissioners of the Land Board; he can then assign or dispose of the property as he thinks fit. With regard to the cry which we have heard so frequently, and which has been reported in many of the papers in these Provinces, that there has been a large exodus from the Province of Manitoba to the territory of Dakota, we have heard very little of it in the Province of Manitoba. There has not been an exodus to any extent whatever. A few disaffected people did go across the line imagining they had a grievance, but that will always be the case no matter how wisely our Land Bill may be framed; and I venture to say that for every one who left for Dakota ten have come from that territory into the Province of Manitoba. I must dissent from the remarks of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) in reference to preemptions. I am strongly in favor of allowing the settlers the right of preemption, and particularly settlers who are heads of families; and I trust the Government will not see any good reason for taking the power in their own hands for abolishing the preemption right. I believe our friends opposite would be only too glad to take advantage of that, and use it as another cry against the Government. If we wish to encourage people to come into our country, we must give them plenty of land. We have millions of acres lying there uncultivated, and I do not think the time has yet arrived when we should limit a grant to 160 acres for each settler. With regard to jumping, and cancellations, and the operations of the Land Board in Winnipeg, I must say that I believe the appointment of that Board was a step in the right direction. Those who have land business to attend to are better satisfied than they were previously, for the simple reason that they can attend to their business in Winnipeg without losing time and money in coming to Ottawa. But I must say that the Land Board have been a little too stringent, and have adhered too closely to the letter of the law. A little more judgment, a little more discretion, and a little more latitude, ought to be used by the Land Board. With regard to the school lands, the hon. member for Provencher, and the hon. member for Lisgar seem to be anxious that they should be sold. I agree with them that the management of these lands should remain entirely in the hands of the Dominion Government; but I do not agree with them that any large portion of them should be sold immediately. About a year ago one section of school lands in each township was advertised for sale; but the two sections of the Winnipeg School Board, as well as the hon. member for Provencher, asked the Government to postpone the sale for two reasons: Because to sell them would be to greatly injure the settlers upon them, and because of the more important reason that the lands should not be sold until they increased in value. These lands have been set aside for the endowment of the educational institutions of

our country, and they should only be sold as they become valuable; and I think the Government would be acting unwisely to dispose of any large quantity of them at the present time. It might be well to dispose of one section in each township, but certainly not more. Some years ago, on the security of these school lands, the sum of \$10,000 a year was advanced for three years, I think, by the Dominion Government to the Local Government; and I think it would be a wiser move for the Dominion Government to increase that sum to \$25,000 or \$30,000 than to dispose of them at the present time. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Lisgar with reference to the squatters on the school lands of five or six years ago. At that time it was impossible for them to get to the outlying districts of the country; we had the grasshoppers during two or three years, and we had much rainy weather, and the people could not get West. Besides, many of them wished to settle in the populated portions of the Province, where they would have a few neighbors, and where their children would have the benefit of schools. So they settled on these lands and made large improvements, and I regret very much that the Government has not made provision for these people, numbering some sixty or seventy. It would be a great hardship and injustice to them to sell these lands without giving them the benefit of the improvements they have made. I had hoped that the Government would have been able to pass a Bill to provide for these sixty or seventy people, whose names have been furnished to the Department, as well as affidavits as to their actual settlement and the improvements they have made. With regard to subsection five, of section twenty, which gives the Government power to withdraw school lands that may be valuable for town sites, I can express no opinion. As a representative from Manitoba, I would be glad if the Government could see their way to allowing the proceeds from all school lands to be devoted to the purpose for which they are intended, and not into the general revenues of the Dominion. Many of our school lands are unfit for settlement, and will be almost valueless unless for grazing purposes, and will not yield a large price; but when there is a section that is valuable, owing to its proximity to a town site, I think that the school fund of the country should receive, at all events, a fair share of the proceeds of the sale of that section. The people of Manitoba, I am certain, will accept this Bill with pleasure; and I trust that the Government will not delay bringing it into force, so that the people of the country may become well acquainted with all the information it contains, and know exactly what they should do when they take up land. I received a letter the other day from a gentleman who settled in the Boyne River district, and who, had he been acquainted with the Land Act, need not have placed himself in the difficult position he did. There are many others in the same difficulty, and they get out of it by blaming the Department for its mismanagement of land matters in the North-West. The more information that can be given the better for all concerned. The gentlemen in the Interior Department have been most indefatigable in years past; their labors have been onerous, and they have endeavored to give the people all the information possible, and yet they are a long way behind the times. The method of issuing patents is a slow process, and causes a great deal of hardship. I trust, when this Act comes into force, with the determination that the Government seem to have to induce immigration to come into our country and make it what it will be in a few years, the backbone of the Dominion, that our anticipations will be more than realised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have every cause to be more than gratified at the reception which the Bill has received, and at the various amendments which have been proposed. I shall not detain the House by discussing any of the remarks, weighty as they have been, made by the

several hon. gentlemen who have spoken, especially those who have spoken from actual experience in the North-West, because any such remarks would be more appropriate in Committee of the Whole. The criticisms which have been offered are directed to different clauses of the Bill; I do not think there is any manner of objection to the principle of the Bill. I propose, when we go into Committee, we shall take the Bill up clause by clause, and if there is any suggestion in reference to any clause which may require further consideration, I will ask the House to allow the clause to stand over. We shall thus pass all the clauses we can to-night without objection, and leave over those important clauses which may require further consideration. I move that this House resolve itself into Committee on the Bill.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. ROYAL. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that the stake claims classified by the Order in Council of February, 1881, will be referred to this Land Board?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to say that just now. This is merely appointing by Statute the Commission instituted by Order in Council. We will discuss their power later.

Mr. ROYAL. There were two Commissions appointed to investigate and report upon those stake claims. Those stake claims were lots staked out by the settlers of the Red River settlement before the transfer of the country to the Dominion Government. As there was some diversity of understanding with reference to the meaning of the word "occupation" in the Manitoba Act, numerous difficulties arose, and they are to be referred to the Commission. Two Commissions were appointed, one of which was the late Chief Justice of the Province, and the second was composed of two Judges. I understand that the two Judges did not make any report. However those peoples claims have been pending for the last thirteen years, and it is a matter of great importance to some of them that they should be settled, and the object of my question is to ask the Government to dispose of these claims as early as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very desirable they should be settled. There was a report, but not, in the opinion of the Government, a full report, by the gentlemen who were appointed a Commission. By a subsequent Order in Council, I find that the Land Board are placed in the same position as the Judges to settle the stake claims.

On section 5,

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me it would be an advantage to establish the bounds of the Provinces in the North-West, and make the surveys correspond with those provincial bounds, have the meridian line and the base line for each Province, and not have a general system for the whole North-West. It is a vast country, and one system for the whole country is carrying it on too large a scale. In all the American States the bounds of the territories are first defined, then the survey is made with reference to those bounds, the meridian line to run as near as possible through the centre of the territory from north to south and the townships being ranged on those lines. I think we might adopt that system in our own North-West. It would be an easy matter to define the bounds of the territory and then lay off our base lines, to the meridians with reference to the territory itself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we have the advantage over the United States in that regard. Our system is much more simple and perfect. Every man knows from Red River westward what the description means, and it is not necessary to ascertain whether he is in Alberta, Assini-

boia, or Saskatchewan. He knows exactly where his township, range, or lot is. In the United States they have a happy-go-lucky sort of plan. They set off the territory in the Indian great West, and when there was an influx of people to any given place they laid that out as a territory. We have the advantage of having one great country before us to do as we like, and we have one vast system of survey uniform over the whole of it. I do not think the ingenuity of man could invent a more perfect system than the present one by which, from the Red River all the way to the boundary of British Columbia, we have a system that is so plain that a child can understand it.

Mr. TROW. I think the system is admirable and could not well be improved.

On section 14,

Mr. CHARLTON. How are those posts marked to designate ranges, townships and sections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At first, they were posts of wood. We find that these disappeared, that people going across the plains have used them as fuel. The Government is planting iron posts wherever they can. The sub-division posts are of wood, and where the land is so rocky that they cannot sink an iron post, there is a cairn of stones.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can a man, by going to a section corner, ascertain what range, or section, or division he is in? In the American system you go on a section corner and you can tell exactly where you are, and this advantage comes from their meridian system. If you cannot tell what meridian you are in by the section corner, you cannot tell where you are. Here you have got to have only one meridian line in this vast country, and consequently you cannot have a system of marking by corners, and you cannot tell in what position you are.

Mr. WATSON. The meridians are about 125 miles apart, and a person would easily know what meridian he is in.

Mr. TROW. I would suggest to the right hon. Premier the propriety of establishing more permanent monuments in the survey. Now, settlers going to that country are put to a great deal of difficulty and expense in ascertaining their lots in consequence of fires having destroyed the timber posts, and they have to re-survey at a large expense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is quite right. We find great difficulty in consequence of the destruction of wooden landmarks, and the Surveyor-General's Department is carrying out the principle of planting iron posts in all the townships.

Mr. WATSON. Surveyors are not sufficiently careful to place the mounds in the right position, and there is great difficulty in finding corner stakes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Some surveyors are very accurate, while others are inaccurate. The Surveyor-General's Department is, however, endeavoring to cure that evil by giving contracts only to such surveyors as efficiently perform their duty; and every year shows what surveyors do their work efficiently, and they have the preference next year.

Mr. CASEY. The Government should consider whether the system of letting this work by contract is a proper one. It tends to cause surveyors to scant their work, especially that of reporting on sections. I have often heard of surveyors making up reports on three or four sections, at the close of a day, from memory. The consequence is, that the field notes are very much distrusted by people dealing in land. By engaging good men and exercising proper supervision the Government would be able to get the work much better done; and accuracy is of the utmost importance in land surveying.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). The clause is all right as it is. If the work were let out by day it would involve a much higher expenditure, perhaps double the cost, and the Government would be imposed upon in all directions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The work as a whole is fairly done, and if it were let out by day work the value of the land, say \$1 per acre, would be absorbed.

On section 16,

Mr. CHARLTON suggested that the sub-division should be into quarter-sections, and he handed to the hon. Minister a diagram showing his proposal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD thanked the hon. gentleman for the diagram, which he said he would submit to experts in the Department, and would, if necessary, ask the Committee at a subsequent stage to reconsider the clause.

On section 19,

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope that the hon. Minister will bear in mind the devotion of some of the school land sales to the purpose of establishing nurseries of trees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a most valuable suggestion *quoad* the North-West Territories, but not *quoad* the Province of Manitoba, which has its rights in these school lands settled. The Government is merely the trustee for these lands, and cannot divest them in any way whatever from the purposes of school endowment. With respect to the North-West, however, as yet, we can do as we please, but I should be very loth to set a precedent for altering the endowment solemnly set aside in the North-West for educational purposes, for any other purpose however benevolent and beneficent, because if the Parliament of to-day can establish nurseries, they can take away these lands to build railroads, and say that these are of more importance to the North-West than education. I think that we must cling rigidly to the educational endowment.

Mr. TROW. Could not a portion of the fund be used for the erection of schools?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no difficulty about that; education means university as well as common school education. The language of the clause on this point is as general as it can well be.

Mr. TROW. It is my impression that a year or eighteen months ago the school lands in the older portions of Manitoba could have been sold at better prices than now. The Government should take advantage of circumstances to create a fund, and the interest growing would increase this fund much more than the lands would increase in value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. Under this clause, it is quite within the power of the Dominion Government, as the guardian and trustee of this endowment, to put these lands in the market. If the hon. gentleman will follow the clause, he will see that this is the case. Some hon. gentleman who spoke while the Speaker was in the Chair, supposed that these lands were going to be locked up; on the contrary, the Government is anxious to put them in the market as speedily as possible, the only limitation being the danger of their being sacrificed. I do not think the Government ought, from any idea of keeping them until ten years hence, when they would be more valuable than now, to keep back these lands from sale. The moment we find settlement going into any part of that country to any considerable extent, and that a fair price can be got, I think these lands ought to be sold and the proceeds funded; because the country ought not to be kept back owing to the prospective and possible advantages to posterity from getting exorbitant prices by-and-bye. The Government were so impressed with this idea, that there



ought to be a commencement in the sales of school lands—to which my hon. friend from Provencher alluded—that they made a tentative offer of them a year ago; but objection was taken by the local authorities, that it was the wrong time, and the protest was so strong, that as they were principally interested the Government dropped the sale. I think, that if the sales had gone on we would have obtained higher prices than now, as the boom was then almost at fever heat. The Government are doing this: in the first place, they have made advances out of the Dominion Treasury to the Province of Manitoba to assist in education, and help them in their schools; and such advances are charged against future sales of these lands. We are now in communication with the Government of Manitoba, and with our own Land Board and officers as well, as to when, where and to what extent these school lands should be put into the market, and under what terms; and I hope and believe that there will be, in the course of the present spring or summer, a considerable portion of these school lands put on the market.

Mr. WATSON. Were those lands withdrawn owing to the objections of the Local Government, or because a part of the lands which were advertised for sale were claimed by squatters who had made on them improvements?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Both. We were crowded with protests and deputations from the squatters, who protested owing to the hardship of their cases. Well, we could not judge of that at the time; and there were also statements made by the Government of Manitoba, who represented that it was an inopportune time to sell. For these reasons, for fear we should make a mistake, we withdrew the lands.

Mr. WATSON. Have the Government come to any decision as to how they will settle with the parties who had made improvements on those lands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have come to this conclusion: whatever rights any of the settlers on these lands have under the law, they shall continue to have.

Mr. WATSON. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will be advisable, when selling, to put only a portion of each section on the market at the time, as, for instance, half of the section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a good idea.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Thus the remainder will be increased in value by the cultivation of the portion sold; in some cases one-quarter and in others one-half of the section could be sold, and the remainder would be enhanced in value in all probability, before it was disposed of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen laughed when I said the occupants of these lands would get whatever rights they have under the law. They have considerable rights under the law as it now exists, but we are now taking away that right. The hon. gentleman will see this if he will read the second sub-section of the twenty-second clause of the existing Act.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman will have much trouble with the claims of those who settled previous to the survey, as there are but very few of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are many of them. There are many cases of men who have deliberately settled on these lands knowing that they were school lands, trusting to the liberality of the Government for being recouped.

Mr. WATSON. How do you propose to deal with such cases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the law, of course.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept of the suggestion I made with regard to nurseries, as these will be practically schools of the most important and beneficial kind, and they are something which will be beyond the reach of private enterprise for generations to come.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that growing trees any more than growing wheat can come under the head of an endowment for school purposes.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. B. W. Beadle stated before the Agricultural Committee that he was making a series of experiments with Russian fruit trees, with the view of obtaining varieties which could be cultivated successfully in the North-West. Judging by his opinion, I should think that this matter was not as far beyond the reach of private enterprise as the hon. gentlemen suppose.

Mr. CASEY. I think provision should be made in some way to encourage tree planting, but I think, instead of taking the money out of the receipts for school lands, it would be more proper to clothe one part of the country by the proceeds of the sales of timber limits in the other. With regard to squatters, I think that those who went out into unsurveyed territory, and who not intentionally or speculatively settled and made improvements upon lands which afterwards turned out to be school lands, should be recouped for their improvements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that every case will be dealt with on its merits. But it would be unsafe to deal with these cases in a general Bill like this.

Mr. SCOTT. As these school lands are put up at upset prices, it might be well to allow these old squatters, who are only some sixty or sixty-five in number, to purchase these lands at the upset price.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In a general Bill like this, which is in fact a scheme or plan, we cannot take up exceptional cases. They must be brought before Parliament or the Government, and the Government, at the bidding of Parliament, can deal with them. And I take it there will be no difficulty about those cases. If the Government sees that a man has really made improvements, they can arrange it that the man who is in possession can, upon paying a reasonable price, get the title—they can arrange it in one way or the other. But it would not do to mar the symmetry of the Bill by making a special provision for such cases.

Mr. WATSON. There are many parties trying to claim those lands who are not, I think, entitled to any consideration. They go on improving those lands, calculating that they will be able to purchase them at the upset price. Some of these lands are valuable, and eighteen months ago, when they were advertised for sale many of these parties who had broken a few acres were indignant at the Government selling them at public auction. I do not think, because a man has a good deal of cheek or thinks he can lobby his claims here in Ottawa, that he has a right to any consideration, because he took up land which he knows he cannot get under the law. In fact there are some of these cases in which, instead of receiving any consideration, they should be compelled to pay rent, because they have gone on to the best lands, which are very easy of cultivation.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be well to have an established rule in regard to these cases, and I believe also that it would be just to recoup those who have settled on these lands innocently. On the other hand, there has been a system of extensive speculation on these lands, and these speculators are the men who try to get the Government to sell at a low figure. This shows the necessity of a stringent law. I know that a Mr. Walker, who came down here

to try to impress on the Government the necessity of selling these lands at \$2.50 an acre, was at the same time speculating in the rights of parties to squat on those lands, for \$25 or almost any consideration he could get. When he went back he said the lands would be sold for \$2.50, and he would get \$8 or \$10 more from these parties. I have reason to know that many of these men engaged in these speculations on the strength of their check, as has been stated by the last speaker.

On section 20,

Mr. CASEY. The question arises under this clause, why should we tax ourselves with the management of these lands at all? Why should not the Provincial Government, which has charge of education, take the trouble of managing and disposing of these lands? They might naturally be supposed to be best qualified to manage them, and to know when they could be disposed of to the best advantage, and when funds are required for the purpose of education.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is that every member from Manitoba has protested against the possibility of the Dominion Government giving up these lands.

Mr. WATSON. I think that at the present time these lands are safer in the care of the Dominion Government.

Mr. SCOTT. Why not provide that one-half of the proceeds of these lands, after deducting all expenses of sale and management, should be appropriated to the educational endowment fund, and that the balance should go into the Dominion Treasury.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the Committee to allow sub-section 5 to stand over.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not understand how the hon. First Minister can reconcile the views he expressed a while ago with regard to the sacredness of keeping these school lands for school purposes, with the provision in the Bill that any that are very valuable may be taken away. If the grant is so sacred, I think he had better let the school fund have what it amounts to. As an hon. member has said, a great many of these lands may be worthless, and if any are valuable, they will only compensate the school fund for those that are worthless.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My memory is very short, and I cannot remember what we did in the last Parliament; but this clause was introduced in the last Parliament, and, if I am not very much mistaken, my hon. friend voted for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think so; but I must protest against the reservation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When that clause was put in, it was anticipated that the Pacific Railway would be built by the Government, and the Government had to choose the points where towns should be built along the line, and there was no reason why an exceptional advantage should be given to the school lands. This provision merely freed the hands of the Government to place a town at the most eligible place for the benefit of the Dominion. However, I shall not press the fifth sub-section to-night.

Mr. CASEY. Sub-section four limits the investment of school funds to Dominion securities. These securities all bear a low rate of interest, and I think it would be advisable to allow the school funds to be invested in first-class municipal debentures, or similar securities, that would yield a higher rate of interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would be giving too much power to any Government. Continual pressure would be brought on the Government of the day by corporations anxious to get the money, and the fund might disappear.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. WATSON. I think it would be a very good idea to allow this money to be used for the purpose of redeeming school debentures, for aiding by loans in the building of schools, and so forth. I suppose the Government interest is only about 4 per cent., whereas some of our towns in the West are paying as high as 8 per cent. on school debentures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question had better be left over until next Session.

On section 24,

Mr. CHARLTON. We were congratulating ourselves on the fact that in many respects our land laws are superior to those of the United States. I would like to see one change introduced, which will remove one of the radical defects of the land policy of the Government. I would like to see a provision introduced that would require settlement as a condition of sale. With that provision we would have a land law, in that respect at least, vastly superior to that of the United States. One of the great evils of the disposal of public lands of the United States, has been sales to non-residents or speculators. This evil has retarded the settlement of the various sections of public lands in that country. I would suggest that this clause be amended by substituting "Act of Parliament," for "Governor in Council," after the word "by," in the fifth line, and by making the balance of the clause read as follows:—

Provided that lands within railway belts, when alternate sections of public lands have been granted in aid of railway construction, shall be sold at \$2.50 per acre, and that land outside of railway belts shall be sold at \$1.35 per acre, that settlement within a period of one year shall be condition of sale, that amount sold shall be limited to the quantity that may be occupied by the settler, that payment shall be made in cash, that at the time of purchase a certificate of sale shall issue to the purchaser from the local land agent, and that the settler has erected a house upon his land and occupies the same and has brought one-quarter of his land under cultivation, the patent shall issue. Provided further, that when deemed expedient by the Governor in Council, after three months' notice shall have been given in the *Canada Gazette*, and in all newspapers published in the Province or Territory in which such land is situated, purchases may be restricted to the even-numbered sections in such township, or such unoccupied lands as the Minister of the Interior shall deem expedient, may, after notice as aforesaid, be withdrawn from ordinary sale and sold at auction to the highest bidder, an upset price being fixed for the same upon terms of one-third down and the balance of purchase money in thirty days; with provisions as to certificate of sale, quantity sold to each purchaser, settlement, cultivation, and issue of patent as hereinbefore provided.

If this feature were substituted we would have the authority of Parliament required instead of the ordinary Order in Council, which would be a beneficial change. By having the prices uniform with those of the United States a larger immigration would be induced; by making the settlement a condition of sale we would have a land law immeasurably superior to that of the United States; by limiting the quantity sold to that which may be occupied by the settler we would effect another great improvement and do away with the great abuse that exists in the United States; by introducing the system of cash sales we would avoid the great confusion and difficulty which this system of credit sales will inevitably create, and we would simplify our land transactions immeasurably, besides relieving ourselves of the necessity of keeping a large staff of clerks. The settler who bought lands would not obtain a patent until he complied with the conditions of settlement; and if it was found necessary to restrict the sale of lands to the even-numbered sections of townships, this could be done, under this clause, on ample notice being given in the *Canada Gazette* and the newspapers of the Province or Territory, as it would not be right to make a radical change on a short notice. If lands were worth much more than \$2.50 or \$1.25 per acre, this clause makes provision for withdrawing them for ordinary sale and putting them up for auction to the highest bidder, at an upset price, on the conditions of settlement already laid down. This is a matter we have often had under discussion in this House. One of the radical defects

of the Government land policy is the sale of lands upon credit and in larger quantities than may be occupied by the settlers. If the conditions of settlement were enforced, the good results to the North-West would become immediately apparent. I beg to submit this clause as merely embodying my idea as to the change we should make in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure my hon. friend's scheme is a pious imagination that can never be carried out practically. I differ from him *toto cælo* in the proposition that the lands should be sold for cash. I want the man of small means, with good health and energy, and enough money to pay one or two instalments, to be able to purchase the lands and pay the balance out of what he makes out of the soil. The hon. gentleman's proposition would simply be to offer the lands at diminished prices to people who have the cash to buy them, and keep out the deserving man of small means. I have a practical objection to providing that the lands be sold with conditions of settlement. We have plenty of land offered on conditions of settlement. The whole homestead system is based on that, and it will take fifty, perhaps one hundred years to settle this country, nearly as large as all Europe, if we only offered the even-numbered sections. The even-numbered sections are open to those coming in to settle, and you must remember that Parliament has solemnly decided that the expenditure caused by the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be defrayed out of the sale of the lands. The railway lands and odd-numbered sections will be put into the market. As a general rule, when you get further away from Winnipeg, out of the immediate influence of speculators—away out on the plains—the odd-numbered sections will be bought by those who have settled under the homestead law, or the even-numbered sections. We will thus get a large sum of money to defray the expenditure that is going on in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Parliament has appropriated 100,000,000 acres for that purpose, and we are obliged to get the best price we can for those lands. I do not doubt there will be any difficulty, if the principle of giving only the even-numbered sections to actual settlers is adhered to, as to the disposal and cultivation of the odd-numbered sections.

Mr. CASEY. I have the pleasure of agreeing for once with the right hon. gentleman in regard to the cash price and also as to the fixed price. It would not be wise to introduce fixed prices. As to selling for the purpose of settlement I disagree with him. I think that selling land under the condition of cultivation would by no means interfere with our getting good prices for those lands, and certainly would not stop their sale. The Canadian Pacific Railway have shown themselves to be as good business men as can be found in dealing with lands, and they sell only on condition of actual cultivation, without necessitating actual residence, and they have been able to sell their lands all along the constructed portion of the lines lying right amongst the Government free grants. The existence of free grant lands alongside has not prevented the sale of their lands, or has only delayed it for a short time. As a matter of fact all the choice free grant lands appear to be taken up, all that lie near the railway, and the settlers who come in afterwards cannot buy railway lands. Of course speculators buy them, but they are compelled, if they intend to keep the lands, to cultivate a certain portion of them each year, so that something is produced and a revenue earned for the Government. I think what the country would make in the increased population of some districts if these terms were enforced, would more than recoup what they might otherwise lose. Now, as long as you sell this land without conditions it will be principally bought up by speculators. The hon. Minister seems to have an idea that away from Winnipeg on

the plains there are no speculators. I think he must have had some little experience that would prove the contrary to him. We all remember, for instance, the great land sales at Birtle last winter when hundreds of thousands of acres were taken up; all the good sections around Birtle were taken up by speculators, who hold them now for a rise. The consequence is that nothing is now open for settlement but the even-numbered sections. Speculators, of course, will not sell without profit, unless they are hard up. That rule will be found to apply throughout the country, that wherever a desirable section of the country is opened up for settlement, the odd-numbered sections, if sold without terms of cultivation, will be held exclusively by speculators, and half the country will be locked up from settlement for years to come. You will find it will be a long time before this land that is locked up in the Birtle district will be brought into settlement. As the object of Government, in disposing of these lands, should be to get settlers into the country and have the country cultivated, I think it is their duty to impose terms upon all lands for sale. I shall not now make a formal motion—that will be made later on—but I would propose the insertion of a clause something like this:

“And on the same conditions in regard to settlement as are required in the case of homesteads.”

Mr. TROW. I regret that this country is overrun with speculators, but it will soon come under municipal government, and annual taxation will cure the evil.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the Government stands in the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman quotes their example about enforcing the terms of actual settlement. A corporation, the hon. gentleman knows, can do what it likes; it has no body to be kicked, and no soul to be saved, and can do what it pleases. But the Government cannot do so. Now I will give the hon. gentleman an example. There are sixty-one men who are now insisting upon a clause being put in this Act for their protection. When a person has bought land and paid for it, if he has not carried out the conditions of actual settlement, it will require, in the first place, a great deal of trouble and expense, to ascertain whether he has done so. Then you will have a large body of petitioners coming down here and saying to Parliament: “It is too bad! we have paid our money, we have not quite fulfilled the conditions, we have only cleared five acres instead of twenty-five; but you are not going to take the pound of flesh from us?” Are we to restore them the money? Are we to turn them off? What are we to do? Parliament will yield, and the men will get their lands, whether they improve them or not.

Mr. CASEY. Whether this argument has any force or not, it will apply only to the terms of homesteading. If it is possible to ascertain whether a homesteader has fulfilled the terms required, it is possible to ascertain whether a man has bought land on those terms. The hon. Minister may naturally suppose the case of a man who has fulfilled only part of the terms. Here again I am compelled to quote the example of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who have foreseen and provided for that case. Where a man has made part of the settlement dues, but not all, he is allowed to retain a number of acres proportionate to the number he has improved. I do not see why the Government should not do the same.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see the second sub-section reserves land containing stone quarries, or water powers. In case lands of that kind were sold, and valuable stone quarries, or water powers or mines, were afterwards discovered on it, how would that affect the rights of the holder?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a question I am not exactly prepared to answer, but my impression is that

if the land is open as agricultural land, and a party *bona fide* goes and makes his entry for agricultural land, and it is put into the market as agricultural land by the Crown, I think the party gets the advantage of the subsequent discovery. But if, when he makes his entry, he has secret knowledge that there is a mine, for instance, and fraudulently intends to work it for mineral purposes, according to the ordinary principles of law and equity his title can be impugned.

Mr. WATSON. It is the duty of the Government to ascertain if anything of this description is on the property before they put it into the market. It would hardly be right, after a man had made improvements, and after he had found a mine more valuable than the farm, to deprive him of the advantage. I think if land is put into the market for homestead or for sale, that the purchaser should be entitled to all it contains after he has fulfilled the conditions of the law.

On section 25,

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a chance here of some advantage being taken of the Government. It might occur in cases of town sites that the Government and the Pacific Railway owned adjoining sections, and that the valuable portion was in the Government section. Under this arrangement, embodied in the clause, the land would be sold on joint account, and although the railway company's portion was very much inferior they would receive one-half of the total sales.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That works both ways.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think the Canadian Pacific Railway will allow it to work the other way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid they have done so; I know where I think we have the best of the bargain.

Mr. CASEY. I think there is great force in the objection taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The Canadian Pacific Railway are not likely to allow such an arrangement to work against them, and the Government cannot hope to be as fully informed of the relative value of the sections as the railway company. In regard to the sales at Regina, I called the hon. Minister's attention to the way in which those lots had been sold, and that it really amounted to a lottery. I heard repeatedly expressions of dissatisfaction respecting that transaction. I know it was not done directly by the Government or by the railway company, but by their agent; but the Government should take care that they are not mixed up in such transactions. They should not go into partnership with respect to the sale of town lots any more than for the sale of farming lands. The sections should be amended by providing that town lots should be sold only by auction at an upset price.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we did not make such an arrangement, we would have no towns along the line. The Canadian Pacific Railway would place the towns where they like. They have every alternate section and they can have the towns on their own land. The Government in such a case could only have the suburbs of a town. We know perfectly well that the railway company would select sites where they would be most likely to sell the land to the greatest advantage. The bargain was altogether in our favor; otherwise the railway company would have from the foot of the Rockies to Red River, every town, village and station on their own land. We had at Regina something to offer. We wanted some point easily accessible for the Mounted Police and for the residence of the Lieutenant-Governor. We said to the company: We will select this place if you will agree to make it a town and the starting point of a railway branch. They agreed, and they are to run a branch due north from Regina and make it a station.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

We agreed that the Lieutenant-Governor shall live there, and by combining the two interests a very respectable town will grow up there; I hope a large and very considerable one, the larger the better for the Treasury. Then there are Medicine Hat and Moose Jaw Creek, points indicated by nature for town sites. It will be a good thing for us to make this agreement, and the company being much more interested, they will desire to obtain the highest speculative price, while the Dominion is, of course, satisfied with a moderate price. This, therefore, is not an unprofitable arrangement between the Government and the company.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I quite agree with the hon. First Minister that we should pass the present clause. If the Government were not to make such an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the latter would place town sites on their own lots and the Government would be left out. If the plan suggested in the Bill is carried out, we can safely rely on the railway company making all the money possible, and we shall get one-half of it.

Mr. CASEY. There may, however, be cases in which a Government section would happen to be at the crossing of a river, and where they would be masters of the situation, and in such cases we should not enter into any arrangement with the railway company.

On section 27,

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest that the fourth subsection be amended by adding words to the effect that in all cases where land has not been withheld from entry, and where settlers have been permitted to make entry, such entry shall not be disputed because it is afterwards discovered that it contains minerals, and is valuable for other than agricultural purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The intention is to get population to settle on the agricultural lands, and to get people there, and this is the reason why we give away a portion of our estate; but if there is any special value in the property, the Dominion, the Public Treasury should get the advantage of it, and not the speculator.

Mr. CHARLTON. My idea is that a settler may be allowed to make an entry; there may be on the land some little stream, and somebody may claim it to be a water power, which the settler might not consider, when the entry was made, to be of any value, though his title might be imperilled. I hold that where a homestead settler is permitted to make an entry and go upon the land, he ought to hold it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly; this does not interfere with that at all. The Act gives certain *in quoad* rights to people settling on unsurveyed land; on agricultural lands the settler has the first right to get the homestead; but are you to say, that a lot of speculators are to be allowed to take up every mine and water power all through the country, to which, when the land is surveyed, they may make claim. That would not do.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. gentleman fully considered the question raised as to the abolition of the preemption of 160 acres.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments of the hon. gentlemen who favor the doing away with the preemption rights altogether, and I must say, my own opinion goes very much with those hon. gentlemen, that preemption rights should be done away with; but you must remember that we have taken certain steps, Canada has advertised largely in Europe holding out certain advantages, and the people of Scandinavia, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, &c., have been told that they can have the right to 160 acres, and 160 acres of preemption, which could not therefore be at once withdrawn. There must not be the most distant shadow of a

breach of faith with the immigrants of 1883, or with the intending immigrants of 1884. It is to be supposed that it will take at least two years before they make up their minds finally, to make the plunge and pull up stakes in the Old Country to come here; for that reason, I think that we must keep in this clause. We have put, in a subsequent part of the Bill, power on giving six months' notice to do away with the right of preemption, and I am quite open, when we come to that clause, to consider whether we shall make it more stringent and say that preemption shall end at a given date; but this must be a date very considerably distant from the present; that is a matter to be considered hereafter.

**Mr. SPROULE.** When a party makes a homestead entry, has he the right to enter for preemption?

**Mr. WATSON.** The settler is not supposed to have that right on unsurveyed lands.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I understood they had; but some parties were in doubt about it.

**Mr. WATSON.** A great deal of dissatisfaction in the past has been experienced with regard to the right to preemption. In the vicinity of Brandon, a number of persons had to form a vigilance committee to try and protect their preemptions, but those who wanted to occupy these lands were the stronger, and the former had to give up the idea of holding 320 acres. If they have the right to hold half a section, this ought to be plainly stated; and if they have not the right, that ought to be plainly stated, in order to leave no ground for dispute.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** This clause certainly gives only the right to homestead. I will consider the question of preemptions before concurrence.

On section 30,

**Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk).** Will the hon. gentleman make any provision with regard to the appeal from the Land Board?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** As was argued this afternoon, there should be a finality somewhere, and I think the chances are greater that a Board composed of men with special qualifications for an understanding of these matters, with, of course, a final appeal to the responsible Minister, will know much more about the justice of the case, and the weight of the evidence, and all the circumstances than any other court.

**Mr. CASEY.** It is not always the best informed tribunal that is most impartial, and though the local agent of the Land Board would be the best possible witness in a case of this kind, I think the parties should have the right to appeal to a court which is more accustomed to judicial decisions than even the hon. Minister of the Department is.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** It will simply be a case of the rich man worrying the poor man out of his place. If you put in a clause of that kind, I venture to say there will be an outcry for an appeal within two years.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I know that parties for whom I have written on this subject, and who have made application, are well satisfied with their decisions. We know, from our experience in other matters, that to give the right of appeal would simply be to say that the man who has the most money carries it to the last court.

**Mr. CHARLTON.** I think that there should be a provision here that notice should be given to both parties before the case is heard. I think also that if it should appear that if a decision were arrived at by fraudulent evidence being given, that should be a ground for setting aside the decision. There certainly, I think, should be some appeal in cases of that kind.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I entirely agree with the observation of the hon. Minister that it would be important in all ordinary cases that the decision of the Board, or of the Minister, should not be final, but I think the Minister will find it a protection, probably, instead of the reverse, if, where there has been deliberate fraud in obtaining his decision, there should be that appeal to the courts which has always been allowed in the administration of our Crown lands in the older Provinces. There were found to be, as no doubt the hon. gentleman knows, many cases of this kind for which it was impossible that there could be any proper machinery for investigation in the Department. There are cases, and by no means rarely, in which false affidavits are put in, and false information made, by which the Crown was misled and deceived into a transaction.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I agree with the hon. gentleman, but I submit to him whether this clause excludes the rights of the courts in cases of fraud *proprio motu*.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I know it was not thought that the courts could have such a power, to set aside a patent, unless that jurisdiction were expressly conferred upon them by a statutory definition of this limited character. It is because I am very anxious that the appeal should not be had except in these special cases, that I think a special and careful provision should be made as to such cases. I think there should be no appeal unless there is a fraud committed on the Crown or the officers of the Crown.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** There is a clause in the Statute of 1880, under the head of Patents, which provides for what the hon. gentleman speaks of.

On section 31,

**Mr. HESSON.** Before this clause passes I desire to know whether it is absolutely imperative that a person who has entered for a homestead shall personally occupy it within six months. I know of some cases in which persons have made some improvements, and have become sick and been unable to remain on their homesteads. In such cases I suppose the spirit of the law would be carried out if the duties were performed by some person on behalf of the homesteader.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The great object is to get the party to go and settle on the land, and not to allow them under a pretence to get someone else to settle on it. If a man has money enough to send other persons to settle on his land, he should not get a homestead. However, if it is shown that a party has gone on the land and is unable, from any circumstance, to carry out the strict provisions of the law, there is power given to the Government to extend the time; but I do not think it would be well to enlarge the time.

**Mr. WATSON.** I know of several cases in which settlers became sick, and upon the certificate of a doctor the time of the sickness was counted in the three years.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I am opposed to that. When a party gets leave of absence for sickness he ought to come back and put in his full time.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is there any provision to apply to cases where the party has died and the other members of the family are not old enough to complete the homestead provisions. There are one or two cases of this kind in which I have tried to get something done, but have not succeeded. In Manitoba, I believe, the relations should do it, but the property would go to the general heirs.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** That is a question of title. The legal representatives have the same right as the homesteader when alive.

**Mr. SPROULE.** If he dies without a will?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The property is escheated to the Crown unless he has relatives or legal representatives.

Mr. WALLACE (York). In the case of a homesteader who dies after residing two years on his lot, are his legal heirs required to complete the term of residence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. ORTON. Is there any provision in the case of insanity? A case occurred in my riding where a young man became insane before he fulfilled his time. This man had resided on the land within a couple of months of the time required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will look into that.

On section 33,

Mr. SUTHERLAND suggested that the number of families be reduced to ten.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the desire of the Government to encourage settlement in hamlets, by which people lose half their time in going to and from their farms, but this clause is necessary to meet the habits of some of the European settlements, as for instance, the Menonites.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The clause is a dead letter.

Mr. ROYAL. I know of a case in my own county in which it was a dead letter. A petition was transmitted by me to the Department, signed by twenty or twenty-five heads of families, who wanted to form a village. By some reason their petition was never answered, and in the meantime those parties expecting an answer had not fulfilled the conditions of continuous residence and in some cases their claims were jumped. I hope if this clause is to remain more attention will be made to petitions sent in.

On section 34,

Mr. WATSON suggested that a certain amount of cultivation and improvements be executed before granting the homestead patent.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). The section provides that he must reside upon it and cultivate it. With regard to cultivation so much each year, I do not think that would work, because in many cases a man might, through sickness or otherwise, be unable to break any more land the second year, though living on his place.

Mr. SPROULE. It is easy to evade that clause as it stands. It is better to say that they shall break up and cultivate not less than 25 or 30 acres at the expiration of the three years.

Mr. SCOTT. It is not necessary to specify any number of acres. Any man who is a *bona fide* settler will break up all the land he can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we stick sternly to the principle of personal residence there can be no difficulty. A man who is going to live on a farm will not stand with his hands in his pockets.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Winnipeg says, that the *bona fide* settler will cultivate every acre he can. The object of this provision is to exclude everybody who is not a *bona fide* settler. The hon. Minister says if you stick to the personal residence clause you will ensure cultivation. That is contrary to experience. Personal residence may be put in, in the winter, when cultivation is impossible, and that is actually done in many cases. A settler who intends to be a *bona fide* settler in the meantime spends part of the summer at something else, and in the winter when he has nothing to do, he goes and smokes his pipe, and eats his bacon quietly on the section. I think that the number of acres to be cultivated should be something considerable. I think five acres a year for the first two years and ten acres for the last year, is too little. The object is to ensure an amount of cultivation practically

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

useful to the settler, and I think that fifteen acres a year, making forty-five in all, might be sufficient. All the capital he requires is a plough and a span of horses, and if he has not capital enough to do that, he has no business to have a homestead.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would allow a man to go who had nothing to cultivate his land but a spade.

Mr. CASEY. If you allow a man to have a homestead who does nothing but spade cultivation you are locking up 160 acres that somebody else might be cultivating profitably. My experience of Manitoba is that the men who go there have ample means of cultivating a farm, and I think they should be compelled to do such an amount of cultivation as practically improves the value of the land.

Mr. HESSON. Some of the most valued settlers we have in Canada came here with nothing but an axe on their shoulders, and have carved out homes for themselves under greater disadvantages than those that beset settlers in the North-West.

Mr. CASEY. Any man who goes to Manitoba with a good pair of hands and a determination to work, can obtain sufficient credit to buy ten or fifteen acres of land a year.

Mr. WATSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, who probably does not know what classes of men go to the North-West and take up homesteads. I have known many who have not possessed more than \$40 or \$50 after their arrival, and who did not possess any influence, but who did not find it necessary to own a plough and team in order to start farming, but hired a plough and exchanged work. Each quarter-section should have certain improvements which should cover ten or fifteen acres for the three years.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I would leave the extent of cultivation to the settler himself. In my constituency I know settlers who have been there for many years, who have not more than twenty acres under cultivation. They do not make their money by cultivating the soil, and do not grow more wheat than they require for their own use; but they keep cattle and are better settlers than many men owning forty or fifty acres, who do not possess any stock.

Mr. CHARLTON. The clause should be made definite in some way, and certainly not be left in its present indefinite form.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The lack of definition is all in favor of the settler. The Land Board will decide whether there is a *bona fide* settlement by residence and cultivation.

Mr. WATSON. I would urge upon the Government, that twenty acres at least should be placed under cultivation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That might be an argument for cutting the 160 acres down to forty or sixty. Different settlers have different habits, and if they occupy their time during the three years in putting up a house, and in cultivating their land in their own way, they will be adjudged *bona fide* settlers.

Mr. SPROULE. In travelling through Southern Manitoba, I have seen thousands of acres deeded without having a settler living on them, yet they were broken up and filled the conditions of settlement. Continuous settlement means settlement during six months of the year, and I know many cases in which the people live on their land in the winter time, and in spring go in search of work. They subsequently obtain the deeds and sell out.

Mr. SCOTT. Such instances are very rare. The reverse is the case. Settlers remain on their homesteads during the summer, and obtain work during the winter to furnish them with means to increase their stock of agricultural implements.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman cannot have visited the neighborhood of Nelsonville and Moose Jaw Creek, where I found hundreds of such farms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there is too much of that sort of thing done. I doubt very much the propriety of defining the number of acres to be cultivated. If we can leave the clause so as to operate in the interest of the settlers, we are safe. After all, the clause had better stand as it is.

On section 37,

Mr. CHARLTON. I think some amendment should be made with reference to persons who may have taken up homesteads and who, being unacquainted with the country, afterwards find that the land is perfectly worthless. If the facts in such cases were attested by affidavits or other proof, I think it would be well that he should be allowed to make another entry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we are to open the door to such cases we will find it necessary to send up an inspector to ascertain the facts in every case which occur. The affidavit system is simply corrupting the whole population. In the anxiety to obtain their patents many affidavits are being made like the old Custom House affidavits. My hon. friend will recollect that when a smuggler went into the business in the old days, he used to get down on his knees and swear on the Bible that he would never tell the truth to a Custom House officer, and he held that that oath justified him in swearing to anything ever afterwards. So about these affidavits. In order to decide whether a party had primarily settled on land fit for settlement we would have to send up an agent in every case, and the door would be open to all kinds of difficulties. Cases of that kind are so few, and land of every grade is so abundant, that if a man is fool enough to settle on bad land he should pay the penalty of his neglect.

Mr. CHARLTON. Still there is a great deal of bad land in the North-West; and when cases of hardship arising from ignorance of the country occur, I think the Government should give the man a chance of rectifying what may be, perhaps, the supreme mistake of his life.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think perhaps the experience of the free grant districts of Ontario may be of some value in settling this question. I know nothing about lands in the North-West, but I know this question has occupied a great deal of discussion in the free-grant districts of Ontario, and I think the general conviction there is that it would be to the advantage of the country if the pioneer settler were allowed to sell his improvements to that class of people who have a little capital, and who would prefer paying a little more money, rather than undergo the first roughing.

Mr. TROW. I think the transfer of lands for a second entry should be made as easy as possible. The first settlers, in many cases, are young men who would be glad to sell out and go further West; and there are many others, from Europe and elsewhere, who would be glad to pay the price of their improved farms.

Mr. WATSON. I heartily agree with both of the last speakers. There are a great many of these pioneer settlers in the North-West who are prepared to go to the front and break up the land for persons who are willing to pay a consideration for improved farms. I hope the Government will consider this matter and make the transfer as easy as possible from the first settler to the man who will take up the conditions where he left them and fulfil them. It makes very little difference what men we have on the land, so long as the country is settled. I think it would be right, also, to make a provision to permit a man to abandon a quarter-section that turns out to be unfit for cultivation, and take up another. In my own county, a great many

people had to abandon their homesteads around Lake Manitoba, because they were drowned out by the rise of the water; I think most of them were allowed to take up second homesteads. Lands that a few years ago were fields of wheat are now two feet under water. It would not have been right to compel those people to remain there and try to make a living by catching jack-fish if they cannot grow wheat. We want to keep all the people we have in that country, and I hope the Government will see their way to make the transfer of homesteads as easy as possible, and to allow a person to abandon a homestead and take up a second if he can give satisfactory reasons.

Mr. TROW. I have travelled over the tract of country the hon. member for Marquette refers to. It is on the eastern shore of Lake Manitoba. Seven years ago it was good arable land, but owing to the flooding of the outlet of the lake the water has risen three or four feet, and the country is under water.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a case which I shall take into consideration. As to enabling a homesteader to sell out at the end of a year and take up another homestead, I think I cannot agree to that. It would be simply opening a door to a great fraud. I think the principle of the homestead is that if a man is unable to pay for the land, he can get it on condition of residence. If after the first year he sells out, this shows that he should never have got the land at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that the hon. First Minister loses sight of the object of homestead entry. The object is to get settlers into the country; and if by allowing second entry, he gets two settlers in place of one, I think that would be in the interest of the country. I think the provision proposed would be favored by nine-tenths of the settlers in the North-West, and I hope the hon. First Minister will still give the matter his consideration.

On section 39,

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that 8 per cent. should be substituted for 6 per cent., as it is impossible for the settler to borrow at 6 per cent.

Mr. TROW. I dissent from this. It would be impossible for the settler to pay more than 6 per cent., and the advantage can be obtained from companies in the Old Country who do not realize more than 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the rate should be altered. The advances will be made by those colonization companies who look for their profit rather to the settlement of their lands than to the charge of interest.

Mr. SPROULE. With the experience we have had in Ontario it is impossible for farmers to pay more than 5 or 6 per cent. on their money, and if you impose a heavier interest than that you put a burthen on them that they will not be able to pay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With such a thin House as at present I would not like to make such an important alteration in the law. This Act has gone all over the world. It is now before the emigrants in England, Ireland and Scotland, and it is understood that they can borrow money at 6 per cent.

Mr. CHARLTON. The proposition is not to impose 8 per cent., but to limit the interest to 8 per cent. It was said to-night that this privilege was inoperative, for the reason that money could not be borrowed at that rate of interest. It is well known that money is worth more than 6 per cent. in Manitoba, and the security is not as good as in the older Provinces. I do not believe that under 6 per cent. many settlers will be enabled to borrow money under this clause. If there is any object in disturbing this clause if is for the purpose of enabling settlers to avail themselves to the privileges that this clause gives.

Mr. SPROULE. This plan has only been tried for a short time. The parties who are loaning money can afford to loan it to these settlers at a low rate of interest.

Mr. AUGER. I think that 6 per cent. is high enough; and if they cannot borrow at 6 per cent. they should not borrow at all. The experience in the Eastern Townships has been that all those who borrow money to settle on new lands have been obliged to go away poorer than when they first came there; while those who did not borrow at all, remained there, and are now generally wealthy men. If you bring immigrants here, you must not give a chance to speculators to put them in such a position that, after years of labor, they will be forced to go elsewhere.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). Why not make it 8 per cent., for the purchase of horses and cattle, as well as of farming implements and the erection of buildings? You give him money to buy seed grain, and you put a mortgage on the homestead for the pay. Cattle and horses are as necessary for a man to begin work with as seed grain.

On section 40,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe there is a general consensus of opinion among the Manitoba members that the right of preemption should be abolished. This clause provided that the privilege of preemption may be discontinued by Order in Council, to be published at least six months, and go into force on the expiration of six months from the first publication thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be very much better, if such is the definite policy of Parliament, that preemptions should be abolished from a certain period.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my own opinion. We might provide that after a given date, preemption shall be abolished; and it should be a date which would not affect immigrants, either in 1883 or in 1884. The date might be fixed at 1st January, 1885.

Mr. WATSON. I would not do away with preemption unless something is substituted in its place. It was on that ground that I advocated a cultivation homestead plan. There are many mechanics and others in Manitoba, who would avail themselves of such an opportunity to obtain 160 acres of land, for they would be able to save sufficient from their wages to pay for the improvements. The proposal I have made would be in the interests of the country and also of the poor settlers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the privilege of preemption in connection with homesteads shall be discontinued from and after 1st January, 1885.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Government have determined to do away with the privilege of preemption, most of the hon. members from Manitoba think something should be substituted. I beg to call the attention of the Government to the desirability of having some provision made for homesteading based on tree culture. There is an inadequate supply of timber in the North-West, and the denudation of timber is one of the evils of the near future. The timber of the United States is swept away at the rate of 12,000,000 acres per annum, and that country realizing the great importance of the subject, ten years ago entered upon the cultivation of trees on the treeless prairies of the West. A Timber Cultivation Act was passed in 1874; it was amended in 1878, and under its operation since 1876, 12,300,000 acres have been entered under the Tree Culture Homestead Act. It will be, no doubt, interesting to the Committee if I should sketch the provisions of that Act. It provided that the head of a family can make an entry of that kind. He is required to cultivate 700 trees per acre. These have to be kept in growing condition for eight years. There is a provision to extend the time in case of grasshoppers, drought or fire; but invariably there must be 675 healthy growing trees

Mr. CHARLTON.

upon the land, and then the deed is given. The desirability of adopting the policy of homestead tree culture in substitution of preemptions is a matter worthy of the consideration of the hon. First Minister, as this will be a matter of the greatest importance in the North-West. I do not suppose that such provisions can be incorporated now, but the policy is one deserving attention, and one which should be acted upon in the near future.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman as to the importance of developing the growth of forest trees. I do not think, however, the experiment in the United States has been a success; the authorities at Washington declare it has not been a success. Large quantities of land were conveyed under pretence of forestry, and so much land was lost to the domain without trees being planted. There must be a much more comprehensive organized system, similar to that in Germany, and in France, and in Norway; and it must be under the constraint of the Government. Now, I will say to the hon. gentleman—though it is a little out of order to talk in Committee about the Government's policy—it is the intention of the Canadian Government, and we have taken some steps already to invite the co-operative action of all the Provincial Governments, in order to have some united action, united legislation, and united governmental control, in the way of enforcing plantations, setting aside certain districts, as in Germany; and wherever a district is there set aside to be cleared of the useful timber, an appropriation of another district, of the same size, is made, which must be planted in the same year when the timber of the corresponding section is cut away. There must be some system of that kind. The idea of bribing people by offering them land for the planting of trees is found to be a failure. This is the opinion at Washington of the land grant authorities. They say that the land is gone, but the trees are not there. We are now taking action in that matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am satisfied to hear the statement of the hon. First Minister, and I presume there is a good deal of truth in the remark made by him, that the tree-planting Act of Congress has not been a thorough success, though I see that the entries under that Act last year exceeded two million acres.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The entries are large enough.

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy foreshadowed will likely be much more efficient than a law of that kind. I am glad to see that the Government is alive to the interests of the country, and to the danger of denuding the country of trees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have a special report on that subject which I will produce by-and-by. The privilege of preemption shall be discontinued from and after the 1st of January, 1885.

On section 41,

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any competition in the matter of grazing-land leases now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hitherto we have granted applications in their order, if the Government or Department believed that the parties applying were *bona fide*—going to be graziers and rancheros. I believe that the parties who have taken ranches, are, on the whole, almost entirely good men—men of capital, who have put in large sums of money and have brought in large herds of cattle; in some cases, I believe, considerably to their own loss during this last year. The experiment, on the whole, has been successful, in the way that it has been a very popular way of employing capital. English capitalists and American capitalists as well, have come into Canada, and have got their grazing leases. The subject of grazing leases, the hon. gen-



tleman will remember, was fully discussed in Committee before; and it was found, as stated then, that our system of granting leases is infinitely better than the American mode by which cattle were allowed to roam at will; and in consequence of that unrestricted permission, the grasses were so destroyed that there are large districts in the United States where the native grasses have been destroyed and therefore become valueless as grazing grounds. By granting leases, as we have done at a very moderate rental, these parties have something like a certainty. They have their leases, they bring their cattle in and protect their grasses and cattle, and grounds; and at the same time, in order to prevent these grazing leases from being an impediment to settlement—these leases all concern the Bow and Belly Rivers, from thence extend to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, far away from Red River—and preventing population going in. When population takes that direction, there is a provision in the law that every grazing lease must contain this clause: that the lease can be terminated at any time on two years' notice from the Government. Well, that is a very short notice, considering the great expense that these people must undergo in getting in there large herds of cattle and in putting up large buildings—for they must have large buildings—in order to classify their herds of cattle; and on two years' notice, the whole of the lease, even when a man has 100,000 acres from the Government, he must give up the whole of his land. Well, the consequence of that is this: it would be a very hard measure, a very hard thing indeed to give two years' notice; and if in any section and portion of a large ranch, settlers desire to establish themselves, all the Government has to say is: "You must give up that section and portion of your lease." If he says he won't, we say: "Take notice that the lease for the whole thing will expire in two years;" and at once he will give up any reasonable portion of his ranch in order to preserve the remainder until he receives a similar intimation from the Government, which must be done.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the mode pursued in granting coal licenses? Is any competition invited?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has not been hitherto competition invited, because so few persons have expressed a desire to go into this business. We were very fortunate, however, in getting Mr. Gethbridge, in connection with Sir A. T. Galt, to undertake these operations. Perhaps some of the hon. gentlemen may know who Mr. Gethbridge is. He is the partner of the right hon. W. H. Smith, a former member of Lord Beaconsfield's administration. They are millionaires. He is a millionaire who has taken a fancy to make investments in Canada. He has expended a very large sum of money already—I understand some £50,000 sterling—and is putting on steamers, and they have made a contract already for the delivery of a large quantity of coal at Medicine Hat to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the moment that railway is finished to that point, and they are also building barges for the purpose of bringing down coal from their mines to this point of delivery. I hope the experiment will be successful. It will be commenced on the largest and most liberal scale, and I hope it will induce others to undertake it. Whenever there is more than one applicant for any kind of section—and the sections are small—then competition will be invited.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see, from the size of this return, that it is quite possible that competition might be secured. There are something like 1,000 applications; and I find on the list no less than fifteen from my hon. friend, the member for Lincoln, on behalf of other parties, ten from the hon. member for Cornwall, and three from the hon. member for Stanstead. There is a letter here from the hon. member for Lincoln, dated the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June, which says:

"MY DEAR SIR.—Will you kindly endeavor to have the Order in Council granted for the coal license granted in the Souris district, for

which I sent an application, a list of which I herewith enclose. Our people are very desirous of leaving next week to explore and take immediate action. I also applied for a timber license for W. Thomas, on the English River, and which, I was informed by Mr. Ryley, was first. Will you please urge this present at the same time. What do you think of the National Policy now? They tried very hard to defeat me."

I do not know whether this reference to the National Policy was intended to help his claim in the Department, but I certainly claim that it would be better to insist on competition in the matter of these coal lands. If members of Parliament are in the habit of making applications in this way, it is time that competition is introduced. It may be possible that this particular license was one which was granted for \$5 and was afterwards sold for \$2,000 per square mile, and whether the hon. member for Lincoln pocketed much of the money I do not know. I am afraid, however, that there are many irregularities under the present system: the evidence points in that direction, when we find that members of Parliament are sending applications on behalf of their friends, and referring to the success of their party, and to the fact that they have had a hard time in their contest.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure, after the application which the hon. gentleman has read, those portions of the return will be put under another cover in future. I wish to point out, however, the inutility of the clause which the hon. gentleman inserted, at my suggestion, with reference to these returns. I asked several times for these until I was tired of asking, and until, I suppose, he was tired of giving the same answer, and in the end the return came down; but in the meantime the coal regulations were confirmed, when it was impossible to make any motion about them. I think it would be well to have these returns laid on the Table within thirty days after the motions are made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I might say that the Department has been overlaid with work, and the returns were brought down as fast as they could be prepared. I think the poor Canadian taxpayer will have to pay the additional sum for the expenditure in getting up the return. With respect to mining lands in general, the Government have not been able to bring down the mining regulations. That subject is a very important and a very intricate one, and was confided to a very competent person, Mr. Lindsay Russell, the Deputy Minister of the Department. He, unfortunately, met with an accident a day or two before the House met, by breaking his leg, which confined him to his room. He had been working at this return and had made such progress that the work could not be confided to any person else. He is now completing them, and they will be submitted to the House in a day or two. The accident of Mr. Russell was very unfortunate, not only with regard to this return but to the other branches of the Department as well. I propose that instead of these regulations lying for a month before going into force, and as the House will not sit a month longer, to invite the attention of the House to resolutions approving of them, which will be introduced into both branches of the Legislature.

On section 44,

Mr. DAWSON. I wish to call attention to one effect which this clause may have in its present shape. It would evidently have a retroactive effect upon patents already granted, and would declare that the gold and silver had never been granted the patentee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just so.

Mr. DAWSON. Then this provision might occasion embarrassment. For instance, a part of the district which I represent is within the disputed territory. There was drawn at one time a conventional line by agreement between the Dominion Government and the Government of Ontario. The Government of Ontario was to manage the lands to the eastward of this line, and the Dominion Government the

lands to the westward. Under this agreement the Government of Ontario granted patents. The reservation of gold and silver was struck from these Ontario patents. Now, it may happen, when the question of boundary is finally settled, that this territory will become Dominion territory, and these patentees would find that this clause might apply against them, and that they would not have the right to the gold and silver which was conveyed to them by the Ontario Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Whatever the Government of Ontario did convey would be recognized by this Government, and whatever this Government conveyed would, of course, be recognized by the Government of Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt.

Mr. DAWSON. But there is another difficulty. I have heard the point raised by sound lawyers that the Provinces have not the right to convey gold and silver, that the right rests with the Crown. I see no objection to the Crown reserving the gold and silver in lands hereafter to be granted, but I do not think that this clause should have a retroactive effect, and I would suggest that the words "has operated or" be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman is logically correct. Either the patents in which gold and silver are not mentioned have conveyed the gold and silver mines, or they have not. If they have not, there is no necessity for the declaration, and if they have, the hon. gentleman, the great advocate of vested rights, is proposing to take away from the patentee what he has got. The clause is either unnecessary or it is wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is neither unnecessary nor wrong. There is no doubt that a conveyance in feehold from the Crown, with or without the reservation, does not cover the gold and silver. The great object in putting in this clause is to settle the doubt for ever. Some of the patents which have been issued have contained the words; from others, which have been struck out; but whether left in or struck out, the mines of the precious metals have not been conveyed. They belong to the Crown by prerogative right. As to the other question which the hon. gentleman raises as to whether the gold and silver belongs to the Crown in its Imperial or its Dominion sense, I do not think there is much in that. I fancy that the British North America Act provides sufficiently that the public lands, including the gold and silver, belong to the Crown as represented in each Province by the Government of that Province.

Mr. BLAKE. It is to be observed that the right hon. gentleman does not confine himself to a declaration of the law, but he also enacts, and I repeat that this is either unnecessary or wrong. The hon. gentleman says that it is unnecessary, because the legal effect is that the gold and silver are not conveyed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to follow the practice of my hon. friend in Ontario; but there is something in what he says, and I am willing to strike out the word "enacted."

Mr. DAWSON. Allow me to point out how this provision might work great hardship. A few years ago the Government of Ontario struck out the reservation of gold and silver from their patents, and it was held and acted upon as law that the gold and silver belonged to the proprietor of the land. Supposing Silver Islet were to come within the control of the Dominion, and not of Ontario, you would say to the people who own that island: "This silver never belonged to you; we have a right to take it, and we take it now." The people who own the Island would have been working as trespassers.

Mr. DAWSON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; whatever the Ontario Government have done under the conventional agreement, the Dominion Government must endorse.

On section 46,

Mr. WATSON. There might be some change in the fourth sub-section of this clause. According to this, if a man sells timber he forfeits his claim to his homestead.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And I think he ought to. The homesteader has no title whatever to his lot until after he has resided upon it and cultivated it for three years, and if he cuts all the timber upon it he not only ought to forfeit his homestead, but he ought to be punished for stealing timber, for it is nothing less than theft.

On section 50,

Mr. CHARLTON. This contains the objectionable feature of the Land Bill and the Government policy. By the abuse of the system of licenses the greater part of the timber limits of the North-West are being farmed out to favorites at \$5 a square mile, and in one case limits obtained at that figure were sold at an advance of \$1,995 per square mile. If the Government wish to give us a good law they will introduce the system of public competition by inserting after the words "sale" in the fourteenth line an amendment of this kind:

Or one-fourth cash and the balance in instalments at three, six and nine months with satisfactory security as the Governor in Council may determine. Provided that the leases of the right to cut timber upon those lands shall in no case be granted except to the highest bidder after competition has been invited by weekly notice in the *Canada Gazette* for six months preceding the day of sale, and by notice for three months in the principal newspapers in the Province in which such timber berths are situated, which said notices shall describe the location, bounds and area of such timber berths.

It may be said that our own friends when in power did as the present Government are doing; but if they did, they acted wrongly; and I have no doubt, had they continued in office and seen the abuses to which this system gives rise, they would have altered it. I desire to place the selling of timber limits on a proper basis, and I hope the Government will accept some amendment of this kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must defend the late Government from the atrocious attack the hon. gentleman has made against their purity. We found the law put into active operation by them, and continued the same system. The late Government were right in adopting that plan originally, and we were right in carrying it out. The time has come when I think we may fairly have the principle of competition. At first, with the timber scattered over a large region, the parties who got the licenses were explorers. They simply had exploring rights. The Government could not well put up berths unless they could arrive at something like a rough description of the external boundaries, and the cost of doing so would have amounted until lately to very nearly the value of the whole license. There has been a great run, certainly, for timber limits, and a great pressure made by the inhabitants to take every step to reduce the price of lumber, which has been one of the great obstacles to the settlement in that country. The Government have provided a reasonable royalty for stumpage, and so on, on these limits. The holders are obliged to put up a saw-mill within the year, and the licenses are only for a year—of course with the general understanding that unless the policy of the Government, or the progress of the settlement or other valid reasons require a change, the party paying his dues and fulfilling the conditions generally will be allowed to continue cutting the timber. With all these licenses, I do not know of anyone who has made a fortune. I believe most of them have lost money, and the price of timber has not come down as it ought. I, for one, if a speculator, would not look for timber licenses in the North-West

just now as a means of increasing my fortune. With the railway open from Thunder Bay, and lumber, the finest in the country, coming across from Parry Sound, I think the timber covered by these licenses will find a competitor in the market that will take the gilding off the ginger-bread. When the railway is finished north of Lake Superior, it will go through one of the most magnificent timbered countries in the world. It has been found that instead of being a barren, fruitless country, as we feared, there is a large body of timber. Meanwhile the question before us now is as to the general policy of the Government, and if the hon. gentleman chooses to move against the policy of the Government on this question, we will be very glad to discuss it. The Government stand in this way: Any respectable person—and I state this positively—without respect to political antecedents or election interests, who has made an exploration, and has sent in a plan of any portion of the North-West which has been opened for timber limits, has got his license upon his executing the lease; and I think that when the list is looked over, it will be found that these leases have been granted without any reference to political consideration.

Mr. WATSON. I have known parties who have spent considerable money in hunting up limits, and when they sent in a plan and application to the Government, almost invariably they found there were two or three applications in ahead of them for this timber limit by parties who had never been on the ground at all, and had known nothing about these timber limits, except from information received from the Department. Of course, the Department was very sorry for it, but still I know several cases of this kind, and by men who intended to operate the limits, and those same limits have remained for several years without being operated. There must be some reason for allowing the party to hold these limits still, and not operate them. In the Brandon and Still River country, I believe two individuals hold two of these limits, and those men were prominent in the Department of the Interior in the North-West. I refer to Mr. Laycock and Mr. Anderson. Mr. Laycock was assistant timber inspector. They have the monopoly, and the limits on the Still River are operated at Brandon, and are of no benefit to the settlers in that vicinity at all. Is it right to grant all the limits to one or two individuals in that section of the country, and run the timber down the river thirty or forty miles away from the people who want to use it?

Mr. BOWELL. This is all very fine in theory; but the man who gets the limits, builds a mill and cuts timber and supplies the immediate locality—that is done in all sections of the world. According to the hon. gentleman's idea, you must make it a condition of every lease that a mill must be built in the immediate vicinity of the timber. Now, Brandon is growing up very rapidly, and a great deal of timber is required there. I must confess I can see no objection to that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before this matter is disposed of it is important that we should dispel the impression that is sought to be left on the public by the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to the leasing of timber limits in the North-West. It has been repeatedly stated that the policy of the Government is to sell the timber limits in the North-West for \$5 per mile, which are resold for \$2,000 per mile. That would leave a false impression on the minds of the public. In the first place, the land sold at \$5 per mile, is land upon which the Government has expended nothing in the way of surveys or in making reports of the quantity of timber on it. The \$5 per mile does not represent the cost to the person who buys it. He has to pay stumpage on that lumber afterwards, and \$5 per mile every year; and I do not hesitate to say that if the timber limits that have been sold for \$5 per mile in the North-West, were put up to-morrow at public competition, they would not bring over

\$5 per mile, the whole lot. There is plenty of land in the North-West that is not worth \$5 per mile. Timber limits in that country are the exception, and there are plenty of timber limits that are not worth these fabulous prices that hon. gentlemen claim. There may be some limits more valuable than others, but it is not fair to try to create the impression that the Government are selling for \$5 per square mile what is worth \$2,000 per square mile.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would be very sorry to be instrumental in conveying a false impression to the country. I have not attempted to do anything of the kind. Nothing I have said is calculated to create that impression. It is true I pointed out that the Government charge only \$5 per square mile and dues of 5 per cent. on the products of the limits, and that they did not take measures to ascertain whether they could obtain more than \$5 per square mile. We complain that it is an injustice to so act without any attempt being made on the part of the Government to ascertain whether any person is willing to pay more or not, and I cited one instance where a friend and supporter of the Government had secured a lease at \$5 per square mile and had sold it for \$2,000 per square mile. That fact conveys the impression that the Government have not exercised proper precautions, because they would have been able to obtain the price of \$2,000 just as well as did an hon. member of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. It constantly occurs in Ontario that limits are bought at a certain rate and are sold for \$200,000 or \$300,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. That occurs after the limits have once been sold, but not when limits are first sold by the Government at public sale.

Mr. BOWELL. Sometimes.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are invariably so sold. Ample notice is given by advertisement, that limits in a certain district will be sold, and the sales are attended by buyers from the United States and Canada. Such limits, a year afterwards, may change hands at an advance on the price originally paid, but not at the rate of \$1,995 over the \$5 paid.

Mr. BOWELL. In some cases where they have been so bought, the Ontario Government has reduced the amount of the annual charges.

Mr. CHARLTON. What I say is that the Government should take every precaution to secure the full value of the limits, and that such limits should be offered at public auction, so that they might be purchased by the highest bidder.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that at a sale in this city, the other day, limits which were sold last year by the Ontario Government for \$70 a square mile brought nearly \$2,000 a square mile. Was that evidence that the system advocated by the hon. gentleman is one under which the Government would be likely to realize the full value? Additional value has been added to the limits in question by investigation and many other things which enhance the value of the property. But whatever virtue there might be in the theory, whenever it has been applied by the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario, as it has been applied of late years, it affords the very strongest argument against the system. A few years ago limits were sold to the hon. gentleman's own political friends, on the distinct understanding that they should bid over their value at that time and that the Government would reduce the charges. The experience of the last few years has proved it, because subsequently the charges were reduced so as to make them very valuable, and caused the owners to make a great deal of money. There was scarcely a man among them who would make less than about 1,000 per cent. on his money.

Mr. CHARLTON. The sale of timber limits which took place in Ontario in 1873, was a sale which realized over \$700,000 in bonuses, and if that sale had taken place under the policy of this Government, it would have realized only \$25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It was different timber.

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. Last year, Ontario placed 1,300 square miles in the market, and received over half a million dollars in bonuses. It may be said, that in 1872 limits were sold for less than they were worth. There might be instances where the knowledge of the parties enabled them to make a profit; but there were other instances where the buyers paid too much, and that was the case in regard to the sale last year. Limits were bought then which could not be sold to-day at the same price. But they were sold in open competition, after ample notice had been given to everyone interested in pine, and they were sold in conformity with the proper principle to be adopted in selling property of this kind, that left no possibility of collusion or corruption, as is possible under the system of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a very strange coincidence in the fact that the Ontario limits mentioned were bought up by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, at prices higher than should have been paid at the time, and that afterwards the charges were reduced. The limits were situated in a section of country where there was an increasing demand for lumber for settlers, and where there were great facilities for getting it to market. But if there was anything unjust in the present system of timber licenses, it is very strange hon. gentlemen opposite did not ascertain it before, when their friends were receiving, not fifty square miles, but 200 square miles, and not taking it as it must be taken to-day, in one block, but wherever they could find good lumber between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains. If the present system is not infinitely better than that, I cannot understand anything. If there had been a strong disposition on the part of the hon. gentleman and his friends to remedy this wrong, surely they had time enough, five or six years ago, to have done so.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) gives an example of the method of resorting to the childish expedient of attempting to justify a wrong by stating another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You admitted it to be wrong.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Government of Mr. Mackenzie adopted a wrong policy in regard to timber licenses in the North-West, it does not justify his continuing that policy. At that time the North-West was a new country, and the necessity of a different policy was not apparent. I condemn that principle, whatever party has been guilty of adopting it. If the late Government did so they acted wrongly, and if the present Government insist in doing so they are doubly wrong, because they have had the experience of years. The hon. gentleman attempted to justify this policy by resorting to the old excuse: "You are another; you have no right to find fault, as you were as bad as we have been."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman has done me justice. He said I resorted to the argument "you are another." The fact was I justified the course of the late Government, and said they were right, and that they being right we followed in their footsteps. But we did not quite follow in their footsteps. Well, as the hon. gentleman says, we ought to learn by experience, and we have. Instead of granting 200 square miles, we have cut them down to fifty; and instead of granting twenty-one years license, we grant one year; that is the difference. But it is idle, this sort of recrimination. The

Mr. SPROULE.

Government have really thought that the course which was inaugurated when we first opened up that country, and first passed this law, ought to be continued; they have continued it hitherto; and the question now is, how far is it to be continued? Well, the principle we have adopted is simply this: We had actually to coax, as the previous Government had to coax, men to go in there, to spend their money in the way of getting out lumber. Before we resigned the Government of which I was a member, in 1873, it was considered a matter of great courage in Wm. Jas. Cauley to go up there and invest the money he had made in the older Provinces, and commence to reduce the price of lumber. The lumber that came into Winnipeg for Fort Garry, as it was then called—came altogether from the United States, and cost—I forget the sum, but my hon. friend from Winnipeg will be able to tell what the price of lumber then was.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was \$80 a thousand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He went up and brought down the price in a year or two a little; and I sincerely hope he made money by it. The whole object of the late Government, and of the present Government, was, and has been, to induce as many men as they could get to go in there and bring in their machinery and saw-mills, if it were only a hand-mill almost, and plant them wherever there was timber to saw up into lumber, and give it to immigrants. The price and profit to the Government was a matter of small importance in comparison to getting, wherever settlers went, some men to put up saw-mills and saw up lumber, as evidence of their good faith to put up a mill and saw lumber, to sell it to the settlers as cheaply as possible; and the more men that went in there, and the more mills they established, and the more licenses that were granted, the better it was for the country; and this was the reason the Government had no trouble about it; they had to make no surveys, as in Ontario, and to go to no expense whatever. They coaxed and asked people to go in and take licenses. Now there is, however, a rush for these licenses, and it may be that in some localities there may be clumps of trees, groves of trees, where the lumber licensee may make money out of it; but those must be very isolated cases, and I am satisfied that the majority of the men who have got licenses will not get their money back, and the majority of them will forfeit their licenses when the Inspector goes round, as he will this year, to see whether the mills are up and doing the work, and sawing the quantity of lumber that is required to be sawn under the licenses, in order to entitle them to hold these privileges.

On section 54,

Mr. CHARLTON. I see the lessee can establish such other manufactory of wooden goods as may be accepted in place of a saw-mill. This is rather indefinite. He might establish a one-horse cooper-shop working but one man.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So he might; and he might make wooden nutmegs.

Mr. CHARLTON. Again: the royalty of 5 per cent. on the sales is insufficient. It would require lumber to be worth \$20 a thousand to amount to \$1. In Michigan where lumber is worth from \$12 to \$13, stumpage is now about \$4; and in Ontario, where the Crown dues are \$1, I think, the dues are very often from \$1 to \$1.50. I suggest that the dues be made specific, so much per thousand feet, instead of a percentage on the value of the sales—say, \$1 on spruce and \$2 on pine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will make a note of that.

On section 70,

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that the policy of the Government in this clause is a commendable one, regarding slides,

but it is a little inconsistent, it strikes me, with the ground taken in disallowing legislation in Ontario having the same result.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But there we have no vested rights. This is a *tabula rasa*. There is neither Caldwell nor McLaren up there.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is now almost too late to stop and argue that question.

On section 33,

Mr. WATSON. Would it not be well to insert here some provision with regard to the encouragement of the cultivation of trees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would be opposed to the granting of land on the condition of planting trees, as the result would be as it is in the United States, that the man would get the land without planting the trees. There might be no objection to the Governor in Council setting aside certain tracts of land, or the proceeds of the sales of certain tracts of land, for the encouragement of forestry. I will take into consideration the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, and by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton.)

Mr. CHARLTON. Have the lands south of the Canadian Pacific Railway been withdrawn from sale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; these lands have been withdrawn; some of them have been conveyed to the Canadian Pacific Railway in lieu of the other lands within their tract which could not be given.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it contemplated to convey all these lands, or only the odd-numbered sections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only the odd-numbered sections.

Mr. BLAKE. But the even-numbered sections have been withdrawn from settlement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And are about to be sold?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have now the matter under consideration. Those lands are exceedingly valuable, so valuable that the homesteader ought not to go in, and the poor man cannot go in. The general intention is to sell those lands and apply the proceeds to replenishing our depleted Treasury.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will they be sold to speculators or to settlers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the highest bidder, if at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry to hear that observation, as I think the Government should not allow the speculator to intervene between themselves and the settler. If these lands are sold to the speculator at \$1 an acre, and the speculator sells them again to the settler at \$10 or \$15 an acre, it seems to me that it would be better for the country, and just as well for the Treasury, that they should be sold directly to the actual settler for the price which the speculator paid for them. We have always maintained the view, on this side of the House, that the plan which the hon. gentleman is about to adopt is one which is inimical to the best interests of the country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A moment ago, the hon. gentleman was arguing that the Government did wrong in not putting the timber limits in the hands of the speculators. He found fault with them because they were selling them at a uniform price by which the poor man could get them for himself. The Government now proposes to sell to the highest bidder, by which the country will get the benefit and the settlers will not be injured, because there are millions of

acres of homesteads ready for the settler. But the hon. gentleman does not want that. He seems very hard to please.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Minister of Inland Revenue understands his own Department better than he does the question of agricultural interests versus timber interests.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has been there, and I think he knows the country better than you do.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the policy of the Government was to sell the agricultural lands at the one four-hundredth part of their value, then I would not object; but I do not see any inconsistency between the position that the Government should advertise their timber limits so as to get the highest price possible, instead of selling them at a nominal price, when they will be bought by speculators in any case, and the position that the agricultural lands which were designed for the homes of the settlers should be sold to the actual settlers, instead of allowing the speculators as middlemen to pocket the profits of the transaction. There is no analogy between the two cases.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly welcome to enjoy his opinion as to how much I know of my Department, but I think I am as well qualified to speak on this subject as he is. I repeat that the hon. gentleman was not consistent in the two positions he assumed, any more than he was consistent a few minutes ago when he advocated the imposition of a higher duty on manufactured lumber consumed by the people of Manitoba. The other night the hon. member for Selkirk complained of the Government, because they, as he said, were imposing high duties on agricultural implements, and thereby grinding down the people of the North-West. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the duty we have imposed on the lumber which the people of the North-West consumes is not high enough, and he wants it raised. I say the hon. gentleman is not consistent, and I am quite as competent to form an opinion as he is.

Mr. CHARLTON. I never advocated raising the duty on lumber.

Mr. COSTIGAN. You said it should be increased.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the duty on lumber was discussed here, I advocated a specific duty in place of our *ad valorem* duty, because the *ad valorem* duty amounted to \$6 or \$7 a thousand, but I thought \$3 a thousand was high enough. To-night I took the position that the system of levying dues is wrong—that the charges ought not to be a percentage on sales, but a specific sum. I do not think that, under the present regulations, the Dominion Government are receiving a fair price for their timber.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend cannot get off in that way. He insinuated that we were giving to our friends, for corrupt purposes, timber limits at too low a price. He wished the price to be raised, and the limits to be put up at competition. Now, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the higher price the licensee pays for his timber the higher he must charge the settler for his lumber; and if the licenses are given at a low rate and a fair rate, and are granted to everybody who chooses to come, as they are, while we are getting a reasonable return for the timber, we are supplying the people with lumber at a cheap rate, and we are robbing the Treasury, as the hon. gentleman says, of the immense profit that we should make by raising the price of lumber to the settlers going into that country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The system of charging a direct percentage is a very objectionable system, because the timber varies in value, according to its quantity and quality. The expense of getting it to the settler, and other circumstances, and the purchaser in making a bid for the timber, will be governed by these considerations. It is absurd to say that a timber limit in one position is worth as much and no more

than another, and the only fair way to dispose of them, is to put them up at auction, with a fixed sum attached. If you place all these timber berths on the same level, you give one berth at the same price as another, although it may be worth three times as much, and to argue that you would raise the price of lumber by adopting another system is pure moonshine. The price of lumber will be regulated by other causes.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think anybody disputes the knowledge of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, regarding the North-West, and for that reason we can appreciate the more highly the very humorous analogy he has drawn between the case of timber limits and the case of agricultural lands. His joke is only surpassed in richness by that of the hon. Premier, when he said that the Government system of granting timber limits gives everybody an equal chance of getting them, and reduces the price of lumber to the settler. The question under discussion is the policy of withdrawing the lands south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from settlement, and selling them to the highest bidder. I do not think the hon. member for North Norfolk, or anybody else on this side of the House, has any objection to selling these lands to the highest bidder, with one proviso: that the purchaser shall be required to reside upon and cultivate them. The proposal to withdraw from settlement lands which have been publicly advertised as open for homesteading, and in default of which promise a large immigration has been directed to this country, is very injurious. I am personally acquainted with a gentleman from Devonshire, of great influence in that country, who came out to the Moose Mountain country on the strength of this advertisement, and got there just in time to get his lands before they were withdrawn from settlement; but in consequence of the change he advised his friends in Devonshire not to come out. This district is one of the very best parts of the North-West, and if the immigrant finds that the lands are withdrawn because they are too valuable to give to homesteaders, and that he must put up with the fag-end of the country, he will go to Dakota where lands are not withdrawn from settlement simply because they happen to be valuable.

Mr. WATSON. According to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, an immigrant in this country is worth about \$800. In the vicinity of Birtle, lands of very good quality were sold in large quantities to five or six speculators. The first day the lands were sold at \$6 per acre, but the following days these men broke the upset price and bought it all in at \$2.55 per acre. If a settler is worth \$800, it would be better to throw that land open to him for actual settlement than to sell it for \$2.55 per acre. These lands will be locked up for some time from settlement, and those people who have settled there will be placed at a disadvantage, by being isolated on that account.

Mr. SPROULE. Only a short time ago the hon. gentleman said it was impossible to lock up land, on account of the taxes imposed, after municipal organizations are formed. I know a gentleman of Toronto, Mr. Christie, who paid on one section at Birtle, last year, \$650 in taxes. The hon. gentleman contradicts himself when he says the lands will be locked up by speculators, and then says it will be impossible to keep them locked up on account of taxes.

Mr. WATSON. I did not say so. I do not know of any case in which farm lands are assessed at the figures mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is unfortunate the statement should go abroad that taxes are so high, for such statements deter immigrants from entering the country. If they thought they would have to pay \$900 taxes on a farm they would not come into the Province.

Mr. CHARLTON.

On section 128,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I call the attention of the Committee to this clause, by which it will be seen that all rights acquired or liabilities incurred under the previous Acts may be continued and completed under this Act. The clause is as follows:—

128. Subject to the provisions hereinafter made, the Act passed in the forty-second year of Her Majesty's reign and intitled "An Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion," and the Act passed in the forty-third year of Her Majesty's reign, and intitled "An Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1879," and the Act passed in the forty-fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, and intitled, "An Act to amend the Dominion Lands Acts," are hereby repealed, and this Act is substituted for them,—the Acts repealed by the Act first mentioned, and for which it was substituted, remaining so repealed: Provided always, that all enactments repealed by any of the said Acts shall remain repealed, and that all things lawfully done and all rights acquired or liabilities incurred under them or any of them shall remain valid and may be enforced, and all proceedings and things lawfully commenced under them or any of them may be continued and completed under this Act, which shall not be construed as a new law, but as a consolidation and continuation of the Acts hereby repealed, subject to the amendments hereby made and incorporated with them; and any thing heretofore done under any provision in any of the said repealed Acts which is repeated without alteration in this Act, may be alleged or referred to as having been done under the Act in which such provision was made, or under this Act. 1879, s. 129.

Progress reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:10 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 30th April, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. COLBY moved that the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 111) to authorize the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to extend their traffic arrangements to the North Shore Railway Company to fifty years from the date thereof, be discharged, and that the Bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole to consider a certain amendment.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ABBOTT moved that the Bill be amended by the insertion, as a separate clause, of these words:

Nothing herein contained shall affect any rights acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect to the said North Shore Railway, under and by virtue of an agreement between the Government of the Province of Quebec and the said Company, executed 4th March, 1882, and confirmed by an Act of the Quebec Legislature, 45 Vic., chap. 19.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ABBOTT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 114) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Motion agreed to; and Bill considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk) moved the following amendment:—

On that portion of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, extending from St. Vincent or the boundary line to Winnipeg,

and all other parts on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba or the North-West Territories the same rates and fares per mile shall be charged upon all freight and passengers passing over the branch or section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line, which shall be formed by the leasing or amalgamations by this Act authorized and its connections in Canada and the United States via St. Vincent, and on freight and passengers by any other Canadian lines of Railway and their connections in Canada and the United States via St. Vincent aforesaid.

Mr. ABBOTT. I presume that when the House goes into Committee I shall be at liberty—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House is not going into Committee.

Mr. ABBOTT. I understand that when an amendment is made to a Bill on the third reading it must go back to Committee. As I have an amendment to propose I wish it to be understood that the former motion which has been made is not to preclude me from moving my amendment in Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the House will not accept this amendment of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland), it is simply and solely a breach of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ABBOTT moved that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to amend it by adding the following:—

If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall undertake the carriage of passenger and goods traffic over the said leased lines, or any part thereof, to Manitoba and the North-West Territories by any route south of Lake Superior, and shall continue to do so after the completion of its line north of Lake Superior, it shall be bound to receive at Emerson, and carry with due despatch to its destination, any such traffic carried by any Canadian line, and allied lines, from the Province of Ontario to Emerson; and shall not charge any higher rate therefor than it receives for the carriage, over the same portion of its line, of similar through traffic carried by it and its allied lines from Ontario to Emerson. Provided always that any railway company in Canada, availing itself of the foregoing provision, and possessing or controlling exclusively railway communication from any point on the Canadian Pacific Railway in Ontario or Quebec, to any other point in either of those Provinces, shall be bound in like manner to receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at the point of connection, passenger and goods traffic coming from Manitoba or the North-West Territories, and carry the same with due despatch to its destination over such exclusive line, and shall not charge any higher rate therefor than it receives for the carriage, over the same portion of its line, of similar traffic carried by it and its allied lines, from Manitoba or the North-West Territories to the point of destination.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose the amendment will be productive of any harm, but it will do no good, because it would be quite impossible to carry traffic into the North-West, unless arrangements are made by which cars carrying goods inwards will be filled for the outward journey.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I would like to ask the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), if it is intended that this provision should not take effect until, and after, the completion of the main lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. ABBOTT. That is the intention, because, of course, there is no reason for any condition or restraint being placed on the Canadian Pacific Railway while the line is under construction. It must have been contemplated, indeed it was contemplated, that traffic should be carried south of Lake Superior until the line north of Lake Superior was constructed.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ABBOTT moved that the above clause be added to the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The amendment applies only to traffic going from Ontario. My impression is that it should apply to traffic from all the Eastern Provinces. I do not

think the mover has any objections to insert words which will govern this point.

Mr. ABBOTT. No.

Mr. WHITE. It may be a question subsequently as to how the provision is to be interpreted. It might be interpreted to apply only to traffic which started from Ontario.

Mr. ABBOTT. I am quite willing to add the words "or any Province East of Ontario."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### RETURN RESPECTING MR. WELLS.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Why the Government has not brought down the return asked for last Session, with reference to one Wells, a brewer, of Goderich, and the Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that there was not time last Session to bring down the papers, and as this is a new Parliament it has not been laid before the House, the Order for the return having lapsed.

#### UNDELIVERED LETTERS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether post letters having endorsed on the envelope a direction to return them if not called for or delivered within a limited time, to a given address, are, according to the practice of the Department, so returned unopened, or whether they pass through the Dead Letter Office and are opened before being returned?

Mr. CARLING. I may state to the hon. gentleman that letters having printed on the envelope, "return if not called for in ten days," are returned without being opened; but letters lacking this notice are sent to the Dead Letter Office, opened, and then returned to the sender.

#### WINNIPEG POST OFFICE.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether the Government has selected the sites for the permanent and temporary post offices to be erected in Winnipeg; and if so, where?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The sites in question have been selected. The site of the present post office will be used for the new post office; and as a temporary post office will be required, it will be erected on the ground belonging to the Government between the Custom House and Land Office.

#### MALPEQUE BREAKWATER.

Mr. YEO enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place any sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the repairing of the breakwater at Malpeque Harbor, Prince Edward Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has been also brought to the attention of the Government by the hon. gentleman's colleague, and it is now receiving the attention of the Government.

#### ELM LOGS.

Mr. SMITH enquired, Whether the Government received a petition from certain residents of Kent, Ont., praying for an export duty on elm logs, and whether a deputation waited upon the hon. Minister of Finance to the same end? What was the answer of the Minister to deputation? And what are the intentions of the Government in respect to such export duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At the last Session of Parliament petitions were presented to the Government by inhabitants of Kent county on this subject. The Government said they would take, and did take, these petitions under con-

sideration, but they did not see their way clear to ask Parliament for the imposition of this duty. No such petitions have been presented this Session, and the Government have no intention to ask, this Session, for the imposition of an export duty on elm logs.

#### PETITION FOR A PIER.

Mr. SMYTH enquired, Whether the Government intends to grant the prayer of the petition of the residents of the southern portion of the county of Kent, for the construction of a pier at Buckhorn on Lake Erie, in the county of Kent, Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I must say that in the Department we have no information about this place and pier; but as such a petition was presented, the intention is to have this place examined during the Recess.

#### JEANNETTE'S CREEK.

Mr. SMYTH enquired, Whether the Government is aware that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is obstructing the navigation of Jeannette's Creek, a navigable stream in the county of Kent, Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department has not been notified that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is obstructing the channel of Jeannette's Creek. We do not know anything about it.

#### DELIVERY OF NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. WHEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to amend the postal regulations so as to allow newspapers to be mailed for delivery free of charge, in post offices at places where such papers are published?

Mr. CARLING. This is under consideration.

#### DOMINION LAW CODIFICATION.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government has appointed a French Canadian on the Commission for the codification of our Dominion Laws?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that so soon as a Commission is finally issued for the codification of the Dominion Laws, a French Canadian will be a member of the Commission.

#### QUEBEC HARBOR POLICE.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government intend to maintain the effective force of the Quebec Harbor Police, or to increase or diminish the number of men employed in that service?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government has not yet decided either to diminish or to increase the Police force, which will depend altogether on the requirements of the service.

#### COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GROSSE ISLE AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation) enquired, Whether the Government intend to establish communication by semaphore, telephone or telegraph, between the quarantine station at Grosse Isle and the mainland; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). It is not the intention of the Government to establish these communications at present.

#### ST. FRANCIS WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause to be erected this  
Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

year, a station at Cape St. Ignace, in the county of Montmagny, on the line of the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). I fear the hon. member has not had time to read the Estimates which are before the House, because he would have seen at page 55, that in compliance with the request of the member from the county, and pursuant to the action of the House last year, \$5,000 has been appropriated to continue the works.

#### REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS.

Mr. TASSÉ, in moving for a statement showing the sums expended each year since 1875, to secure the repatriation of Canadians who have emigrated to the United States; the conditions of transport offered them; the names of the agents employed for that purpose, and their salaries or commission, said: In proposing this motion I beg to offer a few remarks on a subject which I consider of the greatest importance. This subject has more than once engaged the attention of Parliament and of the press—in fact of all those who have their country's welfare at heart. I refer to the repatriation of the thousands of Canadians who have emigrated to the United States. It is not my intention to discuss the origin of that emigration, which is a remote one, nor the causes that have perpetuated it; they are manifold, and some of them beyond our control. As to the number of Canadians who have emigrated, it is large, very large; much larger than any patriotic man could desire. The most accurate statistics lead us to believe that there are about 300,000 French Canadians living on the other side of the line. Some put the number at a much higher figure, but their data are about as reliable as those American returns which count as immigrant every man who goes out from Canada, whether he is a mere tourist, or speculator, or a genuine settler. In passing, let me observe that the development of the French race in the Province of Quebec is the best evidence that an exodus of the magnitude claimed by those American returns would be an utter impossibility. Let us look at a few convincing figures. In 1851, there were 669,528 French Canadians in Quebec; in 1860, 847,615; in 1870, 929,817; and, in 1880, 1,073,820. In fact, notwithstanding the exodus, the whole increase of the population of Quebec, which amounts to 167,511 during the last decade, is due to the French race, less 23,508. Moreover, there was, during the same period a rapid growth of our people in other parts of the country, notably the great Province of Ontario. In 1850, there were 26,417 French Canadians in Ontario; in 1860, 33,287; in 1870, 75,383, and, in 1880, 102,743. Not very long ago the hon. leader of the Opposition explained to his faithful friends the causes of his defeat—carefully avoiding, however, to give the real causes—and he referred to the "political darkness" which existed in Eastern Ontario. Commenting on this subject, the leading organ of the Reform party explained that if such a "political darkness" prevailed in Eastern Ontario, that if the people of that section were less intelligent than those of the west, it was due to the influx of a great many settlers from Lower Canada. All these facts tend to show an immense exodus to the States of the French people—larger than that which I am prepared to acknowledge—would be almost impossible, having regard to the admitted growth of our race in this country. It would be a great error to believe that Canadians of French descent are the only important section of our people who have emigrated to the United States. The west, for instance, exercised a mysterious attraction over our people long before Horace Greeley uttered his famous advice: "Go West, young man." And to-day you could find in the American West—especially in those States bordering our frontier, which we have lost through the blunder of English diplomacy—large colonies composed of English speaking settlers who were formerly citizens of this country. I remember



that, after the great fire at Chicago, it was claimed that there were 20,000 Canadians in that city, a very large majority of whom were of British origin, and came from Ontario. Our neighbors had the benefit of that emigration as long as our own West was a "sealed book;" but now that our boundless prairies are open to settlement, our exodus is not only flowing in that direction, but thousands of Americans are following the same route. The following figures are most convincing on that point: Out of 69,332 persons who entered Manitoba last year, 33,327 came from Ontario, 13,325 from the United States, 2,496 from Quebec, 1,997 from Nova Scotia, 1,485 from New Brunswick, and 376 from Prince Edward Island. The last American Census, that of 1880, claims that there are 717,157 persons in the States born in the different parts of British North America. I will cite some of the States which comprise the largest portion of that population: Michigan, 148,770; Massachusetts, 116,430; New York, 83,517; Maine, 36,989; Illinois, 33,870; Minnesota, 29,475; Wisconsin, 28,808; New Hampshire, 27,079; Vermont, 24,611; Iowa, 21,019; California, 19,465; Rhode Island, 18,156; Connecticut, 16,380; Ohio, 16,026; Kansas, 12,496; Pennsylvania, 12,203; Dakota, 10,661; Missouri, 8,635; Nebraska, 8,552, &c. Of that number we may fairly assume that less than one-half are of French descent. The presence of so many of our fellow citizens on the other side of the frontier has more than once engaged the attention of our public men. In 1857, a Committee was formed in the old Parliament of Canada with the object of finding out the best means of preventing that emigration which was depleting the country of many of its most active and energetic inhabitants. One of the conclusions arrived at by the Committee—of which the hon. member for East York, Mr. Mackenzie, is the only remaining member—was that one of the most effective remedies would be to develop the resources of the country by a system of protection to our home industries. That system has been adopted since. I only regret it was not adopted sooner, and we see its beneficial results in the return of several thousands of Canadians every year to the land of their origin and the land of their love. More than 20,000 returned last year, according to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and they were preceded the year previous by less than 10,000. A few months ago I was invited to lecture before the French Canadians of Massachusetts, assembled in convention at Lowell, one of the great manufacturing centres of New England. I came into contact with many of them. In fact, there were about 3,000 persons at the meeting which I addressed, and I had the gratification of ascertaining that several thousands of Canadians had returned during the year from that single State, and that a great many more were anxious to follow their example. To give an illustration, I may observe that so many were leaving Lowell every Monday night that the railway officials used to style that night the "Frenchmen's night." To the hon. Minister of Agriculture is due the credit of having taken the preliminary steps towards a movement of repatriation. In 1873, that hon. gentleman instructed the Rev. Mr. Gendreau to visit the Canadian settlements of New England, and to report upon the feasibility of securing their repatriation. Mr. Gendreau fulfilled his mission with much diligence and care, and he came to the conclusion that such a movement was not only practicable, but that the bringing back of thousands of Canadians would entail less expense and a much less complicated system than that now in existence for the promotion of European immigration. I beg to draw the attention of the House to the following passage of his report:—

"With the exception of certain parts of the State of New York, I consider that I have visited all the principal French-Canadian centres in the Eastern States. I obtained the greater part of the statistical information given above from the priests in charge of the Canadians, and from tradesmen doing business with them. The totals given above

do not reach 60,000 souls; it is true that there are several other localities which include a not inconsiderable number of French Canadians, yet I am satisfied that in placing at 200,000 the number of French Canadians in the New England States, I am amplifying rather than diminishing the true number of French Canadians who have emigrated to the Eastern States of the American Union.

"It is impossible to ascertain the number of Canadians of other origins who have emigrated to the United States, in consequence of the uniformity of their language, habits and customs with those of the natives of the Republic: no points of distinction present themselves, and as a consequence they are rarely found grouped together by themselves, and it is this circumstance which has caused that part of Canadian emigration quite as considerable in its extent as the other, to evade the attention of the public.

"The States of New York, Massachusetts and Vermont in the East, and Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota in the West, are those which contain the greatest Canadian population.

"Canadians who have emigrated are desirous of returning to Canada; many will do so as soon as they have sufficient means to pay their travelling expenses, and others as soon as the establishment of manufacturing in Canada provides for them the employment which they went to the United States to seek. This was the answer given to me almost universally by Canadians whom I fell in with either singly or in numbers collected together. One of them said to me that he hoped that after millions of dollars had been expended in the encouragement of European immigration, something might perhaps be done to restore to their native land Canadians who were desirous of returning home.

"For it must be borne in mind that hitherto not a single cent has ever been offered to Canadians in the United States, in any shape whatever, as an encouragement to them to return to the country, and that the many inducements held out to the Germans, the Scandinavians, and the Mennonites have never been extended to our fellow countrymen."

It was probably on the strength of this report that the hon. Minister of Agriculture of the day—the hon. Mr. Letellier—appointed two agents in the States to promote repatriation. One of them was stationed at Worcester, Massachusetts, and the other at Detroit. Mr. Charles Lalime is still the agent for the Eastern States, and, under his guidance, hundreds of Canadians have left every year to become settlers in the North-West—in that "illimitable wilderness, and a wilderness of fertile land," to use the language of Lord Beaconsfield. But the other day it was reported that 125 heads of French families had emigrated from Massachusetts to Manitoba. In 1881, more than 1,000 French Canadians settled in that Province, and most of them came from the States. In fact, the movement is assuming such proportions that it was referred to at an enquiry held by the Board of Statistics of Massachusetts as being calculated to affect the labor and price of wages in that State; and those emigrants never had any reason to regret their removal to Manitoba, for they have founded some of its most thriving settlements, namely Saint Jean Baptiste, St. Joseph and St. Pie. The last report of Mr. Lalime, shows that English Canadians that emigrated to New England, were beginning to follow the example of my compatriots, and to return to Canada, and that the repatriation movement was assuming the most encouraging aspect. The following passage of that report, which is dated the 30th December, 1882, will be found interesting on this subject:

"I am pleased to say that my labors for the immigration of Canadians from New England to the Province of Manitoba have been much more successful than in the year 1881.

"According to the list of names I forwarded to-day, you will find that 633 emigrants have left New England for Manitoba.

"A fact to which I especially call your attention, is, that in years past, the French Canadians alone in New England, seemed to take interest in Manitoba and its developments, almost all our emigrants belonged to that nationality, while you will find in the accompanying list of names, that we have this year as many English as French emigrants, a noteworthy fact, and to my appreciation a proof that our Western Province is getting to be better known every day, and which gives me the greatest hopes for the future.

"I also take great pleasure in stating that the emigration from Canada to New England, during the year 1882, has certainly decreased by at least 40 per cent. compared with years previous.

"I have had ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with that fact during my numerous trips to our New England manufacturing cities and towns, and, also, in the course of my relations with the different railroad corporations connecting Canada with New England.

"These railroad companies reports for 1882, show a decrease of about 50 per cent. in their ticket sales less than in 1881, for tickets sold from Canada to New England; while, on the other hand, the receipts of tickets sold in New England for Canada, have increased in the same ratio.

"To add another proof to my statement, I might remark that at the time of the last parochial Census, in the latter part of the year 1882, by the French clergyman, it was ascertained that the French population in Lowell, Mass., Manchester, N.H., and Fall River, had largely decreased."

The western agency of repatriation has been discontinued since 1879, and I really do not know for what reason. There are thousands and thousands of Canadians in the American West, and such an important field of action should not be neglected. If a change of office was necessary, which I am not aware of, it seems to me that the agency should have been maintained, although Detroit may have not been the best location. One may judge of the importance of that field of action by the following facts given in the report of Mr. Tétu, our Immigration Agent at Emerson:—

"The States of Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota, have contributed greatly to the immigration. I think it my duty to remark here, that the immigrants were essentially agriculturists. Many of them had means and brought with them horses, vehicles, farming implements, &c. They say they are well satisfied with the country, and invite their friends to come and settle in it. The continual presence of a lecturing agent who should distribute pamphlets pointing out the best way to get here, and giving general information of the country, is of the first necessity in those parts."

This system of repatriation has cost but a paltry sum to the country. We may judge by the fact that, in 1876, we spent \$2,713 for transport, and \$5,807 for agency—these are the only figures I have found on the subject in the official reports—whilst the total sum spent for the transport of European immigrants was \$56,887. Satisfactory as the results have been, I think that greater results could have been or could be achieved with a more liberal and a more vigorous policy. Let the Government invite delegates—true representative men—from the Canadian settlements of the Eastern and Western States to visit the North-West and to report thereon; let them disseminate throughout those settlements on a more extensive scale, reports and other information concerning our territories; let them take advantage of the publicity of several French papers which are now printed in those States, and which on every occasion stand up for the interests of Canada; let them increase the number of agencies and put them in a state of efficiency; let them reduce the cost of transport, and ere long we shall have the satisfaction of seeing thousands of compatriots returning to Canada, the land of their origin, and of their love. I do not intend to indulge in recrimination; but whatever may be the cause, we have done more for people of every other origin, for people opposed to some extent to our ideas of government and of civilization, than we have done for those of our fellow countrymen, who, through adverse circumstances, and against their own will, have in most cases been obliged to exile themselves in a foreign land. As a matter of contrast, let me draw your attention, for instance, to the obligations contracted by the Government to secure the Mennonite immigration, under date July 26th, 1873:

- "1st. Entire exemption from military service.
- "2nd. A free grant of lands in Manitoba.
- "3rd. The privilege of religious schools of their own.
- "4th. The privilege of affirming instead of making oaths in courts.
- "5th. The passenger warrants from Hamburg to Fort Garry, for the sum of \$30 per adult, \$15 for children under eight years, and \$3 for infants under one year.
- "6th. The prices not to be changed during the years 1874, 1875, and 1876, and if changed afterwards, not to exceed \$40 up to 1881.
- "7th. The emigrants to be provided with provisions during their journey between Liverpool and Collingwood."

We know that besides a loan of \$100,000 was made to the Mennonites—which loan becomes due this year. From this statement it appears that the Mennonites have been treated with much more liberality than the Canadians desirous to return to their country. They had not more to pay from Hamburg to Winnipeg than the Canadians from the Eastern States, besides receiving most substantial

Mr. TASSÉ.

advantages for their settlement. From 1876 to 1879, the price of transport was practically reduced for those Canadians to \$13, but since then they have had to pay \$31, a sum of \$5 being remitted to them after their final settlement in Manitoba. That such a charge reduced the current of repatriation, I have no doubt. In support of that view I will give the following extract from the report of Mr. Lalime, the Government Agent for 1879:

"The number of immigrants from the Eastern States to Manitoba during the year 1879, has been 565. The slight falling off, as compared with the report of my operations in 1878, is owing to two causes.

"Since 1876 the Canadian Government granted aid to Canadians in the Eastern States in order to induce them to emigrate, by an indemnity calculated on their fare, and the price of a ticket was reduced, by that grant, to the sum of \$13.

"On or about the 1st April, 1879, your Government reduced that grant to the sum of \$5, payable to the emigrant only after his final settlement in Manitoba, so that emigrants had to pay the full price, that is to say, \$31, in place of \$13 as in the past, and in consequence of this change, made at the last moment, quite a number of families who had decided to start with the party of the 15th April, were compelled to put off their departure until better times."

From this statement it appears that the policy of the late Government was more liberal, in this respect, than that of the present one—and I am glad I have such an exceptional opportunity to pay them some compliment; but I must observe that, whilst the Reform Government were striving to facilitate repatriation, they were, at the same time, playing into the hands of the Americans, and driving the people by thousands to the States by refusing to adopt a policy of Protection. I will not discuss whether the Mennonite immigration—to which I have referred—was a desirable one, whether it was advantageous to add to our population men who are mere producers and consumers, men who erect a Chinese wall around them, men who refuse to share our duties and our responsibilities as citizens of a free land, men who will not defend their firesides, nor the flag under which they are free from Russian tyranny. Such a discussion would be out of place, but I may well observe that a Canadian immigration is of such superior advantage that we should be prepared to do much more to secure it than we have done to attract Mennonites. I remember that when a discussion took place on this very subject in this House, the hon. member for Compton—then sitting on the other side—asserted that "if it was important to bring the Mennonites into our country, it was no less important to bring back Canadians from the United States." If the hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Agriculture with such marked success and practical ability, will now remember that declaration, I feel quite sure that abundant results will attend his endeavors in that direction. Let me tell him that Canadians, accustomed as they are to a severe climate and to a hardy life, are among the best settlers we could have for our western domains; let me tell him that none have a stronger claim to occupy the valley of the Red River, and even that of the Saskatchewan, than the descendants of the heroic pioneers who were the first to carry the flag of civilization into that vast region. Let me tell him that from a political standpoint—or rather from a British standpoint—their presence in large numbers would be most desirable in our new territories, as they would exercise a beneficial influence in the moulding of a true national spirit. I know that some people are so bigoted and narrow-minded that they view with pleasure the emigration of my compatriots to the United States. I hope they are few, although sometimes they pretend to speak on behalf of many. Could anyone imagine that the following paragraph was allowed to appear in a leading paper—in the organ of a party which claims to be liberal minded, *par excellence*:

"The departure of a few French Canadians for the United States will have but little influence on the whole Province; but if all that race could emigrate in a body, the English influence would be much affected thereby. The matter is that Canadians are a real obstacle to the working of British institutions."

This paragraph, it is true, was not published recently, but the spirit that inspired it still survives. It comes from the same paper which basely insulted our religious feeling in the past; which is sneering on all occasions at the French *habitant*, the backbone of our population; which is impugning the morality of our women, and which is clamoring for the abolition of the French language. I do not intend to dwell on that injurious article; but let me state that if our people had emigrated in a body to the States; if they had accepted the place open to them at any time in the American Union; if they had obeyed the pressing appeal of Washington and Lafayette at a critical and decisive period of our history; if they had not repelled the American invader on the memorable day of Chateauguay, under the command of De Salaberry, the British flag would have long since crossed the seas. Moreover, if our forefathers had not been the first and the most persevering to fight in our Legislative Assemblies for the securing of responsible government, Canada would not, perhaps, be even yet in the enjoyment of the greatest amount of liberty of which any race can boast of on this continent. The best answer, however, which I could give to those who do not appreciate the value of the French population in Canada, even from an entirely British standpoint, would be the following extract of a deposition made before the English Parliament in 1828 by Mr. William Parker—an English merchant who had spent many years here, and had been a close observer of events:

"I would encourage the French Canadians, they are the only people you can depend on. The population of the other Provinces is of a mixed character (a great many loyal, brave and good men, no doubt, amongst them). The French Canadians are united in their origin (of which they are justly proud), in religion, in manners, and in virtue. They have a character to support and they have always nobly supported it. Whilst they were under the French Government they were the bravest subjects that France had, and with one-sixth of their present number they gave the greatest opposition to the British army that they met with at the conquest of Canada. I am persuaded if the French Canadians had been as numerous at that time as they are now, we would not have wrested Canada from France, and if such had been the result, we would not now have the youthful, powerful and federative North American Republic encroaching on us as they do at present. The French Canadians are reproached for not Anglifying themselves; are the inhabitants of Jersey and Guernsey worse British subjects for having preserved their language, manners and Norman laws, or are they so reproached? And yet I will boldly assert that Lower Canada, and other North American colonies, are of ten thousand times more vital importance to this Empire than these Islands are. I consider them more than the right arm of the British Empire. I am convinced that if the French Canadians were double their present number they would set all the union of America at defiance. They are the best subjects this country has."

Whilst I am referring to this subject, let me say that I have seen with regret, the hon. member for East York alluding to our people in a most offensive manner, in a speech delivered at Toronto at the Liberal convention which took place last January. The hon. gentleman said:

"Sir John and his Ministers are mere puppets in the hands of a French majority; they are jumping-jacks, who jump when the Quebec string is pulled, though I fancy it must be rather humiliating for him to be compelled to dance to such music."

I quite conceive that the hon. gentleman should not appreciate French music; but I will ask this House if such language should have been found in the mouth of a veteran politician, whose duty one would think should lead him to strive to unite the people, instead of fostering national jealousies, and national animosities. I am glad to know, however, that the hon. gentleman had a better opinion of our people when visiting Scotland as Premier of Canada. In a speech which he delivered when honored with the freedom of Dundee, he paid us the following compliment:—

"The French people in Canada are in the position of a people speaking an alien language, but do not consider themselves an alien people, and are at this moment as proud of British law and freedom as any portion of the Canadian people; and as Lord Dufferin remarked the other

day in London, there is no class or population more thoroughly trained in Parliamentary practice and life, and to all the rights and feelings of an independent and proud people."

But it is not only here that my fellow-countrymen have been slandered. They have been maligned also in the States, in a public document, by a certain Colonel Wright—they are all colonels in that country, when they are not generals,—Chief of the Board of Statistics of Massachusetts, who went so far as to style them the Chinese of the East. But this odious charge was resented by the Canadians who demanded and obtained a public investigation, which proved conclusively that there was not a more honest, moral or industrious class among the working men of the State. The same slander having been repeated lately by a man named Foster, before a Committee at Washington, the French Canadian groups of New England appointed at once delegates to face their traducers and to confound them. We read some times in papers which are unfriendly to us that we are intolerant, clannish, retrograde and narrow-minded. But facts are the best answers to these charges. When, for instance, did we oppose the immigration expenditure? When did we oppose any public work calculated to develop our country, to multiply its resources, and to increase thereby its population? We know very well, nevertheless, that every expenditure for foreign immigration purposes may reduce to some extent our influence in the community. We, the Frenchmen of Canada, draw no strength from that source. Old France does not send us any more of its blood. To our regret, it seems to have none to spare. In 1882, only fifty Frenchmen and Belgians came to this country, 104 came in 1881, and not more than twenty-seven were registered the year preceding. A few thousand invaded our cities a few years ago, but I confess that most of them were not of a desirable class. They had to be sent back at the expense of the State. They were too well versed in the art of dynamite—which now-a-days threatens, unfortunately, the whole fabric of society. With a proper system, it would be possible to attract a fair emigration from Belgium; and I wish a strong effort was made in that direction, because that country is composed of a very frugal and industrious population, and is the most densely peopled in Europe. We all remember that when Lord Durham submitted his celebrated report on the affairs of British North America to the Home Government, with a view of securing the extinction of the French Canadian nationality, his main recommendation to achieve that object was to promote emigration on the largest possible scale. Lord Durham said:

"I have little doubt that the French, when once placed by the legitimate course of events and the working of natural causes in the minority, would abandon their vain hopes of nationality."

But the English representative had not foreseen the impossibility of absorbing and crushing a nationality which has overcome, like ours, all the storms which have assailed its existence, and which is as firmly planted as its own Laurentian range. In that same report, Lord Durham asserts that "no population has increased by mere births so rapidly as that of the French Canadians"—and thus unwittingly gives to the world the reason why his abominable project could not be realized, why our people could not be annihilated. In fact, our multiplying power is great, very great—nay, marvellous. It rests on the vitality and the morality of our people. It has never been equalled or surpassed in the history of mankind. We are proud to say that no household can present such a formidable array of joyful and healthy children as that of the French Canadian. We ignore entirely Yankee notions in that respect. It reminds me that when Mr. Ampere visited this country, a Canadian *habitant* gave him the whole secret of our preservation in those characteristic

words: "*Nous sommes terribles pour les enfants.*" Not later than the 14th January, the *Montreal Witness* recognized that extraordinary development in the following language:

"Immigration has long made it seem as though the English were proportionately increasing in the Dominion, but multiplication is a more permanent force, and the proportion of French in the whole Dominion is on the increase."

And that force will continue to be our sole barrier, our sole protection against the European waves which are continually sweeping over the country. We were called upon the other day to vote \$500,000 for immigration purposes. This is by far the largest appropriation we ever demanded for that service, the expenditure of last year reaching \$346,442, and that of the preceding year not having exceeded \$206,180. This unusually large appropriation was warranted by an overflowing Treasury, and by the rapid, stupendous expansion of our country. That vote was given cheerfully, because we recognise in immigration one of the main factors of our increasing prosperity. We know that, last year, 112,458 immigrants settled in this country, bringing with them more than \$10,000,000 of money and effects, whilst the number of the previous year was but 47,991—having brought with them more than \$1,000,000. That appropriation of \$500,000 was given cheerfully. I repeat, without eliciting the apprehension, that this Parliament—that we, the French members, are adopting the very plan suggested thirty or forty years ago by Lord Durham, to submerge our nationality. Although speaking a language different from that of the majority, let me state that we are Canadians before all. As such, we are ready to follow our destiny at all risks and hazards, firmly believing that, under the safeguards of our Constitution and of our well balanced system of parties, justice and liberty shall be always the lot of the subject of Queen Victoria in this country. As such, we are prepared to welcome, to give a helping hand to the emigrants from all climes, from all latitudes, who are in search of broad, space and freedom—as such, we are prepared to welcome the emigrants from all countries, either from the Icelandic shores, from the steppes of Russia, from picturesque Switzerland, from the over-crowded districts of Germany and Great Britain—that nursery of nations—as such, we are prepared to assist the British Government in giving to the Irish people the land which they could not possess in their own country, the peace which they could not find, and the Home Rule for which they are agitating. In fact, our Dominion is broad enough to make a landlord of every Irish peasant. That diversity of races far from being detrimental, will be most desirable, most advantageous. Although at times it may give rise to a considerable amount of friction, it will produce a laudable spirit of emulation. Each would naturally strive for the highest prize. As far as we are concerned, we have learned a great deal in our contact with other nationalities. The great empire to which we belong, the great nation to the south of us, have all been made rich, progressive and powerful by a variety of races—so shall it be with us. We shall combine the energy, the industry and various qualities of all those races, and we shall make of them a great Canadian nationality. But whilst prepared to incur all legitimate sacrifices towards drawing to our shores the surplus population of overcrowded Europe, we have the right to expect that the Government will take all necessary steps to assist the return of those Canadians on the other side of the line who desire to come back to their native land, to share its progress and prosperity, to give it the benefit of their labor and industry, and to work out with us the problem of its future. Of course, there will be always a certain emigration to the States, it is as impossible to stop it entirely as to stem the flowing of the St. Lawrence. But let us reduce it to its smallest proportions. During many years the agents of the States have been telling the world

Mr. TASSÉ.

that Canada could not support its own children—and it will be a great stroke of policy, apart from all other consideration, if not satisfied with keeping our own people, with receiving our share of immigration, we are still able to repatriate thousands of our fellow citizens. Such a measure which has already been partly accomplished by the National Policy would redound forever to the credit of the Government, and would be a crowning title to the confidence of this House, and to the gratitude of the whole country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret very much that my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture is not in his place to answer my hon. friend who has just taken his seat; but it would be unfair to the hon. gentleman, and to his speech, to allow it to remain without an answer. I must begin by congratulating the hon. gentleman on his effort to-day. He has shown that when he undertakes any subject, he always studies it thoroughly, and treats it admirably before the House; nevertheless, I must say to my hon. friend that I think he takes too much to heart some remarks which are occasionally made by private individuals on the French Canadian race, either in the press, or in some other manner. Those remarks, of course, are sometimes offensive to the French Canadian race; but I think we have reached that period in our national history, and in our national position, that as French Canadians we may let these attacks pass unnoticed. Our position is such, that to day there is no danger about our keeping our own ground in this country, and extending our hold to any part of the Dominion to which we think proper to go. More than that, the progress which the French Canadian race has made, the position which it has attained, not only in the Province of Quebec and in the other Provinces, the position that it has in this Parliament, either in the one House or in the other, and the position which the members we have in this House according to our population give us, is such that we need not be uneasy as to what newspapers or public men, or any other individuals, may say with respect to us. My hon. friend has referred to the past of the French Canadian race, and to its present position. He has spoken of the loyalty of our race; but, although I must say that we are as loyal as he has represented, I must add that we are not more loyal than are the other races in this Dominion. In fact, we are all loyal, and the idea even of attacking at this day our loyalty has passed away. We are now on the same footing, and we intend to remain on the same footing, which the other races in this country occupy; and we do not intend that they shall imagine that our position as British subjects, as far as our loyalty to the Crown of England is concerned, differs in any particular from theirs. We admire their loyalty—we admire their position, but for ourselves we do not intend to be attacked or belittled. We have come to this period in our national history when we should strive to make this the great country which Providence evidently intended us to make it. We have large institutions, most liberal institutions—institutions based on the Constitution of England. Institutions which have been accepted by the people of the country, and more than that institutions which were petitioned for from the British Parliament, and which the British Parliament and Government gave to us word for word as we wanted them. Therefore, we have not to complain that those institutions were imposed on the Province of Quebec. When the first union of the Canadas took place it was imposed upon the French race without their will, and, therefore, we complained of it though we used those institutions to work the Government of this country to the benefit of the people. The result was that when, in 1861, the question came up of making a larger union, you did not see the French race standing up on the one side and not keeping pace with the progress of the country. On the

contrary, the French race went hand in hand with the English, the Scotch, the Irish, and the Germans, and the other races of this country—all went together to secure the institutions which we enjoy to-day. Therefore, I say that we must leave those remarks which are occasionally made against us, to the criticism of public opinion, which will very soon put down the parties who may make those attacks on one section of the people or the other. But my hon. friend goes further, and he says that we welcome the other races amongst us. He is perfectly right. Whenever an Englishman, or a Scotchman, or an Irishman, or a German comes to the Province of Quebec, he is welcomed; and whilst the large emigrations took place at different periods of our history, when great scourges periodically destroyed the men and women and sometimes children who were emigrating to our shores—when hundreds of young children who were left there destitute, did our people say these are not our blood, they do not speak our language, they do not belong to our creed? No; nothing of the kind. They said they are orphans, their fathers and mothers are gone, and they were adopted by the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec, and they became French Canadians. They speak our language though they have English, Scotch or Irish names. For instance, you find French speaking Canadians named Cameron and Alain, and so you find other Scotchmen who have not been adopted in that way though they are settled amongst us, and are called Frasers. I do not think it is a bad thing that having settled among the French race they speak the language of the country. We are not disposed to carry war against others; but we wish, not only to live in peace and harmony with our neighbors in this country, but we wish also to have the same privileges as they have, and settle not only on our own territory—the Province of Quebec—but occasionally make a little raid into the eastern portion of Ontario and settle there. I think this is an increase of the population of Ontario which does no harm, and we intend not only going there but remaining there. We have settled also in the western portion of Ontario, and we intend remaining there for the good of Ontario. Whilst Ontario has lost a portion of its population, which is going either to the United States, Manitoba, or the North-West, that Province is getting numbers of French settlers—good men, law abiding citizens, loyal subjects of the Queen. They are going there, and they say we want to live alongside of you Englishmen, Scotchmen, and all Canadians, and I have no doubt there are many in Ontario who will be glad to see those Frenchmen going there. My hon. friend the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) says that he regrets that a number of our people have gone to the United States, and have not yet come back. He is perfectly right in that. If our people wish to emigrate we wish them to emigrate, not to the United States, but to the other Provinces of the Dominion, or to the North-West. Let them remain on Canadian soil, under the old flag; let them remain under the institutions which promise to make us a great people. But if they go to the United States, let us do all we can to bring them back. I assure the hon. gentleman that the desire of the Government is that as many of them as we can, may be brought back to Canadian soil. We wish them to come back; but you know, Mr. Speaker, that a number of them have settled in that country. They have married there, they have their families in their business there, and those men will not come back. They have settled there the same as those who left Quebec, and have gone to Ontario, Manitoba, or the North-West; they have gone there for good, they want to settle there; and though they are a loss to the Province of Quebec, they are, nevertheless, a gain to the other Provinces and to the Dominion. For my own part, and I may say, also, on the part of my colleague, we are all as glad to hear our friends make their remarks with reference to the representations to the Government. If

they think that the policy of the Government is not going far enough in one direction we wish them to tell us so, as the hon. gentleman has done in very good and proper language. He says he thinks we might do more to bring back the portion of the population which went to the United States. I have no doubt that his remarks will be read with pleasure by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and that he will not fail to do what can be done to meet the views of the hon. gentleman, at all events to a great extent. I was not prepared to answer the hon. gentleman, or take any part in this debate. I thought my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture would have been in his place to answer him; but I think he supposed that this motion was not coming up to-day. However, the hon. gentleman must see that although there may be a great many of these settlers in the United States from Canada who have not come back, yet there is not only what the Government may do to repatriate these men, but there is a great deal that can be done outside the Government to help the Government. The hon. gentleman knows what has been done elsewhere. He spoke of the Mennonites; but how was it that the attention of the Government was brought to the Mennonites. There were leading men in their country who wished their people to immigrate together, and they combined for that purpose. They came over after having had communication, and they obtained information, and they obtained also the concessions which Parliament granted. If our compatriots in the United States, whether of French Canadian, English, Scotch or Irish origin, who wished to come back to this country, why should there not be a combination amongst them in order to obtain the information they want? If, as I believe, a good many of them want to come back, let them do as was done elsewhere—in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, and Scandinavia, and get up organizations of their own and then communicate with us. I do not say that something more cannot be done by the Government; but a good deal can be done by these people themselves, and also by those colonization societies, which are really societies of the people, because they come into existence by subscriptions from the people. I have no doubt that when the remarks made by my hon. friend are published, they will produce a good effect, and he may depend upon it that my colleague, when he reads those remarks, will not fail to go as far as he can in the direction the hon. gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ROYAL (Translation). Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works was justified in observing that a great part of the work of repatriation should be effected by Colonization Societies and by private enterprise. In this respect, I think the Canadians who have already settled in Manitoba have no reason for reproach. Since 1875 a Colonization Society has been established there which has extended to some French Canadian settlements in the United States, and assisted by the all powerful influence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, we have attracted a current of emigration, which already has furnished us with several hundred families. The highly patriotic address of the hon. Minister of Public Works and of my hon. friend, the member from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), will certainly find an echo, not only in the Province from which I am an humble representative in this House, but also among the French Canadian settlements in the United States, who only await a favorable opportunity to return to this country. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we should not confine ourselves to obtaining our contingent of European emigration. We should have a more complete system than that of the United States. Not only should we try and get from the different races which inhabit Europe, the Latin as well as the Celtic races, a share of the contingent which sets out from their frontiers every year; but we should also be careful to entice into the new Provinces, established to the west of the old ones, a large part of our fellow-countrymen. I believe, and expe-

rience will sustain what I say, that the new Provinces which we have established west of Lake Superior, ought to be settled by Canadians. The climatic conditions, the signs of winter, the intense cold which prevails, the requirements of agriculture, as well as our domestic institutions, all endorse the opinion which I have just advanced. I say that a European emigration cast into the vast plains of the West without any preparation, if it has no nucleus around which it can rally, whose example it can imitate, will be exposed to great dangers, to numerous sacrifices, and to reverses which will retard our work of European emigration. We discussed a few days ago the figures, as well as the estimates, of the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the current year, and the next day we discussed within these precincts the best means to colonize, by wise legislation, our North-West Territories; and thither direct the flood of emigration. This, perhaps, is the best time to investigate the question as to the best class of emigration for the North-West. We could certainly compete with the other nations of the American continent in striving to attract the surplus foreign population, to assist us in building up foreign nationalities on this continent. Our country is a highway to a great extent for considerable masses of emigrants, and, consequently, if the United States can invite immigration to their borders without any danger of losing it, I think we must take a different course from the one we are now following. The smallest loss of our vital forces is a serious loss, in view of the small number of immigrants which we succeed in planting on the soil of Canada. I will not complain; our winters, far from being injurious as far as social life is concerned, have been for us a great safeguard in the past, and will continue to be in the future. The northern people, by reason of their constitution, by reason of the air they breathe, by reason of their habits and institutions, more liberal than we find in the north of any country, find in our winters an element which we appreciate at its proper value. I think it would be possible by a well-conceived and adopted policy of emigration to repatriate a certain number of the 700,000 natives of Canada scattered at the present time along the frontiers of the United States. Repatriation is not a mere sentiment. I think it should be one of the bases of a good system of emigration. The inhabitant of any Province who leaves the soil of Canada to reside in the United States, constitutes a loss which is in no way compensated by European emigration. We usually lose our youth, and this youth which should be retained not only in the old Provinces but directed to the West, would assist us in building up our future nationality. I, therefore, believe that the Government would gain immensely in a social and economic point of view, if the hon. Minister of Agriculture took the necessary steps to do what has already been done to facilitate the repatriation of Canadians of every origin which are in the United States. In 1874-75 the repatriation amounted to several hundred families. With this contingent we established three large parishes, viz.: St. John the Baptist, St. Joseph and St. Pius. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, apart from the families which formed into parishes we have a considerable number of people who came from the United States, who established themselves in the old parishes, taking the place of the hundreds who sold their properties in order to go farther west. Again, a certain proportion of Canadians—I speak of Canadians, of French as well as English origin—a part of these Canadians only came to Manitoba with a view of going to the North-West Territories. To-day they are establishing important settlements which already are called towns, and which will play an important rôle in the Provinces about to be formed. This repatriation is, therefore, not a matter of sentiment, it is not simply a theory, it is not simply a patriotic idea which we express here, and which finds an echo in every soul which loves his country; but we have the tangible results of a system

Mr. ROYAL.

which was adopted some years ago by the Government of Canada. The hon. member for Ottawa observed, a few moments ago, with a good deal of reason, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had done much to encourage, to direct and to sustain the repatriation of Canadians. It was to him we owe in great part the idea expressed by the present hon. Minister of Agriculture. It is only right to do justice to whom it is due, and if, at the present time, we realize that we owe much to the late Government, it is a strong reason to appeal to the present Government, which has at least as much, if not more, means at its disposition. Mr. Speaker, repatriation has set in from the United States. The Canadians who emigrated to the United States were induced to do so for several reasons which the hon. member from Ottawa has not seen fit to investigate. Nevertheless, whatever may be the reasons, the Canadians who go to the United States, and, who are attracted thither by the immense industrial production there existing, by a milder climate, by parental relations, by family associations, find there inducements insufficient if they do not succeed in life; and very strange to say, the efforts which have hitherto been made have scarcely arrested in any perceptible manner that mysterious fever which seems to push population westward. It seems to me that if this repatriation organized by private colonization societies, were aided and sustained by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that the success which attended the past would also attend future efforts, and on a much larger scale, because at that time Manitoba was not known; and it was only by advertisements, by publications, and all manner of means, that we made known to the world that it was not a country covered with snow for nine months in the year. To-day it is well known that our lands are fertile; that our winters are not more severe than elsewhere; that the soil gives large returns, and is superior to any other part of Canada. It seems to me that the task is easier to-day, and that for the \$1 or \$5, which were given at the time as a premium to the repatriated Canadians, we could, to-day, give \$15 or \$20, that is, give to him the same sum as is given to a European emigrant. I am of the opinion that the result would be more in harmony with the policy which we ought to follow, to establish a nationality. I have some letters here from Canadian families who testify their desire to leave the United States. When the heads of Canadian families emigrate to the United States with their families, it is by reason of misfortunes. It is either misery, fire, ruin, under one form or other, which forces them to expatriate themselves. These heads of families having many children, locate themselves in manufacturing centres, and there try to make a living. But soon the atmosphere of the factories endanger the health of the children, sickness develops among them, and, instead of a prosperous family blessed with health, the homestead is transformed into a species of hospital. These families, in order to reach Manitoba, must necessarily travel a great distance, say 1,800 or 1,900 miles. It is only just, therefore, that the Government should come to their assistance, that the Government should do for them what they do for European emigrants; and I feel assured that, instead of having 100, 200, or 300 families coming from the United States per annum, these figures would be doubled, and would even counterbalance the number of families which come from Europe at so great a cost. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that a Canadian who emigrates to the North-West is much better adapted to become a settler and to work for the aggrandizement and prosperity of the country than an European. He is accustomed to our climate, to our system of husbandry, to our municipal institutions, and his ambition is to make a new Ontario, New Brunswick or Quebec, when he has gone to the Western Provinces. Thus, instead of having an emigration polluted with ideas brought by European immigrants, by ideas of Socialism and

Nihilism, we would have men imbued with ideas of Canadian civilization, and who would endeavor to establish, in the western part of this continent, a new Canada. Mr. Speaker, allusion has been made to the Mennonites. The Mennonites are certainly good producers; and in this respect, I think, it would be difficult to find, in any part of the world, a class more independent of the institutions and of the population which surrounds them than the Mennonites. They are an *imperium in imperio*. The Mennonites have a peculiar character which prevents them from assimilating with municipal institutions of the country where they reside. This was the case, not only in the United States, but especially in our western plains. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the Official Report the following which will enable us to understand the character of the community which the Mennonites have established in the North-West. I take the following from the excellent report of Mr. J. E. Tétu, Immigration Agent at Emerson, in 1879:

"The Mennonites here have a government for themselves which decides in all civil and religious matters, and which they obey. In each village there is a *Schultz* (Mayor) elected for two years, who administers the affairs of the community, and who exercises considerable authority. I cannot precisely define the extent of these powers nevertheless. Above this dignitary there is the *Ober Schultz* (Grand Mayor) elected for four years, who is the sovereign Judge of all the population. It is he who, with the assistance of the other *Schultz*, regulates all important questions. A Mennonite never undertakes anything without consulting first the *Ober Schultz* even in the least important matters. The recent *Ober Schultz* is Mr. Isaac Miller. He resides at New Hurst, one of the villages of the reserves, and at present is in his second term of office. The seat of government is situate in the village of Reinland where there is a church, a court of justice, with a clerk. Mr. Peter Wheims is the present clerk. Every Saturday the *Ober Schultz* presides as Judge.

"The chief of the religious administration, who is designated by the name of *Aclteste*, or warden, presides over the religious exercise in the somewhat unique looking church at Reinland, blesses marriages, &c. The *Aclteste* is assisted by six Bishops, who take his place as occasion may require, for the exercise of his functions. The heads of this religion or sect are elected by a general vote of the population, and, as a rule, they are not better instructed or more enlightened than those who elect them.

"There is a school in each village. Reading, writing, German, and arithmetic on a small scale, are taught; the teachers are not well instructed, and their teaching is very defective. There is no lack of good disposition on the part of the Mennonites, but by their habits and manners they are opposed to all outside influence.

"For instance, you could not prevail on them to accept a government subsidy for their schools, nor teachers instructed or chosen outside of their society.

"For the same reason they refuse to have a post-office, lest it might be conducted by a stranger outside of their ranks.

"There were, in 1879, 38 villages, 703 families, 1,917 individuals of the male, and 1,627 of the female sex, amounting altogether to 3,544 souls."

It thus appears, Mr. Speaker, that there are 38 Mennonite villages, 703 families, 1,917 males and 1,627 females, making in all 3,544 souls. These are a few details relative to this strange economic organization which we have in the west of Manitoba. These people do not mix in any manner with the population which surrounds them. They remain outside of our municipal and social organization. They take no part in our political elections, and, in a word, they constitute an isolated government peculiar to themselves. A few years after their arrival in Manitoba a few of their young men went to work about the neighborhood. Soon it was learned that these young men were going to marry young women who were not Mennonites. Immediately a decree was issued recalling all Mennonites at work, and since then, neither for gold nor silver, have we been able to hire young men or young women among the Mennonites for domestic service. Thus you can see how to what extremes this exclusiveness of this particular organization called Mennonite extends. The Icelandic emigration has also been referred to. This emigration has not been successful. It has been a complete *fiasco*, notwithstanding the large amount expended for this purpose. The Icelanders who, if I may so express myself, were placed on the shores of Lake Winnipeg, were neither husbandmen nor fishermen. After the Government had

supported them for one or two years, they quitted their reserves and scattered themselves over Manitoba; but the greater part of them went to the United States. To return, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to the matter first under consideration, and to give a practical result to what has been said, I think that the Department of Agriculture ought to give not only the greatest attention to European emigration, but also to embrace in their programme the repatriation of Canadians in the United States, and when we speak of the repatriation of Canadians we do not merely allude to French Canadians, but to Canadians of every origin and from all the Provinces. Of the 70,000 Canadians scattered along the frontier on the American side, I think the Government could repatriate 50,000 per annum. I second, with pleasure, the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

#### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in the absence of Mr. COLBY, moved that the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### DUFFERIN BRIDGE.

Mr. CASEY moved for copies of all correspondence between the hon. Minister of Customs and any parties in reference to the remission of duty on the iron imported for the construction of Dufferin Bridge in 1873; with copy of any Order in Council authorizing such remission, and of the memorandum of the hon. Minister of Customs recommending such remission, with reasons therefor; and statement of value of iron as entered and of amount of duty remitted. He said: My attention has been called to the fact that no duty has been yet collected on the iron imported for the construction of Dufferin Bridge, built, I think, in 1873. It is reported that the iron was not entered in the name of the actual contractor, but in the name of one of his friends, a Mr. McGillivray, I think, so that his name should not appear on the Custom House books. It is stated that the remission of duty in question was obtained at the request of the then Mayor of the city, I think Mr. Martineau, who asked this as a favor from the Government, on two considerations: first, that the Government, as owner of the canal, should contribute something towards the cost of the bridge, and second, in consideration of a favor that had been granted by the city to the Government, namely, a strip of land on Wellington street, to enlarge the front of the Parliament grounds. Now, if this is correctly reported, the transaction appears to be a very peculiar one. In the first place, I understand that the grant of the strip of land on Wellington street was made to the Government by the city before this question arose at all, and not in consideration of the remission of duty, so that no obligation rested upon the Government to grant this favor. In the second place, it does not appear that this remission of duty was a favor to the city at all, because the duty was not chargeable to the city, but to the individual who had the contract for the bridge, I think a Mr. Goodwin; so that a favor was granted to Mr. Goodwin in consideration of a favor previously granted to the Government by the city. The same argument would apply if the remission be based upon the ownership of the canal by the Government. The Government were not contributing anything to the city towards the cost of the bridge by remitting this duty, but were simply adding to the profits to be made by the contractor on his contract with the city. I suppose the hon. Minister of Customs will have all the documents in his Department, if he is not prepared to explain the matter to-day, as perhaps he is. I simply move for the papers, because the transaction appeared to be a very peculiar one.

—**Mr. BOWELL.** Some time ago my attention was called to the fact that the duty on the iron used in the construction of Dufferin Bridge had never been paid. On enquiry into the Department as to the reasons why this duty was not collected, I find, in the first place, that there is no report in the Department of any reasons why it was not collected, nor in fact is there any report anywhere to be found in reference to the subject at all. Upon further enquiry I learned that the Government had, at the time, consented not to collect the duty for the reason that the construction of Dufferin Bridge was supposed, to a certain extent, to be in the interest of property held by the Government, and this was consented to at the instance of the Mayor and corporation of the city. I learned, also, that the attention of my predecessor, the late Minister of Customs, was drawn to the fact, and that after having investigated the subject, after having tried to learn the reasons why the duty had not been collected, he must, no doubt, have acquiesced in the decision of his predecessor, since he took no further action in the matter. These were the explanations given to me by the Commissioner of Customs. Having learned, therefore, that the Government of 1873 had decided not to collect that duty and that the Government which preceded us, after investigation into the facts by the late Minister of Customs, must have come to the same conclusion as the preceding Government, I did not, nor did the Government deem it proper to, interfere with the arrangements that had been previously made by the Government of 1873 and acquiesced in by the late Government. There is no correspondence about the matter, and this is all the information I am able to give the House upon the matter. Under the circumstances I have stated I did not think it proper we should interfere with the arrangement made in 1873, and acquiesced in by the late Government, since the attention of the late hon. Minister of Customs had been drawn to the matter, and he took no action towards the collection of the duty.

**Mr. MACKENZIE.** I am not able to charge my memory with the facts of the case. If it came before the Council as it probably did, I have no recollection of it. I saw the notice of motion and spoke to the hon. gentleman about it, telling him I was under the impression there was some negotiation with the city council in this connection, but could not say so positively. There was a considerable amount of negotiation with regard to the bridge at the other end of the town, as to the amount the Government would pay, and I think it extremely likely that the same thing took place in regard to the canal bridge. There is some reason why the Government should pay a portion of the expenditure, and if the city and the corporation got the benefit of this remission of duty it was not at all a wrong step, except that I think the Government have no power to remit duties. This should be done by a vote in the House, and that is what was principally wrong in the matter.

**Mr. CASEY.** The whole matter seems, if anything, more obscure since the statement made by the hon. Minister of Customs, who admits that no report has been kept at all of the reasons that induced the then hon. Minister of Customs, the present hon. Minister of Railways, to take the action he did. Of course, when the matter came up before the late Government it was hard for them, as for them as at present, to find out anything about it, since there were no records. It is very strange that the matter should have been left in that way by the Government of 1873. My information is that the Government contribution did not go into the city treasury, but that the city made a contract with Mr. Goodwin to build the bridge at a certain price, he furnishing the material and being liable for the duties, and therefore the remission of the duties was simply a remission made to him, or a sum of

**Mr. CASEY.**

\$2,000 or \$3,000 put into his pocket. The remission may have been well intended; it may have been made as a favor to the city, but it does not seem the favor ever reached the city. I am also informed that the Mayor acted in the matter, not by the authority of the corporation, but as a personal favor to Mr. Goodwin. I was told he had written a letter to the Department, but it seems my information is incorrect in this respect, though certainly the Mayor must have made some representations to the Department. I do not know whether it is too late for the Department to enquire into the matter and see if the city got the benefit. If it did, there is not much to blame; if it did not, there is a good deal to blame. At all events, it is a reflection on the management of the Department at that time in not preserving the records of the transaction. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Railways is not able to be in his seat, as he would, probably, be able to give us some information on the subject.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** No doubt if my hon. colleague were here he would be able to show that the city did get the benefit of the duty, which it was right they should. I do not believe that the money went to the contractor, but I agree with my hon. friend opposite that the amount should have been put into the Estimates. Had it been I am sure no hon. member would have had a word to say against it.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That is quite probable, but there are two points of view in which certainly the transaction appears objectionable. One is, assuming the Government had the authority for this purpose, in this way, to remit the duties, I know of no transaction which it is more essential should be regularly accomplished than the transaction of the remission of duties. It is an executive power which, under certain circumstances and for certain purposes, is vested in the Government; but it is obviously one liable to abuse, open to the suspicion of favoritism, and in respect to which, is of the essence that a full statement should be kept of each transaction. That no record should appear in the books of the Department, how these goods were taken from the Customs without the payment of duty, is, therefore, a very lamentable statement. In the second place, the power to remit duties does not exist for this purpose. If the Government is about to make a contribution by giving up the amount of the duties, the course would be to have had a vote put in the Estimates and collect the duties. The dues would be duly collected and the country would contribute two or three thousand dollars towards the bridge, the equivalent of the dues. But neither of these steps appears to have been taken. The hon. gentleman says he is quite sure the contractor got the credit of it.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I did not say so.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Well, that the contractor did not, but the city did. That will be found to be so. But I think, after what has been said to-day, it will be worth while enquiring whether the hon. gentlemen's convictions of what will be found, will, upon ascertainment, be verified. The hon. gentleman says the information which has reached him is that the city did not get any benefit, that they had contracted with the contractor for the construction of this bridge, that they had not contracted that they would pay the duty on the material, that by consequence it was for the contractor to procure the admission of the material, and that the city has not really obtained any benefit from it at all. That is worth while enquiring about, because if it be the case that the intentions of the Government have been frustrated, and that Parliament has not sanctioned this, and nobody has been released from the payment of this duty, then I think the duty ought to be collected for the purpose of carrying out what Parliament has assented to, namely, that the city should be relieved, to a certain extent, from



the cost of construction of this bridge. But I do not know how we are to be certified of that unless some enquiry is made with reference to the facts of this transaction. Of course, had the records been kept, and had the transaction been announced, as it would have been announced had the records been kept—a record of this particular remission, along with the other remissions at an earlier date—then the facts of this case, at least those facts which appear to-day, would have come before Parliament, and it would have been much easier to find the duty. But I presume the transaction with the city was not so irregular and not so devoid of public interest as the transactions of the Government appear to have been. I presume that the contract with the contractor is available, or the price the city paid him is available, and that, therefore, it is easily to be seen whether this was in fact remitted to the city or remitted to the contractor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A great many things have happened since 1873. The hon. gentleman says it is quite irregular; I say it is irregular, and I am not at all sure that the Government who have inherent powers under the Audit Act, should not have repaired the irregularity. At all events that power ought not to be lightly exercised. But since 1873, at all events, this remission took place, and in 1873 the Government of that day went out and a Reform Government came in. The hon. gentleman was a member of that Reform Government, and from 1873 to 1878 the facts were before that Government, but the Government did not in any way trace up this irregularity. The hon. member who moves this thinks he has made a point; the leader of the Opposition thinks he must support him. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) gets up and candidly and honestly says that he believes, from his faint recollection of the matter, that there were some negotiations on the matter. I do not myself remember anything about it, because it is a considerable distance of time between 1873 and 1878; but I have little doubt that the city got the advantage of it, and that the negotiations the hon. gentleman says were going on to help the town, first to the Chaudiere bridge and then to the Dufferin bridge, resulted in these duties not being executed. It is a small thing to make a fuss about, but still there must be a fuss about something.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying I recollect negotiations going on. I recollect negotiations about the other bridge, and there may have been about this. I was not able to charge my memory with it. It must have taken place before we came in. It would not naturally come before us at all, and did not come before us that I recollect—though I think I recollect some discussion that embraced both bridges, but my recollection is very faint indeed.

Mr. CASEY. My information is very positive. I think it worth enquiring into.

Motion agreed to.

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

### After Recess.

#### RAILWAY TRAFFIC ON THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. McMULLEN, in moving for a return showing the number of petitions presented to this House, praying for such legislation as will secure a better observance of the Lord's Day, as regards the running of railway trains, &c., &c., together with the aggregate number of names attached thereto, said: 'The House will, no doubt, remember that I recently put a question to the Government with regard to what course they intended to take with respect to the petitions that had been presented to this House upon this question. I was very sorry that the Government answered

me that it was not their intention this Session to take any action upon that matter. I feel bound to bring this question before the House in some shape, because the number of petitions that have been presented from the several constituencies throughout this Dominion, I think, deserves from this House and at the hands of the Government, more than a mere passing notice. I think it is quite time, when a question of this kind is so urgently pressed upon the House with regard to the observance of the Lord's Day, that some action should be taken, either by the House or by the Government, in trying to prevent, in the future, a continuance of the desecration complained of. I find that several religious denominations throughout the country have taken action also. This is not a political question; it is a question upon which I believe, and trust that a very large number of the hon. members of this House will agree, that it is our duty to lend our aid and assistance in trying to secure whatever legislation is necessary in order to meet the expressed wish of the petitioners who have sent in memorials upon this subject. I am not going to say that perhaps it would be wise and judicious to have such legislation as would prohibit altogether the running of trains on the Lord's Day. I am quite prepared to admit that circumstances may exist when it may be necessary to run trains—trains that leave the ordinary hour on Saturday night, and possibly permitted to reach their destination on the next day. But I hold that when freight trains are so generally run on the Lord's Day as they are in this country, and on some lines, that it is not necessary that they should be allowed to continue this practice. I say that we ought to take steps to secure a better observance of the Lord's Day, and though we might permit the running of trains that cannot very well reach their destination except by encroaching on the Lord's Day, I think we ought to prevent trains starting on that day and continuing their journey when there is no absolute necessity for it. I am also prepared to admit that when a train has left its station point on a day that would enable it to reach its destination before the Sabbath and through some unforeseen difficulty or accident is prevented from reaching its destination before the Sabbath, it should be allowed to complete its journey on that day; also a train carrying perishable commodities that might suffer serious damage by being detained. In these cases there might be some reasonable excuse for allowing trains to run on the Lord's Day, and to this effect legislation should be had so that something in the shape of a permit issued by some Government official should be granted to enable a train to go on to its destination. But I say, with regard to all other trains, some steps should be taken to meet the very proper wishes of the petitioners. I am sorry, as I said before, that the Government have not seen it to be their duty to take the step asked by the petitioners. I think, when such a number of petitions are presented, they should be sufficient to convince the Government that an evil exists, and that to an extent which the people of the country feel, and it is the duty of the House and the Government when petitions of this kind are presented, at least to give them some consideration, and if the question cannot be dealt with fully the Government at least should advance a step in the direction of meeting public opinion on a question of this important character. If we allow the Sabbath to be desecrated in this way it will become a standing evil and will grow upon the people. It is demoralizing to the youth of the country. At the railway stations along the line young men gather, waiting for the arrival of trains to watch them as they pass. I hold it is the duty of the House and of the Government to see that something is done to prevent the continuation of this system, if it can be prevented, which I believe it can be. I notice that this subject has been before Parliament before. In 1878 an hon. gentleman brought it up, and it evoked considerable discussion. I was glad to see that the hon. gentleman, who was then

leader of the Government, Mr. Mackenzie, stated at that time that he had stopped the running of Sunday trains on the Intercolonial. I believe that was done during his Administration, and I am glad even that step was taken; I believe, also, that the hon. gentleman took steps with respect to the running of canal boats and the opening of canal locks on Sunday. I do not know whether the condition of things he established still continues, but I hope the restrictions then imposed are still in force and will be continued, and that some legislation will be introduced by the Government, if not this Session—for I believe it is too late to move in the matter—at least next Session to carry into effect the wishes of the petitioners and place restrictions on Sunday traffic. I hold the Government have a very serious responsibility resting upon them in connection with this matter. People have presented petitions, because they feel that an evil exists, and that it is growing, and if we shut our eyes and ears to their remonstrances, and the curse of Him who rules dominions and nations should fall on our land owing to the desecration of the Lord's Day, the responsibility will rest at our doors, and at the doors of the Government, and not with the good people of the Provinces who are pressing this question upon us.

Mr. ALLEN. I go a little further than the hon. member who has just addressed the House, and I would entirely restrict trains from running on the Sabbath. If any arrangement is made by which trains are allowed to run, if they carry perishable commodities, it is more than probable that arrangements will be made in Chicago or other places, by which such trains will be allowed to pass through our country on the Sabbath. That should be prevented. Another matter which I should like to see taken up by the Government, is the running of steamboats on the Lord's Day. It is a fact, that in almost all sea-port towns in this country, congregations worshipping every Sabbath are disturbed very much by steamboats and trains running on that day. I hope the Government will see it to be in their interest, and in the interest of the country, to place some restriction on that traffic, and give magistrates such power that summary measures may be dealt out to offenders, and thus stop Sabbath-breaking, which is becoming so general. I hope the Government will do that for the country which the Christian Church in every quarter demands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the motion is carried I desire to say that the mover can hardly declare that the Government do not want to give any consideration to the matter, because the Government said they were not ready to suggest any legislation this Session. The fact that the Government are not able to propose a measure this year should not be interpreted to mean that they are not prepared to consider the petitions. Those petitions are received from a number of people whose ideas and principles lead them to petition Parliament in that direction. Every petition to this House, especially on a subject of that kind, is worthy of consideration, and the Government, when it stated, through a member of the Ministry, that they were not ready this year to submit a measure, did not say they would not take the petitions into consideration. I must say, however, that if the hon. gentleman's proposal should be carried out to its full extent it would, perhaps, be found that petitions would be received in another direction. He would find, most likely, that if the British and foreign mails arriving at Halifax on Sunday should be detained until Monday, the whole of the West would complain at their detention for twenty-four hours. Those points have all to be considered, and it is not such an easy matter as the hon. mover believes it to be, to regulate this subject. I must say, however, that the Government are as much in favor of observing the Lord's Day as is any hon. member on the other side of the House. We are favorable to it, and we

Mr. McMULLEN.

would not be doing our duty if we did not say so, and act on that statement. The fact is, that we avoid running trains on the Intercolonial on Sunday as far as possible, and the same applies to vessels passing through the canals. The hon. mover spoke of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration as having stopped Sunday traffic on the canals to a very great extent. I am not ready to say whether it was so or not—no doubt the hon. gentleman must have been informed that it was under the Government of the hon. member for East York—but the same rule is observed to-day and has been observed since we came back to power in 1878. Of course the hon. gentleman is aware that at the end of each season there is a great rush of traffic, and for two or three Sundays at the close of the season boats are allowed to go through the canal because a great deal of produce might otherwise be damaged or destroyed. There is no objection to the granting of this motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is right in his recollection as to canal traffic. The canals were not closed on Sundays when I took office. Some have been opened for traffic, and I am afraid are open for traffic still—the canals on the Ottawa River. These were not placed in the same position as the Welland and St. Lawrence canals.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Ottawa canals are not open every Sunday during the season, but only for a couple of Sundays at the end of navigation when there is danger of the canals being closed; then we allow vessels to go through in order to save the cargoes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I believe, in common with the petitioners, that it is important that we should preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath Day. I believe it is essential to our strength, liberty and welfare generally that there should be a day of rest, and anything that interferes with that deserves the attention of Parliament with a view to measures being proposed for its removal. On the other hand, I doubt exceedingly whether this House has power and is competent for it to undertake the legislation asked for by the petitions now before the House. It is clearly a matter which belongs to the Provinces, in my opinion; but the Government, with its control over its own railways and canals, can do much to promote the proper observance of the Lord's Day, and to that extent, I think, we may fairly call on the Government to do all it possibly can. I do not know what regulations at present are on the Intercolonial, but I recollect that the regulations that were made were something like this: that freight trains should stop over the Sabbath, wherever they happened to lie, unless they had to run some little distance for fuel or some necessity for existence, but that through passenger trains within any reasonable distance, should complete their journey. The passenger train reaching Halifax early in the morning, for instance—about nine o'clock, I think—passed Truro about six o'clock, or thereabouts, as it seemed unreasonable to expect a whole train load of passengers to wait within sixty miles of Halifax for the sake of two or three hours' journey on the Sabbath morning. It was, therefore, arranged that this train should complete its journey, but that any train reaching Moncton, or some central town, should not proceed during the Sabbath, so as to afford everyone opportunity of worshipping and enjoying the rest of the Sabbath. I recollect one very strong advocate of rigid Sabbath observance in the Province of Nova Scotia, who wrote—I was going to say savagely, but very strongly at any rate—to the newspapers denouncing myself and the Government, because we did not do more than this; but I found, that this gentleman went in one of the morning trains on the Sabbath to preach in Halifax, and I am afraid, that we would find examples of that sort now and then. I think, apart from all controversy as to what proper Sabbath observance really means, or as to whether it is a sentiment with some, or a matter

of necessity with others, the grand results which spring from the observance, and the beneficial effects which one day's rest out of seven has on the whole community, make it very desirable for any Government to do all in its power to promote its observance. As I said a few minutes ago, I doubt very much whether we have this in our power; personally, I think we have not; I think that its observance is a matter to be regulated by Provincial laws; and at this moment I believe that the law is such that the magistrates—in Ontario, at all events—can stop traffic on canals and railways. I recollect very well, that, some years ago, some of the officials of the Government allowed a vessel to pass through the Cornwall Canal on the Sabbath, and were promptly arrested for the desecration of the Sabbath by the magistrates at Cornwall, and the Government had to pay the fines. Now, I have known cases where magistrates interfered at railway stations, to prevent the loading and unloading of goods, under the Sabbath Observance Act; and I have pointed out to some of the petitioners who have sent petitions to this House recently, that they had the remedy in their own hands, that their magistrates in the different localities can enforce the law as it now exists, without appealing to this House to do it for them, and that it is their duty to exhaust the means which they have in their hands, under the law as it stands, to accomplish what they want to, and then to come to us, if they think we have any power, and we would do what we could to aid them in their laudable object. There will be always differences of opinion as to what constitutes the proper observance of the Sabbath, and there will be some who maintain the right to do as they please on every day of the seven; but I think, that all nations have generally fallen into the opinion—from whatever ground arrived at is a matter of little consequence—that the observance of a day of rest in every way is a necessity for the human system, and must be beneficial to any nation that adopts it. I have the utmost sympathy with the object aimed at by the petitioners who have presented petitions to the House at present, and while I would be very glad indeed to aid them in every possible way, I would be sorry to trench on the functions of the Local Legislatures even to effect that object.

Mr. WHITE, (Cardwell). I am sure that everyone will concur in the wishes of the petitioners, that the Sabbath may be observed; but there are some practical difficulties in the way, to mention which may subject one to the imputation of being indifferent and careless about the observance of that holy day. For instance, I will give an illustration; and I would be very glad if it were possible—from my standpoint, at any rate—to change it. Take the illustration of the Intercolonial Railway, where I believe the Government have done more than is done by any railway company to meet the very proper wishes of the people of this country for the observance of the Sabbath day. The Intercolonial passenger train leaves St. John on Saturday night, gets as far as Campbelltown on Sunday morning at eight o'clock, and has to remain over at Campbelltown for the observance of the Sabbath until Monday morning at eight o'clock. Now, there is no doubt about this, that a considerable portion of the Sabbath, at any rate, is desecrated—if I may use that expression—by the fact, that this train has run from midnight on Saturday, until 8 o'clock on Sunday morning, and I know from my own observance in travelling on that road, that stopping over at Campbelltown for Monday is anything but conducive to religious feeling. People find themselves in a miserable—I hope my New Brunswick friends will not consider this an improper expression to use—in, at any rate, not a very religion-inspiring place; there may be religious services held there, but if so, I confess I failed to discover them on the day I stopped over at that place, and the disposition was anything but one that would lead one to go with a

proper frame of mind to church on that day. The truth is, if one must say it, that the day was given up, and must in the very nature of things, to absolute *ennui*, and annoyance at the detention, and to anything but real Christian feeling, or it was given up to dissipation, just as people might be disposed; and that is one difficulty in stopping trains or conveyances of any kind over Sunday at these small places. It may be possible to give to the people connected with the transportation, the opportunity of going to see their friends at these places, or to church, if they so think proper, but to the great mass who travel, instead of being a source of advantage to them from a religious point of view, I believe that it is just the reverse. Now, I know, as a newspaper man for instance—I had experience of the practice which prevailed in a newspaper office, which I know something of sometime ago, of going in Saturday night, working until Sunday morning, then stopping off until Monday, in order that the printers might not go back at any part of the Lord's day for their work. They did not go back again until Monday, and what was the result? The men worked all Saturday night until an early hour on Sunday morning, got up late in the day from the nature of things, tired and fatigued, and instead of going to church, the chances were that they went to see their friends; Sunday was not by any means a typical Sunday as kept by them, and a blue Monday almost inevitably followed. I know that a change was made connected with the establishment to which I refer: the men broke off on Saturday evening at 6 o'clock; went home and had the opportunity of going to bed early—perhaps doing the marketing with their wives that night—and next morning they got up at a reasonable hour in a frame of mind to go to church; and although they came to the printing office and did the same number of hours' work on Sunday night which they used to do on Sunday morning, when nobody was awake to see what was going on, I dare say that many people would consider this a desecration of the Lord's day, but to my mind it was nothing of the kind, just the reverse; and so I believe that if the train which leaves St. John on Saturday night, left it at 11 o'clock on Sunday night, and travelled straight to Quebec, there would be less desecration of the Lord's day by the employés of the railway, and certainly those who travel on that train would be in a better frame of mind by going straight on their journey westward. There is no doubt that this whole question is surrounded by most serious difficulties; but there is no greater fallacy than to suppose that the stoppage of a train at a wayside station on Sunday is to the advantage of the observance of the Sabbath or the promotion of Christian sentiment. All that can be done—all that ought to be done—and I think every one will say that it should be done—is to so arrange the trains on railways and the steamers that there may be as little stopping over as possible. So, with regard to our canals, if a steamer enters a canal late on Saturday night, and if it is found that it cannot go on, it is true that the religiously-minded connected with the vessel may go to church if they think proper; but I venture the opinion—though it may be regarded as somewhat heterodox—that to the persons on that vessel the staying over at a particular place on Sunday, with practically nothing to do, infinitely more harm would be done, from a religious point of view, and as much harm from a physical point of view, as if the boat had proceeded on its journey. I think the question is so surrounded by difficulties that no hard-and-fast rule can well be laid down, and that the true plan is to adopt such means as will secure as few detentions of passengers and others as possible by the proper arrangement of the time of departure, and in that way prevent a great evil—the accumulation of passengers and persons connected with trains at small wayside stations, which is simply provocative of a great deal of dissipation, instead of tending to religious fervor or Sabbath observance.

Mr. BOURBEAU (Translation). Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow this motion to pass without making a few remarks as to the observation of the Lord's day. I am not aware of what is going on, on the Intercolonial Railway, on the Government Railway. I am not aware of what is done on the Government Canals; but I think the holy day of Sunday ought to be observed in a manner to attain the end for which it was instituted. I know, however, Mr. Speaker, what takes place on the Grand Trunk. I know what is going on on that line, as I live close by it, and I can say to the hon. gentlemen of this House, that this company observes Sunday very badly. It is all very well to see a train carrying the European mails running past, that cannot be helped. It is all very well to see a train laden with emigrants running past, this also cannot be helped; but when we see the employés of the Grand Trunk working on Sunday, not in removing snow, not in repairing the road to prevent accidents, but in transporting horses, in doing everything necessary, to saw and cut wood in the sheds, this is what should not be allowed. I suppose it is possible for anyone to prosecute a company which compels its employés to work in this manner, a company which abuses its power to compel its employés to do such work as sawing wood on Sunday under pain of losing their situations. The question coming up this evening, I think the time appropriate to make known to the House and to the country the manner in which the Grand Trunk acts towards its employés. I have had occasion several times to see employés of this company receive orders to go to the sheds to cut and pile wood, to supply the locomotives. I have seen four, five or six passenger or freight trains pass on Sunday. Mr. Speaker: I will say nothing more. I wish the Grand Trunk Railway Company to understand, to know that I made my protest here as to the manner in which they observe the Sunday, and my object is attained.

#### MANITOBA INDIAN AGENCY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for report on the condition and management of the Manitoba Indian Agency under J. A. N. Provencher, the Indian Superintendent of the Manitoba District, made by the Government Commission of Enquiry, composed of the late W. H. Ross, Barrister, and Ebenezer McColl, Indian Agency Inspector, and the evidence upon which the same was made; also a voucher dated June 25th, 1875, for \$180, signed by one Tremblay; a voucher dated June 25th, 1875, for \$1,290, signed by one Tremblay; and a voucher dated December 26th, 1875, for \$600, signed by one Tremblay. He said: As I presume this return will not be a very long one, I hope that it will be brought down and laid on the Table before the prorogation of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that the hon. gentleman does not wish to be unfair, but, on the other hand, I think he should complete the information, by asking for all the other papers connected with this enquiry. It is only fair to the parties mentioned, that if they made any statement, or filed any document, that they should be brought down at the same time.

Motion amended by adding "and all other papers connected therewith."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### POSTMASTERSHIP OF L'AVENIR.

Mr. RINFRET moved for copies of the complaints brought against the Postmaster of L'Avenir, county of Drummond, during the year 1832, and the evidence given at the enquiry which took place in the matter, as well as the correspondence between the Government and the Post Office Inspector.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of the reports of the Inspector cannot, of course, be brought down, because they are confidential reports to the Government, but any correspondence which we can bring down without interfering with the public service will, of course, be laid on the Table. If an Inspector makes a report to his chief which the latter may require to be very free in order to enable him to know the exact condition of affairs, that freedom would be lost if such reports were to be published. For that reason they are not usually brought down. Of course, if we see no objection to it we will bring it down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Surely the hon. gentleman does not take the ground that every Inspector's report is a confidential document?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; but in certain cases it is. I do not know whether the report, in this case, is confidential or not. I hope it is not; if so, I will bring it down.

Motion agreed to.

#### PEMBINA BRANCH—GRAVEL CLAIM.

Mr. CASEY moved for copies of all correspondence, reports, accounts and other papers relating to any claim made by D. B. Woodworth, and others, for compensation for gravel, said to have been taken from claimants' land for use on the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway; together with a copy of the evidence respecting such claim taken before the Board of Dominion Arbitrators, showing the amount claimed, and the award, if any, made by said Arbitrators, and what sums have been paid thereunder.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think a motion of this kind, that reflects on, or rather refers to a member of this House, should be moved in his presence. I would, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate, so as to allow Mr. Woodworth an opportunity to make any statement he thinks proper to make.

Motion, to adjourn debate, agreed to.

#### THE VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS.

Mr. DALY moved for a return showing the amount of money paid as the emoluments of their offices, to the Judge, the Registrar and the Marshal of the Vice-Admiralty Court at Quebec, and the amount paid to each of those officers of the Vice-Admiralty Courts at Halifax and St. John respectively; also, a return showing the number of libels filed and cases tried in the said courts respectively, from the first day of July, 1867, to the present date. He said: I move for this return for the purpose of asking the Government to give its attention to the subject of the salaries of the officials of the Vice-Admiralty Courts at Halifax and St. John. It appears that the Judges of these courts now receive but \$600 a year each, and that the registrars and the marshals receive nothing whatever beyond the fees derived from the suits which come before the courts. I find, however, that the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court at Quebec, receives \$2,000 a year, the registrar \$666, and the marshal \$333. There may be some very good reason for the difference. I have no doubt that the officers of the Quebec Court fully deserve the salaries awarded to them; at the same time, I fail to see why the distinction should be made. This subject has already been brought before the notice of the House. I believe that at the present time, there is correspondence passing between this Government and the Government of Great Britain, with the view of the Vice-Admiralty Courts in the Maritime Provinces, which are not Imperial Courts, being made subject to Canadian jurisdiction alone. Should that suggestion be carried out, I think it very proper that we should now ask the Government to take into consideration the remuneration of these officers. It is with that view that I make this motion; and

I believe the statistics will show that the amount of labor performed by the Judges, both in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as the number and importance of the causes tried by them, are equal to those in the Quebec Court. Therefore I hope that on the first opportunity steps will be taken to remedy what appears to me an anomalous state of affairs.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., (not hitherto ordered) between the Government of Canada and the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec and of Montreal, the Boards of Trade of various localities in the country, and any persons interested therein, respecting the deepening of Lake St. Peter, and the channels of the St. Lawrence; the deepening of the canals, the improvement of the harbors of Quebec and Montreal, and the assumption by the Dominion of Canada of the debt contracted by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal for improvements in the River St. Lawrence.—(Mr. Rinfret.)

Copy of award of arbitrator on claim for damages put in by contractor for Grenville and Carillon Canal under contract in force in 1871-72, with statement of sums paid thereunder.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copies of all documents or extracts from documents, showing: 1st. The total length of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed in the Province of Manitoba, and entitled to the land grant; 2nd. The length of branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed in the Province of Manitoba, and in like manner entitled to land grant; 3rd. The total number of acres of land given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Government of Canada, in the Province of Manitoba, under the provisions of the Act 44 Vic, chap. 1.—(Mr. Royal.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports and correspondence in relation to the dismissal of David Damour, heretofore captain of the lightship at Isle Rouge.—(Mr. Lanier.)

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 25) to amend the Acts respecting Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Richey.)

#### RATE OF INTEREST.

Mr. AUGER, in the absence of Mr. CATUDAL, moved the second reading of Bill (No. 77) to fix the rate of interest in Canada.

Motion negatived on a division.

#### DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOLDUC (Translation). In proposing the second reading of Bill (No. 85) to amend the Dominion Elections Act of 1874, said: The object of this Bill is to amend clause 109 of the Dominion Election Act of 1874. According to this clause any person can prosecute those who may be guilty of corrupt practices, and in almost every instance, the parties who bring these actions are insolvent and can give no security for the costs. By this amendment, I propose that whoever may wish to bring such actions in future, shall be compelled to make a deposit, which I will fix at \$50, or leave the matter to the discretion of the Court. I also propose, Mr. Speaker, when the House goes into Committee on this Bill, to propose another amendment. By the law of 1874 the deputy

returning officer is obliged to make oath as to the closing of the court; according to the present law he must take this oath either before the returning officer or a justice of the peace. In many instances it is difficult to find a justice of the peace present at the closing of the court to administer the oath. I think that the poll clerk could administer this oath to the deputy returning officer. This same law exists in the Province of Quebec and gives satisfaction to the public.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this is a good and proper measure. If parties are subject to the annoyance of being sued innocently, there should be a guarantee that they will not have to pay the costs.

Mr. BLAKE. We are gradually making arrangements by which we will abolish all provisions for preventing violations of the Electoral Law. We have laws to try controverted elections and the arraignment on a petition against an hon. member on the one side and an hon. member on the other side. The cases come before the Judge. The counsel in the one case says he has no evidence, and the counsel in the other case says he has no evidence. The Judge summarily dismisses both cases, and both hon. members are confirmed in their seats. We have other means by which penalties are provided for corrupt practices, but proceedings are very seldom taken. I do not acknowledge what my hon. friend said, not having heard of any cases in which the law has been abused, in which for want of this additional precaution, vexatious prosecutions were brought; but there can be no doubt whatever that the additional precaution is proposed to be taken to place another obstacle by which to impede and prevent the course of justice in prosecutions for frauds and crimes against the Electoral Acts. Another provision under which Judges are bound to proceed against persons whom they find to be guilty, in the course of their enquiry, of crimes against the Election Law, has, although in various instances persons have been shown to be guilty, not being complied with, and no proceedings taken. Upon the whole, from the time we began by requiring a deposit in cash of \$1,000 as preliminary until now, when we propose this extra obstacle, our proceedings seem to be more and more towards the putting of obstacles in the way of the ascertainment of crimes against the Electoral Law. If cases were made out of a system of using persons who are worth nothing as promoters of prosecutions, we might be called on to consider how far that inconvenience is to prevail, or how far some greater inconvenience might happen; but I do not understand my hon. friend to make out a case of the systematic putting forward of worthless persons in these prosecutions. I do not think that unless such a case is made out that we ought to put a single additional obstacle in the way of investigation into frauds in the Election Law or upon all those frauds.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I see there is no provision to whom this bond is to be given or in whose hands it is to be left. If the Bill is to be of some practical value it should make some provision on these points.

Mr. BLAKE. There should also be some mode of testing whether the security is satisfactory; at least, that is generally embraced in similar legislation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill is not now ready to make these amendments, I think the Committee had better rise and report progress, and the amendments can be got ready for the next sitting of the Committee.

Progress reported.

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Shakespeare: That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering a resolution declaring it expedient to enact a law similar in principle to the law now in force in Australia, and entitled the 'Influx of Chinese Restriction Act, 1831.'

Mr. HOMER. Before this question is put I wish to make a few remarks. During the recent debate on this subject reference was made to the Chinese Restriction Act of the United States. That restrictive law was not enacted until after the completion of the overland railroad to the Pacific coast by which the State of California received from the east all the additional labor required in that State. Reference was also made to the Australian Chinese Restriction Act. Neither did these Colonies enact restrictive measures until they had obtained from the older countries a supply of immigration sufficient for their needs. That immigration was conducted by the Government, and was conveyed from Great Britain to the Australian Colonies in a chartered line of ships. So you will see that in the cases both of the United States and of Australia provision was made to replace Chinese labor with white labor before they enacted restrictive measures. The people of British Columbia stand in an entirely different position to those of other countries. That Province has no railway conveying emigrants from the Eastern Provinces to her shores. Neither are there any organized lines of packet ships conveying thousands of immigrants from the older countries to that Province, such as was and is now the case between Great Britain and the Australian Colonies; and in consequence of British Columbia not having those facilities for obtaining immigrants, she has not to-day a surplus of labor, but is in need of a largely increased supply to meet the continually augmenting requirements of the country. Almost every industry of importance in British Columbia, at the present time, is more or less dependent on Chinese labor, more particularly the coal mining, the salmon canning and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To place restrictions upon Chinese labor before making provision to replace it by white labor would be, in my opinion, a very serious mistake, for it might be the means of crippling those industries for years to come; but so soon as provision is made to replace the Chinese with white labor, or so soon as provision is made to obtain an increased supply of white labor, then I should be glad to support a Bill in the House for the purpose of restricting the importation of Chinese into the Dominion.

Mr. ALLEN. It may appear strange that any member on the floor of this House should advocate a law by which immigration to our country would be restricted, a country where we have so much land unoccupied, a country that requires so much labor, both for the field and domestic purposes, and where wages are so high and servants so difficult to secure; but I have had some experience in regard to Chinese immigration, and the result of that experience is that I believe a country like Canada or the United States or the Australian Colonies, where I had that experience with respect to the Chinese, is injured by that immigration. Chinese came to Australia by hundreds of thousands. They brought the greater part of their clothing with them, they purchased nothing they could avoid, they lived in the most economical manner and spent nothing in the country; everything they made they took out of the country with them, and if they should die they would not leave their bones there, although we did not consider that a very serious loss. They came there under an organized system by which companies paid their passages, and the men occupied the same position as they do in British Columbia and the United States, not one by which they were altogether slaves, but  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

by which all the money they earned was handed over to the company and transmitted to the country from which they came. I believe that such an immigration to any country is a disadvantage rather than a source of strength; and after having tried Chinese immigration for many years, the Australian Colony passed a restrictive measure by which not more than ten Chinese in a ship of 1,000 tons burden are allowed to come into the country. Look also at the experience of the United States. After an experience of more than a quarter of a century of the Chinese in that country, restrictive measures were adopted. When the hon. member for King's, a few nights ago, declared that the Chinese were a law-abiding and industrious people, and a people who required to be christianized—with all of which we agree—he forgot to tell the House that the United States Commission, after hearing the evidence of 138 witnesses, unanimously recommended the American Government to restrict Chinese immigration to that country. The hon. member who has just addressed the House stated that the industries of British Columbia consisted principally of mining, lumbering and fish canning, and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Suppose we allow as many Chinese to come in as they please, they may arrive not by the hundreds or thousands but by the million, for the Flowery Land can spare them, and British Columbia would be overrun by them. What would be the effect? They would go there with the intention of taking away all the money possible from the country. If they were engaged in the gold or iron industry they would take the product away, if they were engaged in the canning business there would be the same result. Would the country be any better for that, or would the people derive any advantage from that? The same might be said of lumbering and any other industry. I believe the immigration we want for this country is a class of immigrants who would come and settle. If we allow white men to work on the railway and to develop our mineral and lumbering industry, we would keep the money in the country; and we should encourage such a class, and we should give the white men advantages over the Chinese. If Onderdonk and Company, or any other railway contractors, have to pay a little more for white labor than for Chinese labor—and the general decision is that one white man can do almost as much as three Chinese—and if the country have to pay them \$200,000 extra for employing white men, I do not think we would be perpetrating any great wrong in forcing them to build the railway with white labor, if we place them in a position to pay that white labor to do the work, and I believe such a course would be for the benefit of the country. If poor white men go into the prairie country without sufficient funds to support them and enable them to build themselves a home, and therefore work on the railway, they remain in the country and spend their money here, and we thus keep the money for building the railway in the country. But when Chinese are employed the whole amount of money they earn passes into the hands of the Chinese companies, who send it out of the country. I believe they are no better than a flock of pigeons coming on to a farm and eating the wheat and carrying every grain away. Some persons will say that the Chinese give value for the money they receive. The pigeons do the same thing, but they carry away every grain from the farm. That is the position of the Chinese, and such in effect is the opinion of the people of British Columbia, who know their value and what the Province requires better than we do. Our experience and knowledge of them is very limited; but with the experience which they have had of them in British Columbia and in San Francisco, and with the experience which they have had of them in Australia, I believe we must come to the conclusion—and if we do not do so to-night, at some future date, which is not very far distant—that this country will be better off without this immi-

gration, the absence of which will give our own people a chance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who will decide, when doctors disagree. We have had this subject discussed before—a few nights ago; we had, on the one hand, my hon. friend who makes this motion, and we have the hon. gentleman who has just spoken so well on this subject; and on the other hand we had the hon. gentleman from Charlotte-town, and my hon. friend from King's, New Brunswick, who is not now in his place, on the other side, defending the usefulness of the Chinese and the advantage of having them in the country. I shall take as I did before, a middle path. I shall agree with my hon. friend from the mainland, New Westminster, who says, it will be all very well to exclude Chinese labor, when we can replace it by white labor, but until that can be done, it is better to have Chinese labor than no labor at all. I am one of those who have a great sympathy with the cry both of California and Australia, against the permanent introduction or entry into a country of a foreign race. I am sufficient of a physiologist to believe that the two races cannot combine, and that no great middle race can arise from the mixture of the Mongolian and the Asian. I believe it would be a great mistake, and would tend to the degradation of the people of the Pacific; and that no permanent immigration of the Chinese people into Canada is to be encouraged as a body of settlers, but under the present system there is no fear of that. The Chinese, when they come over to British Columbia, do not bring their families, their wives, with them. They work, and I believe they earn their wages, which are given to them, or they would not be employed. When they make money enough, they return to their own country, China, and take their money with them, and therefore they are not permanent settlers. At any moment when the Legislature of Canada chooses, it can shut down the gate and say, No more immigrants shall come here from China; and then no more immigrants will come, and those in the country at the time will rapidly disappear. They have not their families with them, and leave nobody behind them, but according to their system, religion or superstition, as the hon. gentleman has just said, they will not even leave their bones behind them. They are sent back to China either alive or dead; and therefore there is no fear of a permanent degradation of the country by a mongrel race. Now, the short and pithy speech of my hon. friend from New Westminster, states exactly my opinion. He says: So soon as you can replace the Chinese by white labor, pass any legislation you like, but in the meanwhile do not deprive all the enterprises of that country, in fact, enterprises in some respects, railway enterprise and other enterprises of the only labor which they can get. In a few years you will have the Rocky Mountains pierced by a Pacific Railway, and perhaps by-and-bye, we will have an overflow from the Western States into British Columbia flowing north, but at present such is not the case. We have no white labor of any consequence going into British Columbia. There is no doubt a project pressed upon the Canadian Government by the Government of British Columbia, to aid them in bringing white labor from England around Cape Horn on vessels carrying rails to British Columbia. There is no other means of bringing them. We cannot send them to Panama, and if we try *via* San Francisco, they all disappear before they arrive at British Columbia; so that either they must have Chinese labor or no labor at all. It is quite true that the Chinese take away their wages, and it would be preferable, that we should get a body of workmen, and laborers, and artisans, who would remain in the country and settle in it, spend their wages in the country, raise families and become valuable settlers; but that will come very soon, and in the meanwhile until the Pacific Railway is constructed, it seems to me it would be premature to press this motion. We are

asked to pass a resolution by which we will adopt the Australian law. Now, I venture to say, that very few members have yet studied the case, or have yet read, or know what the Australian law is. I venture to say that it would be quite impossible for this House to adopt this resolution in its entirety. The employment of these people is, I think, an absolute necessity. I am told that in the Island, you cannot get a servant; you cannot get a cook, unless a Chinaman; and the cry for the present is got up by a few whites, those there, and who like to have a monopoly of the work and to have the right to charge their own price for their labor.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is protection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now, I know that Onderdonk, the contractor for building a certain portion of the Pacific Railway, has done everything in his power to get white labor. I know that he has gone to enormous expense to get skilled labor from Canada. I know he has brought from Ontario a large number of carpenters and builders, to perform the wood, and trestle, and bridge work, and work of that kind, on the Pacific Railway, but he cannot get sufficient men. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman who spoke last said that white labor is infinitely more valuable than Chinese, and that, for general work and practical purposes, one skilled, strong Englishman, or white man, is worth three Chinese; but if you cannot get the one white man, you must employ the three Chinese in the meanwhile. Let us consider this subject, which is of very great importance, now brought before Parliament. It was brought up, with a great deal of ability, by a member of the last Parliament, Mr. DeCosmos, who pressed all the considerations which are now being pressed with a very considerable amount of ability, and the answer of the last House was that in the meanwhile you must keep Chinese labor until white labor is ready to supplant it. As soon as this takes place, then I will go just as strongly perhaps as the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution, in favor—perhaps not of exclusion, because it is a very strong measure for a civilized country to exclude the people of a nation with whom you trade, and whom you treat as a civilized nation or a quasi civilized nation;—but there must be some regulation, one similar to that passed in the United States which amounts to exclusion, but more nearly alike to the legislation in Australia where it is not excluded positively, but where it is regulated and restricted. But until we can be sure that British Columbia gets a sufficient amount of white labor, I think we ought not to paralyze to a great extent all the enterprises and all the industries of that country for the sake of increasing the wages of the few white operatives who are in that country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Knowing the doctrines of the hon. gentleman, and the doctrines on which his Government is based, I am astonished that he has taken this ground. He is willing to protect every interest but that of the workingmen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no workingmen to protect.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman stated that only workingmen demanded this measure, and any measure which they demand at his hands, he is bound to give in the way of protection; but while he is giving protection to everybody else, the moment he is asked to protect labor, the hon. gentleman's doctrine is at an end.

Mr. BARNARD. I may say that having been in British Columbia for some time I have seen the practical working of this Chinese problem, and I have found that they are competitors with white labor. I am free to confess, too, that the only reason why employers engage the Chinese in that country is that they are forced to do it. Mr. Onderdonk himself, who has had them working for him in Cali-

fornia, declares that he would much sooner have white men to work for him than Chinese if he could get them. You must remember the position we occupy in British Columbia: we are 4,000 miles from here; we are north of California and Oregon, and few laboring men have been induced to come to that country except through the discovery of gold. Money has actually been sent from the country to bring out these Chinese; and had some trouble been taken for the purpose of securing white labor we would have had it in abundance. A short time before the contract was given out in British Columbia I urged strongly that the matter should be brought before the House in order that Parliament might take action against the employment of Chinese as far as possible; for if the House had simply passed a resolution branding these Chinese, thus showing that a majority were opposed to their introduction, it would have had a great effect in bringing in white labor. I believe that white labor is to be had in abundance, only for the presence of the Chinese, but white men do not care to come so long as they are present in such large numbers.

Mr. BAKER. I would not be doing my duty if I did not make a few remarks on this question. There are two things which I wish to impress on the House. The first is, that the people in my constituency, Victoria, the capital of the Province, desire most strongly that the immigration of the Chinese into British Columbia should be restricted. The second point is, that these restrictive measures can be secured to the Province by having the Chinamen land at Halifax, Quebec and other ports, and filter through the other Provinces in order to get to British Columbia.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They can do that if they like.

Mr. BAKER. If they were encouraged, the same as other immigrants are, to come to Quebec, Halifax, St. John and other Atlantic ports, they would have considerable difficulty in getting to British Columbia. All that I ask is, that we should have restrictive measures. I do not ask for anything to expel the Chinamen from British Columbia, as we are satisfied they would soon die out, so that only their bones will have to be taken away. We ask for a law similar to the law which has been enacted in Australia, so that not more than ten may be allowed to come into the Province in a vessel of say 1,000 tons burden. With regard to the question of Chinamen working on the railway, and the statement that there are no white laboring men there to protect, I beg most respectfully to differ from the hon. leader of the Government. There are a great many workingmen in British Columbia, and there are many more who would be induced to come but for the fact that they are met on the border by the Chinese, who are allowed to underwork them, and who can underwork them because they work for the small sum of 25 cts. per day, a sum which no white man with a family can live upon. To use the parlance of the country, a white man requires at least two good square meals a day. There is another reason why we do not desire them, and that is, that they do not spend their money in the Province or in the Dominion. As soon as a Chinaman has accumulated his sum of money, he takes it to China, and then sends out his thirty-first or thirty-second cousin to supply his place. From conversations which I have had with hon. gentlemen, I am inclined to believe that there are very few of them who have ever really seen a Chinaman. I would like, since immigration to this country is being encouraged, that hon. members of this House should have the opportunity of seeing John Chinamen in their various constituencies, and then if they are disposed to keep them, we shall be very glad to part with our share.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I trust the motion will not be carried. This is a question of vital importance. It is a Mr. BARNARD.

question which has been before the House for some weeks, and I think the best thing we can do is to vote either for it or against it. I want to see the question voted upon, whether the result should be yea or nay. With regard to the works on the railway, we have in to-day in the Province of British Columbia, all the Chinamen we require for building all the railways we ever shall build, in addition, of course, to the white men who are coming in to the Province continually. I am informed by newspaper reports, as well as by letters which I have received from friends that this spring white men are going into that Province by hundreds, no less than 2,000 or 3,000 having gone there already this season. The trouble is, however, that white men going there and finding that they have to come in contact with Chinese, will not remain there under such circumstances. Hon. members may be surprised at this statement, but it is a fact. It is a very unpleasant thing indeed for respectable men to have to go to work alongside of that class of people. The hon. gentleman opposite, who spoke to-night on that subject, spoke from experience. He has lived in a country where the fact of having so many people of that class in their midst was a known evil, and those who have not lived among them have really no idea as to the trouble we have with them. My hon. friend from New Westminster speaks as though we have not sufficient Chinese there yet. Of course the hon. gentleman is a member of this House, but I might state, for the information of hon. members, that, in the Local House of British Columbia, there are three representatives from the district which he represents, and every one of those gentlemen have voted in favor of restrictive measures, so that it would appear, at least to my mind, that he does not express the well-understood wishes of the people of his district. If doctors disagree, then how shall we get at the truth. I maintain that the people themselves are the best judges, and it is scarcely necessary for me to say that some measures should be adopted when the people themselves have petitioned this House for such measures over and over again. This year they have done the same thing, they have asked that some restrictive measures shall be passed to prevent such a large influx of these people into that Province. We see from newspaper reports that so many Chinamen are going there that the farming class have to leave. They are not able to obtain lands, because they are reserved from settlement; but if there were not so many Chinese in the Province, I have no doubt that these men would find other employment until the lands were thrown open and they could settle upon them. Now, with regard to this Bill, it is not intended to exclude the Chinese entirely. The proposition is not to interfere with those that are there, although there are two thousand more now on the way from China to British Columbia, and for aught I know, they have landed before this hour. At the rate at which they are going into that Province the whole of the white population will be swamped by these Chinese, and I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House desires to see such a state of things. I am satisfied that if hon. gentlemen in this House had to live there and labor for their bread, they would express themselves very decidedly in favor of this resolution. Now, what are the provisions of the Bill? One is that no ship shall arrive at any port in the Province with more than one Chinaman to every hundred tons register of the ship. If the House thinks this figure is too small, we can make it two or three to every hundred tons. The resolution is that we pass a Bill similar in principle to the one now in force in New South Wales—not exactly the same, but similar in principle. I think the proposition is a very reasonable one, especially as this question has been brought before this House on several occasions, and has been very fully ventilated by the representative from the Province of British Columbia. All I ask is that this motion may be voted upon.



It has been on the paper for some time, and I wish to see a vote upon it, yea or nay.

Mr. HOMER. I wish to refer to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare). The district which the hon. gentleman represents does not, I believe, employ a great many Chinamen. I believe there are no very extensive industries there requiring them; but the district I represent employs about one-half of all the Chinese in the Province; there are some four thousand employed in the salmon fisheries, and about the same number upon the railway. Notwithstanding the fact that several hundred mechanics have been brought in this spring, the wages for that class of laborers have already advanced a dollar a day. A great many farmers have gone into the Province, but the number of laborers that come in are but a fraction of what is required. To show the opinion of the Legislature of that Province with respect to restriction on Chinese immigration, I may state that on the fourth of this month a resolution was introduced there against the employment of Chinese on local railways which are now in contemplation, and that motion was lost by a vote of twelve to eight, the three representatives from the district which I have the honor to represent here voting against the resolution. So my hon. friend is entirely mistaken in the views he represents to prevail in my district with respect to Chinese immigration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. mover of the motion says he wishes a direct vote upon it I shall not stand in his way by insisting on my motion; and if the House will allow me, I will withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Motion, to adjourn debate, withdrawn.

Mr. GORDON. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Homer) speaks as if certain industries in British Columbia could not be carried on successfully without Chinese labor. As I understand this motion, it is not intended to interfere with the Chinese now in the Province, but to restrict the number coming in in the future. I will say, so far as the coal lands are concerned, that the Chinese are not a necessity. I will say more—they are kept in all these enterprises, railway and others, as a sort of base currency for fixing the value of white labor. Since I have been in this House, I have received a large number of letters from people in this and other Provinces, enquiring about British Columbia, and if I thought for one moment that the unlimited immigration of Chinese were to continue, I would certainly advise every applicant to keep out of British Columbia. I would not advise one of my fellow-countrymen to go to British Columbia and place himself right in competition with this element, knowing the Chinese as well as I do. I am disappointed at the remarks of the right hon. leader of the House. At an early stage of the Session, on the 23rd February, before this question was brought up at all, under the form of a resolution we had the assurance that the Government regarded this as a very serious question. The right hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"It is a very serious question, one whose importance cannot be overrated, one that cannot be slurred over, but must be treated. It is of great consequence to British Columbia, and is of subsequent consequence to the Eastern Provinces, and must be fairly considered, so that some principle may be laid down regarding it, and that principle carried out in practice."

I felt somewhat assured by these remarks that the Government, after the consideration that had been given this question in the past, had come to the conclusion to deal with this question on its merits. But if the dealing with it is to be put off until the railway is completed, that would be, I consider, an act of selfishness on the part of hon. members from the other Provinces, by deferring the settlement of this question until such a time as the Chinese will begin to find access to their Provinces. Until such time

those hon. members seem to think it all right that the Chinese should have unrestricted admission, and British Columbia suffer the consequences. If I should have the honor to be in the House at the time when hon. members will consider it opportune to exclude them, I should vote for their unlimited immigration. I do not think this question can be dealt with too soon. As to their working in the mines, we have a Local Act debarring them from any position of trust about the mines. The feeling is, then, that the Chinese could be dispensed with. They are now in equal number to the whites, and if you had them in equal numbers here there would be no difficulty in settling the question to-night.

Motion negatived on a division.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

106. Additional public buildings on Wellington Street.. \$300,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is for a new building on Wellington street, between Metcalfe and Elgin streets, with the full depth of the lots. At present the Departmental buildings are much too small for the wants of the public service, and we have been obliged to use houses outside, and still the public offices are much too crowded. The business is suffering on account of it, due greatly to the increase of business in the Department of the Interior, Indian Affairs, &c. Under these circumstances we have decided to secure the lots I have mentioned in order to erect thereon a building which would suffice, at all events, for a number of years to come. The lots will cost something like \$83,000 or \$85,000, the amount for which will appear in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year. The building itself will cost probably \$400,000 or \$500,000. This vote will be sufficient for the year. After the contract has been given it will take at least two years to erect the building. It will contain a basement and will be three stories high, with a Mansard roof. It is intended to transfer into that new building the Department of the Interior and Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, the Patent Office, and the Model Rooms. The Mansard roof story will probably be utilized for the Model room, as there will be ample space for that purpose. The room where they are now is so small that they have to be piled up, and are, consequently, not easy to see.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did the Government consider the possibility of extending the present buildings on the hill?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; we considered that, but we found that if extending the Western Block on the square and then turning toward the north that it would give accommodation, but not sufficient. We found that it would cost more to make this extension than to erect a whole new building, for the reason that the architecture of the extension would have to be in accord with the building as it appears on the Square. In the building on Wellington street we should be able to have plenty of light and large airy rooms for the use of the officers who will be employed there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are we to understand that the architecture of the new block is to be of a different character from that inside the grounds?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the building on Wellington street will be more in keeping with the architecture of the best buildings on that street than with the architecture of the present Departmental Buildings.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I recollect very well when the hon. gentleman made preparations for the Western Block before he left office in 1873, and it fell to me to carry out that idea

with the plans for the new building called the Western Block. We were subjected to an incessant fire in the House from hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that it was not required, but now we have the same gentlemen proposing a vote of \$500,000 to erect another building still, after their denunciations of the extension of the Western Block on account of its not being required. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain that inconsistency.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The circumstances have changed since then and the business has greatly increased. At the period the hon. gentleman speaks of we did not believe the requirements were such as to warrant such a large building. He may have been mistaken—it is in human nature to be mistaken—but I do not think we were mistaken at that period. The hon. gentleman may have foreseen that the wants of the public service would require larger buildings, but even his foresight did not go far enough for the wants of to-day. At present the hon. gentleman will admit that more room is absolutely required. The proposed buildings will have a length of 200 or 225 feet, the building will have a depth of some fifty-five feet, and then there will be an open space and behind that a passage way, so that there will be plenty of light. The passage will run from Elgin street to Metcalf street and will have a width of perhaps ten feet.

Mr. BLAKE. I think I saw some statement in the newspapers about very much larger claims for the land being made by tenants and others, which are under the consideration of arbitrators.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there were two half-lots that we could not obtain without expropriation. There was some difficulty, and we had to expropriate. There are some three or four claims made by parties who contend they have a right of way, for example, and another party claims that the erection of this building will deprive him a light for his industry—I think he is a photographer. I do not know how far we are liable; but these claims have been referred to the law officers to be investigated, and any claims that have to be decided by the courts will be so decided, and we will, of course, have to pay according to the judgment.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the total cost of land and buildings will be about \$500,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it will come to that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, find a room for the national gallery in the new building. I have not been in the building of the Supreme Court, but I am told by members of the profession that the library is not adequate for its purpose even now, and when the arrangements which the Government assented to for the removal of the text-books is carried out, it will be found to be entirely inadequate. I throw out the suggestion that, as I am told, there are not a great many pictures in the National Gallery, perhaps the hon. Minister may find in this new building, or some other building, room for the collection, and thus afford accommodation for the reception of the books for the Supreme Court.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention was called to that matter some time ago, but I was not in a position to say what could be done. If another room, or a couple of rooms, properly lighted, can be obtained either there or in some other building, we will do what we can to accommodate the Judges and lawyers who attend the Supreme Court.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How many rooms for clerks is it intended to provide in the new building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but the intention is to make large rooms in order that the clerks, instead of being separated in small rooms, may be, as far as possible,

Mr. MACKENZIE,

under the surveillance of a head officer. We find in all the Departments a difficulty in this respect. I do not say that officers will try and waste their time, but the existence of a number of small rooms is not conducive to the proper administration of affairs. On the contrary, if the rooms are large as in a bank, the work will be done more quickly, because clerks can go to each other in respect to matters of work with little trouble, whereas, if they have to go to separate rooms time is lost, and they are liable to be delayed by persons in the corridors.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the hon. gentleman intends to carry out the plan in the new Western Block?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are large rooms in the Western Block.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I saw it stated in some newspaper, that the Government were entertaining the question of prospective damages in some of the properties about to be expropriated. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to contradict that statement.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no such intention. We will pay what the court decides.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is it true that the question of prospective damages is submitted to the arbitrators?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I was about to call the hon. Minister's attention to the desirability of dividing the building into large rooms, specially for clerks dealing with the same subject, and I think this will be a very desirable improvement. I am a little surprised, speaking without much experience of the extent of the service, that this large demand is being made upon us just now for new buildings. It is only a little while since \$300,000 or \$400,000 were expended for the enlargement of the Western Block, and that in the face of a very strong remonstrance from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have now a proposal to expend a further sum of \$600,000. It is made in order to accommodate the increased staff, which seems to be becoming larger every day of the year. I think the staff numbers over 100 employes more than the number employed in 1878. Is this expenditure incurred in order that the staff may be further increased? The Departments are full and there is no further room for additional employes. I am almost inclined to be severe enough on the hon. Minister of Public Works to say that this is merely an additional convenience, not for the public service, but for unfortunate gentlemen who, no doubt, are anxious to place themselves under comfortable salaries in order to spend their valuable lives in the service of the public. I notice by the last report of the hon. Finance Minister that the present Departmental Buildings cost \$4,173,977. We intend to enlarge that sum by about \$600,000. We have spent on the Post Office about \$250,000, about \$50,000 on the Geological Museum, and \$30,000 on the Supreme Court. The Committee should obtain some more satisfactory explanation and a fuller justification of this large expenditure before it votes this large sum asked for.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister has, no doubt, considered the fact that the risk by fire will be very greatly increased in the new building, as stores facing on Sparks street will be immediately in its rear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter has been attended to. In the plan prepared by the architect, care is taken to make that side of the building fire-proof. In answer to the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), if my explanation has not satisfied him, I am afraid I cannot satisfy him. As we have not had room for the transaction of public business we have been obliged to hire accommodation in the neighborhood of the Post Office, and even then the Departments are crowded—not, as the hon. gentleman very chari-

tably supposes, because we want to take into the service a great many more employes, but because the public service requires that the employes we have shall be provided with proper accommodation. The buildings are too small, and we cannot get along with public business, and therefore we must have confidence in Parliament providing a remedy, and afford accommodation where the officers can work well. Besides, the service is growing. The North-West requires more and more attention, and the number of officers in the Department of the Interior has been increased, and must be increased as the public demands require. And for that purpose we must have more room; and that is the reason why we come to Parliament and ask for the grant, which, we hope, will be given.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The last performance of the hon. gentlemen in providing accommodation, was to buy an old building for \$20,000, and spend \$30,000 in repairing it. This is decidedly better.

Mr. VAIL. What is the intention of the Government, in taking from Ottawa so much tax-paying property, in making an allowance to the city of Ottawa? This is a serious thing for the taxpayers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This relates to another branch for consideration; and I must ask the hon. gentleman to postpone his question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose there is something almost so sacred in the hours nine to four, that it would be impossible to entertain a proposition to alter them, to perhaps an hour earlier in the morning and an hour later at night, giving two hours more work to each employe, which, with every employe about the buildings, would accomplish a vastly greater amount of work than could be managed in this way, and perhaps accommodation would be found for the requisite number in the present buildings, saving \$600,000, and perhaps enabling us, without the expenditure of a greater amount of money, to give somewhat larger salaries, perhaps, to those already employed. It does seem to me the proper way in the public service—the best for the men and for the country—is to employ as few hands as possible, and see that they are paid fair salaries for the work which they do.

110. Public Buildings, Nova Scotia..... \$67,200.00

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman give us some statement on each item under the arrangement formerly made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will. The first item, Sydney Quarantine Hospital, \$2,000, is a revote. The site could not be obtained at the proper time, and, of course, we had to delay the expenditure of money.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was there not a small hospital there five or six years ago?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sure of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had none there before. The second vote, \$12,000, is to continue the erection of public buildings at New Glasgow.

Mr. BLAKE. Will this complete the work at Sydney?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will not. I think there will be an additional vote in the Supplementary Estimates to complete the work, I believe. We had \$6,000 voted last year for the New Glasgow Public Buildings. A site has been purchased, and this \$12,000 is to go on with the erection of the building; but some more money will be required—probably \$6,000 or \$7,000. Halifax Cattle Quarantine Station, \$5,000. This vote was not expended last year, because we had not decided, I think, about the site, and this amount will cover the expenditure there. Truro Custom

House, Post Office and Savings Bank, \$21,000. There is here a building for which we had \$15,000 voted last year; \$6,000 is a revote, \$15,000 being a new vote, making the \$21,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will make a proposition to the hon. gentleman, which will save a great deal of discussion, perhaps. I would like also to know, not merely what these buildings are for, but the number of employes in such districts at the present time, and the revenues obtained there from Customs, Excise and Post Office, or whatever other branches of the public service are there accommodated. If a short return were made out and brought down and printed before Concurrence, it would be very easily done, and it would save a lot of questions, and save some time in discussion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course. I could not have that ready now, but I will make a note of it, and try to have it brought down before, or at, Concurrence. Antigonish Public Buildings, \$3,500—this amount is required to complete them. Windsor Post Office, Custom House, &c., \$10,000. We had \$5,000 last year for this purpose, and \$10,000 are asked for this year, but more will be required—probably \$5,000. This is for preparing and repairing a certain portion of the building, rebuilding fences, repairs to the outbuildings, and contingencies, making in all \$1,400 for the Halifax Penitentiary. We could not allow the property to go to waste as the building is a good one, and has been put temporarily in the hands of the Local Government after the destruction of the poor house. These poor people were in the street, and we were asked to allow them to be put in this building until they could find proper accommodation elsewhere. This amount is to keep the property in repair until we decide what is to be done with it—whether to keep it for a while or to dispose of it at public auction. The vote of \$2,300 for Pictou Marine Hospital is to make up a balance of \$2,235 from last year. We had to meet the expenditure necessary for fences and outbuildings, which, according to the engineer's estimate, made up the \$2,235. We had a vote before for \$600, and the reason I have asked for \$2,300 is that we may not be short a few dollars. The next item, Amherst Public Buildings, \$10,000, is for the construction of a building for the accommodation of the Customs, Post Office, Inland Revenue, and Government Savings Bank. This is only the first vote, and most likely another vote for the same amount will be required next year. These are the explanations with regard to the whole vote of \$67,200.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to Halifax Penitentiary. It was a good while in contemplation that the penitentiary should be disused, because, owing to the completion of Dorchester, the convicts were to be removed. It is a good while since it was disused, as it is some time since Dorchester has been occupied, and convicts removed there. I think it was an extremely reasonable thing, in view of the calamity which befel Halifax, that the building should be at the disposal of the city and local authorities temporarily—I am not at all objecting to that—but the hon. gentleman informs us that we have to spend \$14,000 to improve the property while the Government is making up its mind what to do with it. There has been a good deal of time for the Government to make up its mind, and I would like to know how much longer it will take them to make up their mind? Perhaps you, Mr. Chairman, knowing something about the city, could tell them whether they should sell it by public auction, or what other disposition they could make of it, because if we are to go on spending money upon it, it would perhaps be better to give it away than to keep it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is possible that arrangements might be made with the Local Government for its purchase. They might find that these inmates who took refuge there were so well suited, that they would be disposed

to purchase the property. I have no doubt that the matter will be taken up as soon as possible, in order to see what is to be done with the property.

111. Public Buildings, Prince Edward Island..... \$9,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The only item is Summer-side Public Buildings, \$9,000. We had a vote of \$5,000 last year. These votes being for a Post Office and Custom House. This would be a total of \$14,000, and we will require \$6,000 more.

Mr. DAVIES. I notice there is no vote for Charlottetown Marine Hospital. Why is this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose because it was not required.

Mr. DAVIES. How is it kept up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These votes are for build-ings and not for maintenance.

112. Public Buildings, New Brunswick.....\$107,200.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is \$12,500, to complete St. John Marine Hospital, Woodstock Post Office, Custom House, &c., \$15,000. We are to erect here a building 115 feet long, by 90 feet wide; built of brick with stone dressing covered with slate, and 32 feet above the ground level. The total amount required will be \$27,000, so that \$5,000 more will be required to complete it. For St. Stephen's Post Office and Custom House, we had a vote of \$15,000 last year, and we ask for \$5,000 this year.

Mr. GILLMOR. Has the site for that building been purchased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the site has not been purchased yet. Only one offer has been made.

Mr. GILLMOR. Nothing has been done at all?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. How much has been voted for it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$15,000 was voted last year. We intend expending \$10,000 by the 1st of October, and we have a revote this year of \$5,000, making \$15,000 in all. For Sussex Post Office, Custom House and Inland Revenue building we ask \$9,000 additional for the purpose of completing the building, making in all \$16,000.

Mr. BLAKE. How many inhabitants are there in Sussex?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 3,584. That is the population of 1881. The next item is \$15,000 for the Moncton Post Office, Custom House, &c., the whole building will cost \$35,000, and we shall require about \$5,000 after this vote. For the Dorchester Penitentiary we asked \$25,000 last year, and we ask \$30,000 more this year, and to complete the works that have been begun there we shall require another \$30,000 next year. The total expenditure on the penitentiary will then have been nearly \$400,000. For the Newcastle Post Office and Custom House we ask \$10,000 in addition to the \$4,000 which has already been voted. We have yet to select the site, and I suppose \$15,000 or \$16,000 will cover the whole cost. The Carleton Post Office, for which we ask \$10,000, will cost about \$15,100, so that in another year we shall require probably \$4,000 or \$5,000 more.

113. Public Buildings, Quebec ..... \$246,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$3,200 for Lévis fortifications and military buildings, are required for improvements in the stonework and the woodwork, and for building culverts, drains, &c. The \$19,000 for the Quebec fortifications is for extending and repairing the walls and fortifications in various places.

Mr. LAURIER. As far as I understand, this will complete the restoration of the wall from Kent Gate to Palace Gate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Beyond.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to put a railing on the top of the ramparts, so as to make it a promenade, as was originally intended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first thing is to complete the walls. The vote of \$2,500 for Dufferin Terrace is to complete the fortification wall under the Terrace. The vote of \$22,500 for the Quebec Citadel, is for restoring the outward fence, repairing the bastions, and for general repairs to the Citadel; as well as for repairing officers' quarters, stables and hospital, sergeants' mess room, and canteen buildings, for removing outer works and fixing embankments, &c. As far as I can recollect, it is the same as the one that was built under the hon. gentleman's Government—on the left hand side, going into the Citadel.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not a warlike roof.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt it is not, but in time of war it could be quickly removed. The Quebec Customs Warehouse. We had \$20,000 voted last year, and we now ask a revote of \$10,000 and an additional vote of \$20,000. It will be built on the Government ground, on Dalhousie street, where we have a good piece of ground in close proximity to the Custom House. We thought that was the best spot to put it, and it relieved us from the necessity of purchasing ground with all the jealousies that spring up when a piece of ground is to be purchased. I believe the whole cost, when completed, will be \$60,000. We will avoid, by this means, a good many rents that we now pay in different places in the city, and the work will be done more economically. The goods will also be safer, and, no doubt, the revenue more secure. Then there is the other vote of \$1,500 to complete the wall at the foot of the cliff beneath the Citadel, in order to prevent the falling of rocks into Champlain street. Three Rivers, the conversion of the former Custom House into a post office, will necessitate some repairs. In Sherbrooke, for Post Office and Custom House, \$20,000. Last year we asked a revote of \$10,000 and an additional vote of \$18,500; this will complete the building. The other vote is Hull Post Office and Inland Revenue Office, \$10,000 additional. The words "to complete" should be struck out here, because it will require \$5,000 more to complete it, or a total of about \$23,000 or \$24,000. Grosse Island Quarantine Station, a revote of \$1,000 is asked in connection with the construction of a dwelling to be used by the chaplain of the Episcopal Church. The Montreal Drill Shed: we had a vote of \$20,000 last year which has not been expended; we ask a revote of that and \$20,000 more. The reason this work was not continued, was this: We had a survey made of the property in Montreal where the old drill shed stood, and the report was that the outside walls were canting and it would not be safe to put the new roof over them, but they should be demolished and rebuilt. Thus, if we had put the roof on the outside walls we would have had an immense building which would have cost \$125,000. We thought we could not afford that or go into that expense without stating to Parliament the cost, because when we asked Parliament for \$20,000 last year we stated the cost would likely be \$30,000 or \$40,000 more to complete, or a total of between \$40,000 and \$50,000. Since then there has been a new survey made by the new architect, who reported to me that the outside walls, though not perfect, might be made so by demolishing and rebuilding eight or nine feet and then placing an iron roof over them. The whole thing would cost \$55,000 if the roof were entirely of iron, but if of iron and wood it would cost \$45,000. But I think we will decide on putting on an iron roof, as it will be much more economical in the long run, and the entire cost will be only \$55,000 instead of \$125,000. The city gives us the lot and building as it stands, and, of course, if at any time the Government gave

up the drill shed the property would revert to the city. Dominion Buildings, \$12,900. This is on the different public buildings in Montreal: the Post Office, \$5,254; the Examining Warehouse, \$3,958; Weights and Measures office, \$907, and sundries, making a total of \$12,900. In regard to the examining warehouse already mentioned, there will be in the Supplementary Estimates a much larger vote for replacing the present wooden joists and beams, which are decaying with dry rot, with iron posts and beams. The next then, is \$18,950 for the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary buildings, with which is connected an item of \$9,050 for materials and tools for use of convicts in construction. The vote for the buildings is to extend the dining room and to make additions to the building, and includes the materials as per architect's estimate. Then I have the details. Materials for building the new dining room, \$3,540; extension of main building, \$8,340; main sewer, \$200; two hose reels, \$210; repairs and water supplies, \$200; and all the other details which foot up to \$18,950. The \$9,050 is for material and tools; \$5,646, 25 cords of hard wood, 75 tons of coal, 120 tons of Scotch coal, steam pipes, stoves, repairs to water apparatus, keeping four horses with oats, hay, straw, repairs to harness, waggons, &c.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that this is a misleading item. I think my hon. friend will see that his officers have not placed a proper statement before him. It looks like an attempt to get through items in connection with the penitentiary under the head of construction, and make the maintenance of the penitentiary much less than it really is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that these items are required for the convicts to work with. If you hire mechanics and laborers from outside they generally bring their own tools with them, but you have to furnish the convicts with tools to work with. For example, we require some galvanized iron, zinc, borax, bolts, planes, &c. The whole list amounts to the sum stated. Next is the Quebec Dominion Buildings improvement, \$3,000. This is for improvements in the Quebec Post Office, Excise Office and Cartridge Factory—\$2,200 for the Post Office, \$350 for the Excise Office, \$411 for the Cartridge Factory, and \$218 for contingencies. The vote for Sorel Public Building is for the erection of a public building in Sorel for the accommodation of the Post Office, Inland Revenue Department, &c. The Corporation of Sorel will give a site. The cost of the building will be about \$20,000. The item, Lévis Immigration Station, is for small repairs there. Quebec Military Buildings, including drill shed, \$30,000. We have an old drill shed on the Grand Allee. The intention is to remove that building and erect a new drill shed further up, on land belonging to the Dominion. The Quebec Government and the city of Quebec will contribute \$15,000 each. They considered the Dominion Government might be induced to propose a vote of \$60,000 beyond the total sum contributed by them; but after consideration we thought that \$30,000 by the Dominion Government and \$30,000 by the bodies I have mentioned would be sufficient to erect a public building which would be useful, not only for drill purposes, but for agricultural show purposes.

Mr. VAIL. The drill shed at Quebec was a very good and convenient building a few years ago. If it is in a state of decay it could be made available for Militia purposes for a very much smaller sum than that proposed for a new building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has been erected many years. It was a good building in its time, but like everything else it has fallen into decay.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was erected about twenty-five years ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so. I do not think any loss will accrue to the country from the building of this drill shed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how several of the items, such as 75 tons of hard coal, for instance, can be put down as materials.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Read the full details of the proposed expenditure, amounting to \$9,050.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not object to what were materials but to some of the items which I did not think came properly under that head. I fail to see how repairs to a steam pump and a coal stove come under the head of materials.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course there may be two or three items which might have been placed under another head, but with this exception the hon. gentleman will see that the whole amount is correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Under the head of Penitentiaries, we find this item: Penitentiary at Kingston, working expenses, \$20,093.05, and St. Vincent de Paul, \$95,178; and what we complain of is—at least I do, and I think also the hon. member for West Durham—that the amount which should have been charged as the working expenses of St. Vincent de Paul, are transferred to this building account, in order to cover up the amount, which ought to have appeared in the penitentiary accounts proper. I would like the hon. gentleman, or some other member of the Government, to bring down a statement showing what is comprised in this statement of the working expenses in two penitentiaries; and we will then find you are placing many items in this new building account, and which ought to have gone into the penitentiary accounts proper.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I am not in a position to give that list this evening, but I will see that the statement is brought down.

114. Public Buildings, Ontario ..... \$342,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the Cornwall Post Office, Custom House, &c., the vote last year was \$20,000, and it is \$20,000 this year. We will only require a little over \$9,000 more to complete the work. Brockville Post Office, Custom House, &c., last year, \$20,000, and this year, \$10,000. This amount, \$10,000, will have to be supplemented afterwards by \$20,000. Kingston fortifications and military buildings, \$12,000; this is for a gas supply apparatus to replace coal oil lamps, the light of which injures the pupils' eyes, while the use of coal oil is dangerous. We also make provision for water supply, &c. Kingston Penitentiary, \$15,000, for internal fittings, repairs, &c. The next item is to complete the Belleville Post Office, Custom House, &c., \$17,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The total cost will be \$37,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The next item is the Hamilton Post Office, Custom House, &c., \$125,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is it intended to sell the present buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; when the offices have been transferred. The post office, as the hon. gentleman knows, is in a very good position, and will sell advantageously with the back lot. The Custom House is not so well situated, but it can easily be disposed of, and I think to our advantage. In this case we will require this sum to complete the buildings. The total cost will be about \$280,000. The next item is \$13,000 to complete Stratford Post Office. It will cost about \$21,000 or \$22,000. For St. Thomas, we ask \$28,000, and we will require about \$11,000 more to complete.

Mr. WILSON. I notice that \$20,000 was the vote last year. Was some of the land included in that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The site is evidently not included in this.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it will take about \$11,000 more to complete.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it will require \$28,000 to complete, and the total cost will be nearly \$55,000.

Mr. WILSON. The contract will be about \$50,000 independent of the land.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the contract is about \$37,000 altogether.

Mr. WILSON. Should not the words "to complete" be omitted here as in the previous items?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right. These words have been erroneously inserted by the printer. For Chatham Post Office we ask \$16,500, and about \$8,000 more will be required to complete. The total amount will be \$44,000 or so. For London Post Office we ask \$3,600. There were some repairs and alterations begun a year or two ago, and these have been continued.

Mr. BLAKE. These repairs and alterations seem to have been rather expensive.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there was an addition made, and there was also a balance due on the old contract. The next item is \$10,000 for Amherstburg Post Office, Custom House, &c. We have not purchased the land, although two or three offers have been made. Of this sum \$8,000 is to purchase the lot, and the balance is to go on the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite decided that the building will be erected in Amherstburg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; Parliament voted the money last year for that purpose, and it has been so decided. At Galt nothing has been done, and the vote is asked in order that we may select the lot and pay ordinary expenses until we get a vote for the erection of a building. At Berlin a site has not been selected. The vote was forgotten in this case, but it will appear in the Supplementary Estimates. The vote of Cobourg Post Office, Custom House, &c., is to complete the alterations and fit the building for offices, superintendence, and incidental expenses, making the balance required \$7,000. For the Clifton Post Office and Custom House, for which we ask \$12,000 this year, tenders were called for, but they have not yet been awarded. The building will cost about \$40,000. For the Barrie Post Office the same vote is asked, and it also will cost \$40,000, including the furnishings and fittings. The town of Barrie gives the site. For the Port Hope Post Office the same vote is required, and the cost will be the same. For the Gananoque Custom House and Inland Revenue Offices, \$5,500 is asked towards the erection of a building on the site of the old building; probably \$1,500 or \$2,000 will be required to complete it. For the Belleville Examining Warehouse we ask \$4,000, for the purchase of a lot in the rear of the Custom House, upon which we intend afterwards to erect the Examining Warehouse.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Surely there is no need of an Examining Warehouse there. What is the amount of business done in the Custom House at Belleville?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The exports amount to \$1,602,000, and the imports to \$392,000, and the Customs duties to \$67,952.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It does not rank with some other towns in that respect. Is it the intention to have examining warehouses erected at all places where \$60,000 or upwards are collected, or is this place to be specially favored, and if so, for what reason?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The lot is very small in rear of the Custom House, and as it was going to be sold and

Mr. WILSON.

could be had at a moderate price, we secured it so as to prevent the erection upon it of some building that would be a nuisance to the Custom House. There is a building already on the lot, and a small sum of money will most likely be sufficient to put it in a condition to be used.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But that was not my question. My question was, does the Government intend having an examining warehouse at every place where \$60,000 is collected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think a rule of that kind has been established.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there an idea of doing it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I think the idea of the Government will be to put an examining warehouse where we think it is needed.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is to be expended on this examining warehouse besides this amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say exactly, but we will only spend what is necessary to make it suit the trade there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. gentleman is reversing the terms. The trade is to be made to suit the examining warehouse, not the examining warehouse to suit the trade.

116. Public Buildings, Manitoba..... \$163,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the Manitoba Penitentiary we ask \$40,000. This will take three years to execute. The total work is as follows: New cell wing and boiler house \$85,000; additional expenditure for pumping purposes, \$5,765; repairs asked by the Department of Justice, \$3,599; reconstructing cells, \$7,000.

Mr. BLAKE. We should have details of repairs, which may really belong to maintenance and not be charged to construction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A part of the repairs, I think, was for padlock, which we ordered because the building was not considered safe, and might, I think, be taken as part of construction. I will furnish details on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not want so much to ascertain the details as to see that items belonging to maintenance are charged to construction. The padlocks, if not a renewal of or substitution for others, might be charged to construction; but I presume padlocks were not the whole expense.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, not altogether. The next item is for Parliament Buildings at Winnipeg. This work has not progressed as we would wish. The contractor took it at such a low price that he could not execute it, as work, labor and material went up as they did, and new tenders were called for and they would cost \$15,000 or \$20,000 more than expected.

Mr. CHARLTON. Must we build Parliament buildings for all the Provinces in the North-West?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That policy was adopted and approved by Parliament with reference to the new Provinces. We will have to ask for buildings at Regina. The Parliament buildings at Winnipeg will cost about \$115,000. For the Lieutenant-Governor's residence we ask a revote of \$10,000 and a new vote of \$23,000; the total cost will be \$70,000. We have selected the site of the present Winnipeg Post Office for that of the new one, and we have made arrangements for the erection of a temporary one on the Government property between the Custom House and the Land Office. This temporary office will cost \$12,000 and will be a portable edifice, so that it can be removed when necessary. The total expenditure will be about \$162,000.

117. Public Buildings in the North-West Territory...\$59,100.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first vote is the ordinary vote of \$5,000 for all public buildings that require improvements. The second vote of \$0,000 is for a Dominion Lunatic Asylum, or Hospital. The vote last year was not expended, and we ask a revote of that sum with \$10,000 additional. The institution will be most likely at Regina, and will be made suitable for either purposes. New gaols and lock-ups, \$10,000, is a revote. The capital of North-West Territory, \$20,000. That is a revote. Qu'Appelle Immigrant Shed, \$3,500. That building has cost more than was expected at first. Immigrant Station west of Qu'Appelle, \$600. The site will be selected afterwards.

Mr. CASEY. Where is this immigrant shed to be located?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Troy, I think. It is not intended to make extensive public buildings at Regina at present, until the population has increased somewhat. I am not sure this vote will cover the entire cost of the public buildings at present intended, but we will do as much as we can with it. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Territory was here lately, and I have conferred with him about the buildings.

Mr. CASEY. I moved some time ago for a statement of the location and cost of these buildings, and I was led to understand by the hon. First Minister, that it had not been settled in regard to their position and character, and it seems it has not been settled yet. The plans that were drawn up last summer have not been carried out, then?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government declined to adopt those plans because they were too expensive.

Mr. BLAKE. Where are these new gaols and lock-ups to be?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Strong representations were made to the stipendiary magistrate that new lock-ups were needed. They have been using the Mounted Police lock-ups, which are mere guard-rooms; but the population is increasing, and consequently the number of criminals on short punishment terms. These places are overcrowded, and it is improper that persons imprisoned for small crimes should be put in with persons convicted for larger ones. I suppose one of these new gaols will be near Fort McLeod, one at Regina, and one at Battleford. It is proposed that Colonel Richardson, one of the stipendiary magistrates, will be transferred from Battleford to Regina. It has hitherto been a matter of enormous expense to send criminals across the continent to Winnipeg, but the case will not be so bad next year. They can be sent from Fort McLeod, about 100 miles to the railway, and thence to the penitentiary.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that these lock-ups shall be in connection with the stations, so that they may be under the surveillance of the Mounted Police? or are we now commencing a regular penal establishment for these Territories? If the Mounted Police are not allowed to act as gaolers, we must have gaolers to take charge of the prisoners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Regina will be the headquarters of the Mounted Police, and there will also be a detachment at Fort McLeod. They will watch these prisoners until, by-and-by, these lock-ups may assume the character of penitentiaries.

118. Public Buildings, British Columbia... \$11,750.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to Vancouver Quarantine Station and outbuildings, \$7,500, we were not in a position to establish those buildings last year, and, therefore, we ask for a revote of the amount, \$5,000, and \$2,500 more.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is it?

115

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand it would be near Victoria. New Westminster Post Office, Custom House, &c., to complete, \$11,500. This building will be erected on the site of the old Post Office. The next vote is to complete the Nanaimo Post Office, Custom House, &c., \$22,750. The total cost of the building will be \$36,250.

119. Public Buildings generally..... \$15,000.00

Mr. VAIL. I hope the hon. Minister intends to spend some of that amount in the western part of Nova Scotia. I observe that, with the exception of a small vote at Windsor, which is a short distance west of Halifax, all the amount voted for Nova Scotia is to be expended among the counties east.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is for public buildings generally—for repairs, not to erect new buildings. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that western Nova Scotia is considered a very important portion of the Dominion, and that it will be taken care of.

120. Public Buildings—Repairs, furniture, heating, &c..... \$302,400.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount for repairs, furniture, heating, &c., \$175,000, shows an increase of \$10,000, on account of last year's vote being insufficient.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is anything proposed to be done at the rising ground lying between the Western Block and the Central Block?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would be a large work, and I have not submitted it to my colleagues. Some persons think it should be levelled so that the view of the river might be improved, while others think it should be allowed to remain as it is.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the hon. Minister will never think of removing it.

Mr. BLAKE. I would venture to suggest that a screen fence should be erected at the rear of the Eastern Block so as to shut out from view the wood piles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will not forget the suggestions that have been offered. An increased amount of \$10,000 is required for heating the Public Buildings. Of the total amount of \$50,000, \$36,000 was entered for cordwood and \$1,000 for coal.

Mr. BLAKE. The larger proportion of the increased cost is due to the increased value of cordwood. The staff seems to be excessive—\$9,000 a year as wages to firemen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In order to insure the work being properly done we must pay good wages so as to obtain men in whom we have confidence. Whenever a man has been found to indulge in intoxicating drink he has been allowed to leave the Department, because we must have men on whom we can rely, day or night.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be possible to substitute coal for wood for fuel to a large extent and effect a saving?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This question has come up several times. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will agree with me, that if we were to use coal exclusively for wood, we would have these buildings very soon as black as the public buildings in London, England.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The experiment made shows that already.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. And another thing, we would then have to change the flues, I understand, and the heating apparatus as well. Of course, I am only a layman in these matters, but I had the whole question so explained to me. However, we had under consideration a plan which of course, is not matured, but our officers are now giving their attention to it—to see whether we could not heat these

buildings with gas. Then the necessary apparatus would not be in the building, but below the hill on the wharf, or on a platform built for the purpose; but this scheme has not reached that point, when I could say to my colleagues, it is feasible. Of course, before we adopt any new scheme, we must be sure that it will work properly, because it would never do to have these buildings without heat, especially when hon. members are here.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope that no attempt will be made to heat with coal without smoke-consuming apparatus. Coal heating was tried in the Western Block, and the result was the great disfigurement of the building, as any one can easily see on examination.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the number of cords used and the price of the wood?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot now say. It is done by contract, awarded every two or three years. The price is, however, increasing, because it is brought from a greater distance, and the supply is diminishing.

Mr. CHARLTON. The use of anthracite coal would obviate the smoke objection, and it would be much cheaper than wood.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that we would have to import it.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be cheaper though.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There would be some, but not a large saving, on account of the change in the heating apparatus.

Mr. BLAKE. That change would be once for all, and this is an annual charge with the rest of us, the change from coal to wood would not be so great; still the hon. gentleman does not pay the duty on coal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope that next year I will be in a position to give to hon. gentlemen a comparative statement of the different systems, and then hon. gentleman can judge of the saving. The next item is gas for the public buildings here, which is \$2,000 more for the same reason that I gave with respect to the heating.

Mr. LAURIER. Can we not hope that this Chamber will be lighted soon with the electric light?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That question has also come up; but we were not in a position to do it this Session. As the hon. gentleman is aware, there are a number of electric lights, and every inventor says that his light is the best of all. We wanted to see what light we might approve of, and one day a certain party, whom I will not name, as I do not wish to injure him, said his invention was to be seen in a certain street of a certain city; and I sent the chief architect of the Department, a mechanic and an engineer with the gentleman to see it at night and report on it in the morning. My two officers then told me: We cannot accept that light, because it flickers, and therefore would not do, especially in the House of Commons, where the members must have a steady light, being there for a long time. We did not want to take the risk this year, but if, during the Recess we find a proper light, it will be decided whether we will not light these buildings with electricity. This light will answer better a large room like this or the Senate, than small rooms, for which I am told that it is too strong; and unless they invent something to dim the light, it will not do for small apartments.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We want a strong light at present, as there is a great deal of darkness in these buildings.

Mr. BLAKE. That great difficulty has been entirely overcome by the Edison invention, which can be more diffused than an ordinary gas light. Ordinary lamps are used, which are just the same, 16-candle power, and they are

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

divided down even to four-candle power, while the light is very steady. Most hon. gentlemen had an opportunity of seeing it—I was not able to avail myself of the occasion—at Cornwall lately, but I have seen it at New York, and certainly I cannot conceive of a more perfect light in all particulars. It was perfectly steady, and as bright and gentle as you might please to make it; certainly it was a very great improvement over gas light, and when we have to sit as we do here, for so many hours, consuming our eyes, it is of very great consequence to have the steadiest and brightest light possible. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. gentleman will find the Edison light very satisfactory.

Mr. VAIL. It appears to me that the Minister of Public Works is very wise in waiting for this light to be perfected before it is adopted. I notice that they were used a good while in London, England, at the Charing Cross Depot, a very large place, indeed, and although it was steady for fifteen or twenty minutes, the light then darkened, and afterwards flashed up again. I do not think that this light is at all in such a perfect state as would justify its production in a building like this until it is tried a little farther.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite true, that all the systems of electric light burning carbons, approached by machinery, and burning down, flicker and go out occasionally; these were used in London, in different cities of the United States, and in certain parts of Canada, to light outdoor areas, but they would not do for this building, while the Edison system, which is incandescent, succeeds without doubt to perfection. The flame is enclosed in glass, and cannot and does not flicker, and it gives a steady light. I think that not merely on account of the light, but of the purity of the atmosphere, the Government ought to experiment during vacation, and next year give us this light, because really the amount of gas burned here does vitiate the air dreadfully.

Mr. CARLING. It is very fortunately consumed.

Mr. CASEY. If we are to continue the use of gas, we had better make our own gas—I mean ordinary coal gas. The \$22,000 which gas costs us would pay the Government a rate of interest on a capital of \$500,000, and I think that we could put up a very expensive set of gas works for a good deal less than that, while we could easily improve on the city gas, which is both dear and bad.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will consider this subject carefully during Recess. Of course if we decide about putting them in this room I will take care that the gas jets remain as they are. The next item is for water, Public Buildings, Ottawa. The addition of \$100 to this item this year is to supply water to the Indian Office on Wellington street. The next item is for the allowance for fuel and light for Rideau Hall. Then we have telephonic service for Public Buildings, Ottawa, \$4,000. The amount asked last year was not expended, because we were not ready, and we had not enough money, but with \$1,500 more we will be able to have a telephonic service between these buildings.

Mr. BLAKE. Will that cover subsequent rates, or will there be an annual charge or rental?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for an exchange for a limited number of instruments with services in the offices of the heads of Departments, Banks, and other Public Buildings. There will be subterranean wires in lieu of suspended wires. The incidental expenses, salaries, &c., will be \$1,500 a year. The idea is that this service will be for the buildings, and if we want to communicate with the outside world, we will be put in connection with the city offices.

Mr. BLAKE. As there is to be a limited exchange there will be circuits in connection with the Buildings, and also with some of the principal institutions outside. An



annual charge of \$1,500 would seem to be a pretty heavy one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I think it is the exact amount which is charged now for telephonic connection, that is \$30 a year for each instrument. The next item is for salaries of engineers, firemen and caretakers, &c., of Dominion public buildings (hitherto paid by the respective Departments for which the services were performed). As these Custom Houses and other buildings are completed, we have of course to put proper officers in charge of them.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any portion of this expense in connection with the buildings here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I think not; it is for buildings in various cities and towns throughout the Dominion.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think it would be well to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the enormous sums which we are annually paying on Rideau Hall. Now that the hon. gentleman is erecting a building for the accommodation of public servants elsewhere, I think it would be well for him to consider whether he should not erect a suitable residence for the Governor General which would not require such enormous expenditures for fitting up and repairing as are required for Rideau Hall. The first cost of the building was \$80,819, and we have already expended, on additions and buildings of one kind and another, according to the Public Accounts, \$236,785. That old building has cost us in addition something like \$200,000 more for repairs. Last year the repairs alone amounted to \$22,254; the previous year \$5,439; in 1880, \$61,391, or altogether, since it was first purchased, including its cost, \$542,265, or over half a million dollars. I hope the hon. gentlemen will consider this vast drain on our resources every year. Lighting and heating is also a very large item, and the Department might well consider whether something could not be done to relieve us of a portion of that expenditure. I do not object to making the Hall a comfortable and suitable residence for His Excellency—it is due to the Governor General that it should be comfortable—but it certainly seems that one half a million dollars is a very large sum to have expended on a building which is certainly not a very fine one to look at, though I cannot say anything as to whether it is comfortable or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is true, a large sum of money has been expended on that building from year to year, but it was not a new building when it was purchased, and it had to be put in good order. Then it was found that large additions were required which cost large sums of money. It is not a very prepossessing building, but is, I understand, a very comfortable dwelling. It would please me and I have no doubt my colleagues very much, to be able to come down and ask for a vote for a new building, which would be more seemly if not more comfortable, and the time will come when we shall have to erect a new building either there or elsewhere, but I do not know whether we shall be able to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman so soon as he seems to desire. In the meantime, however, we must keep the building in proper order, in order that the Governor General and his household may be comfortable. I do not think last year's expenditure was at all extravagant. After an examination by experts, we removed the drains from the building, as the inmates were afraid of fever, and that cost a large sum of money. The heating has to be done with stoves, as there are no furnaces in the building; so we have had to spend a large amount of money for stoves and fuel. Altogether, I do not think we can reduce that expenditure if we keep the building comfortable.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 1st May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that as the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the time be extended until the 11th of May, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Railways, &c.

Motion agreed to.

### INLAND REVENUE ACT CONSOLIDATION BILL

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to consolidate and amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. Although this is apparently a very long Bill, it is merely a re-enactment of the present law, with a few changes in some clauses, which I will explain as we reach them. In the first clause the only change is adding the word "malt," which seems to have been an oversight, and then by adding the new sub-section C.

On section 2,

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is changed to the old Act. In the first place, the words "or cultivation of tobacco for sale" are omitted, on account of the changes you will find in the section referring to the subject of tobacco. Under the resolution already introduced, hon. members will have seen that in future we do not intend to have any supervision of the cultivation of tobacco at all.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman has not indicated where those words "or cultivation of tobacco for sale" are to be found. This Bill, like the Militia Bill, does not indicate what is omitted, and such cannot be found, except with the aid of a search warrant.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the fifth line of the seventh section, in the new Act, sections dealing with particular subjects are grouped together, so that section two, for example, of this Act, does not correspond with the same section of the old Act.

On section 8,

Mr. COSTIGAN. Sub-section four of section eight is new, and it reads as follows:—

If any Inspector of Inland Revenue reports to the Department of Inland Revenue, that it is not expedient that a license should be granted in respect of any building in connection with which the license is applied for, in view of its proximity to any such shop or premises as in the next preceding sub-section mentioned, the licence shall not be granted notwithstanding that the provisions of the said sub-section would not operate to prevent the granting of such license.]

Mr. LAURIER. I think the power taken is a very proper one, but it should not be placed in the hands of subordinate officers. I would suggest that the word "may" should be substituted for "shall."

Mr. COSTIGAN. I accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

On section 30,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The last proviso of sub-section three is an amendment of the old Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the object?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object is simply the convenience of the manufacturer. It was thought that these uninspected scales would not be used in weighing the raw material, or in ascertaining the manufactured product, but only in the intermediate processes of manufacture it might be a hardship to require the manufacturer to purchase new scales, when no injury to the public would be done by the use of the old ones.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to know the *raison d'être* for this change. It would seem if these scales are false, if they have not been verified, that there might be an injury to the revenue as well as to the public.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not see how that can happen, as the law makes ample provision for the protection of the public as well as of the revenue with regard to the use of unverified scales. But in this case the manufacturer might even guess at the quantity, say of tobacco, to be used in making a certain number of cigars, so that I can see no harm in his using these scales instead.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). As I understand this House, these scales are only used by the manufacturer in his own business, and do not determine the weight of what he gives to the public, or the weight of the material on which the duty is levied. They are simply private scales, for the purpose of showing that such a quantity of tobacco will make so many cigars, or so many plugs of tobacco, as the case may be. You are giving a legal status to scales that are no scales at all. If a man chooses to use a scoop shovel, or to guess the quantity, I do not see how you can make him amenable to the law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There may arise a necessity for this provision. It may be that the clause will bear the construction that the hon. gentleman gives to it, but I think that would be a strained interpretation. If the hon. gentleman reads the section, he will find, I think, that under it neither the public nor the revenue will suffer.

On section 37,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not the wording of this section give greater weight to the oath of a person, than to the statement of the owner of a manufactory? The Department may at any time examine a person who has left the employ of a manufacturer, and upon his testimony, may reject the written, and in fact sworn statement of the manufacturer, or his bookkeeper.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No complaints have been made to my knowledge, against the working of this provision; but if the hon. gentleman thinks there is any serious objection to the wording of the clause, I am willing to allow it to stand.

On section 57,

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is a reduction of the warehouse fee here, from \$40 to \$10 for each additional warehouse.

On section 58,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is a new clause and reads as follows:—

The Governor in Council may order that an Inland Revenue Bonding Warehouse shall be established at any place or places specified in such order; and such order shall prescribe the storage dues, and the license fee to be paid by persons using such Inland Revenue Bonding Warehouse, but such license fee shall not exceed ten dollars per annum: Provided always, that all goods stored and kept in any Inland Revenue Bonding Warehouse established under the provisions of this section shall be stored and kept at the risk, in every respect, of the

Mr. LAURIER.

owner thereof, and that any damage or loss by fire or otherwise shall not give rise to a claim for indemnity by the owner.

This section is put in for the convenience of the trade.

Mr. DALY. I am happy to see this clause introduced. It remedies the evils we have felt for some time.

On section 64,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The second sub-section is a new section. We make this alteration so as to apply to all manufacturers instead of to distillers, as it was in the old Act.

Mr. LAURIER. There seems to be no reason why an exception should be made.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The difference is that in the first case what is taken is taken from the manufacturer and paid for; in the second case, the material taken is in order to ascertain the degree of moisture, and it is given right back to him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it must be remembered that after tobacco has been tested for moisture it is utterly worthless. When samples of tobacco, worth \$1 or \$1.25 per lb, are taken from say 100 bales, the amount is considerable, and the Department should pay for it as it is taken for Departmental convenience.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Only very small quantities are taken to ascertain the degree of moisture. All these changes have been made after full consultation with the officials throughout the country, and with the manufacturers themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. The principle is a wrong one, that you should compel a man to supply these samples without paying for them, which in the aggregate may amount to a pretty large sum. The first part of the section provides that an officer shall not take any of these samples without payment being made; but the latter part states that he may take samples of tobacco and not pay for them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The section does not state the quantity he shall take as samples. If the manufacturer is not on very good terms with the officer, the latter may take a pound to test. The section gives a power to officers which they should not possess.

On section 68,

Mr. LAURIER. The language of this section is so vague that it may place tyrannical power in the hands of the inspector or collector. There is nothing definite about it; it says, if any person does anything "in the opinion of the officer." I think the section should be reconsidered.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This section applies only when the officer is in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. LAURIER. The power already given to officers is very strong. If the rules and regulations imposed on manufacturers are complied with that should be sufficient.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman takes an extreme view of the case, and presumes that the officer is going to abuse his position.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not do so; but the hon. gentleman will agree that in an Act of this kind, which is an infringement of the liberty of the subject, it is only right and proper that officers should be kept within strict rules, and not be in a position to place annoyances, not contemplated by the Act, on manufacturers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is only a collector who can exercise this power. The officers will have to report to him, and he will have to use his judgment in the matter. I agree with the hon. gentleman that no restrictions should be imposed that are not absolutely necessary, but I think this restriction is necessary.

On section 71,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask my learned friend if there is not a protection given to the defendant in that case, which is not given in ordinary law.

On section 76,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to say a word or two in a general way with reference to this Bill. It only came into our hands yesterday, and it contains 374 clauses, between 50 or 100 of which are new clauses. I have been endeavoring to read the Bill, and was at work until twelve o'clock last night, and for a good while this morning, in order to understand it and know what it was. I then come to the House and find that it has been taken up. The new clauses are intricate, and yet some hon. gentlemen cry "carried, carried," as they are called. The hon. Minister ought to be satisfied to get this Bill through in two or three days, as it entirely remodels the whole matter. I do not want to make a complaint, but I do not think that we ought to have gone on with this Bill to day at all. This is a new clause, and I am at a loss to see the necessity of it. I think that it is too stringent, and that it ought to be struck out.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Then we would have to strike out clause eighteen.

Mr. PATERSON. I know that; but there are a good many clauses which I would like to strike out. Clause eighteen was passed before I came in. How do you interpret, for instance:

Every manufacturer who neglects or refuses to keep his license posted as required by section 18 of this Act, shall incur and pay a penalty of \$50 for the first offence, and of \$100 for each subsequent offence.

Of course, I cannot now speak on clause eighteen, which was passed unfortunately when I was not in the House; but I have made a note of it. What is meant by "subsequent offence," if you do not have the license posted?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose it means notification, if the license is not up.

Mr. PATERSON. He is notified, and then the official comes in an hour after, and the license is not up. Is that a subsequent offence; and if another hour elapses, is that another subsequent offence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. By section eighteen, we provided for the posting of licenses on the premises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not exactly that; it was as follows:—

18. Every person licensed under this Act, shall keep his license posted in a conspicuous place in his manufactory."

All the licensee has to do is to stick it up, and keep it up; and this provision being in the Bill, something must be done to enforce it; if it is not posted up under section eighteen, the offender must be punished under section seventy-six.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not see the necessity for it. Only the license is issued, and suppose it is destroyed, or torn down from its place in the shop or store, a new license cannot be got. All these difficulties present themselves.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All you have to do is to prove that, and it will be renewed.

Mr. PATERSON. If any good purpose could be served by posting the license I could understand it. Why should it be posted up, when a record is kept of every manufacturer who is licensed, and this is entered in a book and numbered, the officers of the Government have it. It is known to the Department, and why licenses should be kept posted up, is something which I cannot understand.

Mr. BOURBEAU. All we have to do is to prove that we have posted up the license. When a store keeper gets a license, he is obliged to have it posted up in the store. If the license becomes torn, or is in some manner removed,

all we have to do is to prove that we have posted up the license.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This relates to manufacturers, and not to store keepers. The Government, in the first place, have a record of every manufacturer who is licensed. They have this entered and numbered. They know all about the manufactory, and where it is—they cannot help knowing where it is—and why a man should be required to keep his license posted up, and a penalty of from \$50 to \$100 enforced, if it is torn down, I cannot comprehend. The license is guarded carefully, in some special drawer, and it is always kept there. Under another section the burden of proof is thrown on the man; and why should the license be stuck up where some person may have access to it and destroy it? If the Department knows that a man has a license, what object can be served by this provision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is done for the same reason that such notice has to be put up in steamboats—a copy of their license, and all the regulations. Captains have to put up such notices, and also inn-keepers, licensed to keep spirituous liquors.

Mr. PATERSON. Can the hon. gentleman tell the practical use of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to tell the public that he is a licensed dealer, and not an illicit dealer. This gives notice to the public.

Mr. DAVIES. The only force in the objection is in the imposition of a penalty of \$50. If a license is torn down inadvertently, only a nominal fine would then be imposed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it is torn down, there would be no nominal fine.

Mr. DAVIES. No discretion is left. There must be a fine of \$50.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is only done if a man refuses to comply with the law.

Mr. DAVIES. If the fault is due to inadvertency, it is not reasonable to fine a man \$50; but if it is due to any other cause, then this would be reasonable. I think that we can meet the difficulty by saying that the offending party should pay a fine not exceeding \$50.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask us to go back to section eighteen which has already been passed without the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the posting of the license can be any great inconvenience, but I certainly think the penalty is an extremely severe one. Would it not be well to make the penalty not more than \$50, leaving the amount to the discretion of the magistrate after considering the circumstances of the offence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is simply the order of the Statute that every manufacturer shall keep his license posted. That is an easy thing to do, and if he does not do it he neglects or refuses to do it—to use the words of the Statute—and he pays the penalty. If he neglects or refuses he must do so perversely, and therefore he should pay the penalty. If the license is torn down, or taken off, then he does not refuse, and he is not liable to the penalty. The intention must be willful, or there cannot be neglect or refusal.

Mr. LAURIER. The argument of the right hon. gentleman justifies my contention. I say that he should not pay the same penalty for neglect as for refusal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the hon. Minister might tell us whether the lack or absence of such a provision has produced any evil results in the past. For my own part I am utterly at a loss to conceive what additional

security such a clause can give the Department. The Inland Revenue Law is at any rate an annoying and vexatious—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not to the honest dealer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, to all dealers; because the Department, in watching the honest dealer, is forced to take strong steps to guard against fraud, and they feel constrained to word the Statute so strongly that it is almost impossible for any man, honest or otherwise, to comply with it. For that reason there should be no vexatious restrictions placed in the law unless for a specified and a good purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand it, the law imposes heavy penalties upon vendors of leaf tobacco who sell to any but licensed manufacturers; and in order that they may know at a glance whether they are selling to licensed or unlicensed manufacturers, the notice should be put up where it may readily be seen. Then the seller has no excuse.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I candidly confess that that is the reason, though I have not seen it before. The Inland Revenue Law deals with so many matters that we are all apt to look at it from our particular point of view, and perhaps to overlook matters which do not pertain to that branch with which we are most acquainted. But is the penalty not rather severe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not, considering that perverseness must be shown before the penalty can be imposed.

On section 77,

Mr. SCRIVER. I would call the attention of the hon. member for Halifax to part of this fifth sub-section. It provides that all horses, vehicles, and so forth, which are used for the purpose of removing spirits, malt, &c., to be used in producing any articles subject to Excise in contravention of this Act, shall be liable to be seized, and may either be destroyed when and where found, or removed to some place for safe keeping. That would seem to imply that the horses may be destroyed and might bring up the question of cruelty to animals.

Mr. RICHEY. There is nothing here providing that the destruction of the horses—if any are to be destroyed—shall be cruelly done. I remember some hon. gentlemen opposite objected when we attempted to provide that animals might be destroyed under certain circumstances.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman will see, however, that there may be cases in which it would be proper and necessary to destroy them. I think the intention of the clause was not to take the life of the horses, but to destroy the vehicles. Probably there has been an oversight in wording it.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey) will not pretend to say that it is necessary, or in the public interest, that horses seized on occasions of this kind should be destroyed. The seizing officer will have a perfect right to exercise his sole judgment and discretion, with reference to seizing and destroying the man's horse. I do not think the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue intended that such a course should be pursued.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think that we shall differ as to that. The Act provides that these things shall be forfeited to the Crown, and the officer shall have the benefit of them; so that he is not likely to destroy them.

On section 78,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Supposing a man is engaged in the manufacture of other lines of goods besides tobacco; would the seizure provided by this section cover those other goods, or only the line that is subject to Excise?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it covers all that is in the premises.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would not, I think. It ought to be sufficient to seize the offending stock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the stock that offends, but the man, and he is liable for all that is there.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But he offends as to this stock, and if you seize that stock alone, it ought to be sufficient. He may have \$10,000 or \$15,000 worth of goods there besides the particular line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he will take the greater precaution. This is the old law, which I have no doubt was copied from the English Excise Law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman will know that businesses are very much more divided there than here, and probably the question has never arisen there.

On section 79,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a clause of the old Act which I think was too stringent also. The Act provides that a return shall be made on the first of every month. On the sixth of the month the duty becomes payable. That day might be a very busy one for the manufacturer, and he might forget to send down his cheque for the duty. In that case he would be liable to lose all his stock. I think it might be provided that the officer shall remind the manufacturer on the sixth of the month, and give him six hours notice. Another clause gives the officer the right to share in the proceeds of the seizure, and thus makes it his interest that the man should neglect to pay the duty, and that the seizure should take place.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This clause is from the old Act, and it has not been found to work harshly. If the sixth day should be a busy day there is no reason why the manufacturer should not pay on the fourth. The objection urged by the hon. gentleman that the officer being a participator in the proceeds of the confiscated goods will not exist under the present law, as it will provide that the officers above the rank of an exciseman shall not participate in the fines, because the seizures are not made by them, but by the officers under them. As the collectors are required to act as Judges, it is thought that they should not participate in the fines, so that the public will have full confidence in their decisions.

Mr. PATERSON. There ought to be some one to see that the duty is paid, as it is possible a man in business might forget to attend to it. It would not be too much to require that an officer should, on the fifth or sixth day, give notice that the duty is due; but when it is his interest that the merchant should forget to pay—when he gets a share in the forfeiture—he will be careful not to take any such steps.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You could not expect officers who might be a mile and a-half distant to go round and give the notice.

On section 80,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This clause is changed by imposing two different penalties. The party who puts up these illegal packages is guilty of a misdemeanor, and the party who sells the package also incurs a penalty.

On section 82,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is the old Act, the only change being the addition of the words "except as permitted by the Act," and the words, in the fifth line, "or in whose licensed premises there shall at any time be found any box, &c.," and the words in the old Act, section 155: "without first giving an exact return or account, with a description of such packages, and of the marks or labels then upon them, to the officer of Inland Revenue under whose survey his premises are obtaining a permit thereto," are left out.

Mr. LAURIER. These words left out have a great bearing on the clause. The clause in the old Act means that if a person does any of the acts mentioned without first giving an exact return, he shall incur a penalty; but you amend the Act by saying that, whether he gives a return, whether he is innocent or not, he shall be fined.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Circumstances have changed, which make this change absolutely necessary. There is no necessity for these articles being brought into factories at all, and the fact of their being brought there we must presume to be evidence of fraud.

Mr. LAURIER. There may be cases where they are not brought in with fraudulent intent, and no opportunity is given to establish that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not want parties to bring in these packages at all, and therefore we struck out the notice under which they would have an excuse to bring them in.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This seems to be a very stringent enactment. Supposing a person brings into a cigar store an empty cigar box and sets it on the counter, and an Excise officer comes in and finds it, would you fine that vendor \$500 and seize his whole stock?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is only consistent with sub-section F of section 247, which provides that manufactured tobacco of every description should be put up in new packages.

On section 83,

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is the old Act, with a few additions. In sub-section two, the words "tobacco press, cutting machine, or knife," are added. In sub-section four, the word "plan" is added. In sub-section five, the words "collector of Inland Revenue" are added.

Mr. PATERSON. We find here entirely new features. I take exception to the provision concerning tobacco presses, cutting machines, or knives. It is well known that in some manufactories, the men, after using up their old knives, throw them away and buy new ones with their own money, as they cost but a few cents. The manufacturer does not know anything about it, and he has no means of knowing; and still you propose to make him liable to have his whole place seized for the acts of his men.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think that he is supposing a case which is not likely to occur.

Mr. PATERSON. It occurs every month or two when a man throws away his knife. The language does not permit any deviation from it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. How does the hon. gentleman expect that control can be exercised otherwise?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no necessity to control the number of knives in a tobacco manufactory, and no good object can be served by putting these words into the clause.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the regulations they are required to make a report of everything that is required. If they require one knife, or ten knives, they are supposed to state that. If one of the men found his knife useless, and replaced it by a new one, of course that will not be looked upon as a violation of the law.

Mr. LAURIER. I can well understand that the Department should have control of all the stock owned by the manufacturers. But if the men furnish their own knives, it is impossible to expect that the Department will hold the manufacturers responsible for those knives.

Mr. BOURBEAU (Translation). I always understood that the manufacturers furnished the knives, but if they oblige their employes to furnish their own knives I think we can

compel the latter to declare the number of knives of which they make use. I think after this Act the manufacturer can oblige the employes to furnish the necessary knives to cut tobacco, or he can furnish them himself. If he furnishes them himself he will have control of the number of knives used in manufacturing; if, on the contrary, he obliges the employes to furnish the knives, he can fix the number which they may use, and remove from the factory those which they do not use.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We will strike out the words "or knife," but leave the rest in.

On section 86, sub-section 8,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). These penalties are very disproportionate. A manufacturer has to make a monthly statement. If it is not made on the first of the month he is liable to a penalty of not less than \$50, nor more than \$300; for the second and subsequent offence he is liable to a penalty of \$500, together with a further penalty, equivalent to double the amount of the license fees, duty or other impost payable under this Act, on any spirits, malt, beer, manufactured tobacco, cigars, stock, goods manufactured in bond, or materials for manufacturing them. In the case of one of the large manufacturers the penalty for simply omitting to make that return on the first day of the month would be equal to not less than \$50,000 or \$100,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We have suggested only such changes as are necessary; the other sections are from the old law, respecting which no changes have been made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am not complaining of the new Bill; but I contend that the old Act is too stringent, and you are making it more stringent and difficult to work up to. My opinion in regard to penalties—and I ask the first man if there is not some force in my contention—is this: A certain penalty is imposed for the first offence; for the second offence a very heavy penalty is imposed, and, in addition, the Bill provides for forfeiture of stock. That is, proportionately, a far heavier penalty on a large manufacturer than on a small manufacturer. I will not say that the former is more respectable, but it cannot be argued in the other direction; but when it comes to a question of forfeiture it means that the former pays \$1,000, while the latter pays \$1. The principle is not a fair one, although it is in the old Act. The penalties are too severe, and might be relaxed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very true that some of the penalties may be excessive, and that the whole system of penalties may be wrong; but I take it that we cannot consider this question now. If we are going to take up this question of penalties, their cumulative character, their varieties of amount, we must make a special study of it. This Bill is simply a consolidation of the Statutes, with the addition of some amendments. Both in England and here, we find it difficult to carry consolidation of laws, from the fact that although clauses may not be altered in any way from the old Act, hon. members may discuss them, and this fact has caused great restriction in passing Consolidation Laws in England, and Bills have several times been abandoned on that ground. This Bill is not only a consolidation but an amendment, and the effect of the whole Bill being discussed *de novo* will be that an hon. member, or a Minister, wishing to amend and consolidate an Act will not introduce a consolidation Bill but simply a Bill with a few clauses containing the amendments to the old law which he seeks, the amendments being judged on their merits; and great inconvenience will be caused to the public, professional and otherwise, for there will be half-a-dozen amending Statutes, as the Government will not bring down consolidation Bills, because their discussion may re-open the whole question. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) really objected to the whole system of penalties, and desired it to be reconsidered,

he may enter into the subject. But the Bill does not propose to readjust the penalties. The hon. Minister introduces certain clauses on that and on other subjects from the old Act for convenience sake, just as they are, and wishes the Committee to pass them. The hon. Minister offers amendments, and if they are accepted they become part of the Bill; but we would never get through with any consolidation Bill if every clause were considered *de novo*.

Mr. LAURIER. All these penalty clauses are very severe, but in my judgment there is no remedy. All Excise Laws must be so; it is not the fault of the law itself, but of the system which is a consequence of the Excise Law.

On section 97,

Mr. WILSON. Power is given under this clause to commit offending parties to prison for a period not exceeding two years. This is certainly giving very extensive power to the courts in cases where a money penalty is involved, and I would like to call the attention of the Government particularly to its severity.

On section 109,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice that though this section has been amended it contains the same objectionable principle which appeared in the old Act; and I think, as the Minister has struck out that principle from another clause, he should go further, and not allow any participation in the penalties by any officer in the Excise whatever. The excisemen are the men who have to look after the manufacturers, and the tendency would be that they might wink at a mere oversight on the part of the manufacturer with a view of sharing in the profits afterwards. I think this is a most injurious principle, and it involves a great source of danger, as, in my opinion, there should be no law on the Statute-book which would allow any unworthy person who might creep into the service to wink at any innocent oversight or neglect on the part of the manufacturer. It should be the duty of the exciseman, so far as he has the power, to see that the manufacturer carries out the strict requirements of the law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The reason why we changed the law with respect to collectors is one which does not apply in the case of other officers. I believe thoroughly in giving the Excise officers an interest in the seizure so that they may look after any attempts to defraud the revenue. The reason we excluded the collector from any participation in these fines was that he was not, properly speaking, the seizing officer, but a man who was called upon to act as Judge, and should, therefore, be in a position to ensure respect for his decisions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then, Sir, I entirely dissent from the hon. Minister. The principle is an utterly wrong one, and one that should be without any justification in any assembly. If a manufacturer makes a certain omission on a certain day—if he should make a mistake with regard to one out of hundreds or thousands of packages which may be going out of his shop from day to day—if he should, during the hurry and turmoil of business, be guilty of one of the very little trifling neglects which it is almost impossible to avoid, you offer a direct inducement to the officer of the Excise to allow the manufacturer to do so because he shares in the fines, which may, perhaps, amount to hundreds and thousands of dollars. It may be that he shares to the extent of thousands of dollars, for a man's whole stock of \$50,000 or \$100,000 worth of goods may be seized under this clause; and he a competent witness. He whose duty it is to see that the manufacturer does carry out the law, who may know that the manufacturer had simply forgotten, who may know that the manufacturer is an honest man, and had no intention of fraud. This provision offers him an inducement to let that manufacturer forget, because the seizure can then be made, the penalty levied, the man's

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

stock confiscated, and he shares in it. I say the principle is wrong, no matter who defends it.

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

### After Recess.

On section 115,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would suggest that a concise set of those Departmental Regulations should be placed in the hands of each holder of a license.

On section 171,

Mr. ORTON. In regard to this clause, I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to the change in the law of the United States in regard to the import duty on malt. As hon. members of the Committee are doubtless aware, there is now a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, instead of 20 cts. a bushel as formerly, and they have also reduced the duty upon barley imported from Canada, from 15 cts. to 10 cts. per bushel, which, no doubt, is a considerable advantage to the Canadian farmers, thereby affording them a better opportunity for obtaining a market for their barley in the United States. At the same time, it is also important to the farmers of this country, and to the large malting interest in Canada, that our maltsters should be, to some extent, encouraged, and, if possible, some equivalent be given to enable them to compete with the maltsters of the United States, thus affording competition in the barley market of Canada for the barley produced by our farmers. It has been suggested that there should be even a further drawback upon the malt which is exported; and, for my part, I do not see that it would be at all injurious to the interests of any class, and it would place the maltsters of Canada upon a fair footing with the maltsters of the United States, and the result would be highly beneficial, not only to the large malting interest of Canada, but to our farmers who are engaged so largely, and from year to year are engaged more largely, in the production of barley. It will not be out of place to refer to another matter while this clause is under consideration, which I think is also of great importance, and to which I have had the honor of directing the attention of the House on former occasions, that is a change in the law with respect to the duty—as to whether the duty should be collected from malt or from malt liquors. As the Committee are doubtless aware, a fierce battle was fought in Great Britain in regard to this question. The farmers of Great Britain desired to have the duty taken off malt, for the important purpose of enabling them to use malt in feeding cattle; and as we are competing, not only with the cattle feeders of Great Britain, but also with those of the United States, it is eminently desirable that this country should be placed on an equal footing in regard to this industry in regard to other countries. I do not see why malt should not be obtained by our farmers for feeding purposes in a very simple and easy manner. The Government of the United States have, for a number of years, pursued a policy there which has worked very satisfactory. They have collected the duty, not from malt but from malt liquor, by a system of stamps—stamps being placed on each package sent out of the brewery or other place where malt liquors are manufactured. The result has proved, as I have said, to be highly beneficial. A great saving, it is said, is effected in the Inland Revenue Department of that country by that system, and brewers are not subjected to the same difficulties they undergo under the system in vogue here. It is true that in Great Britain no farmers are allowed to use malt, and the duty is now collected from malt liquors. The same system does not exist. The duty there is collected from so much per gallon on malt liquors instead of on malt, and the farmers have the advantage of using malt for feeding

purposes. In respect to this point, of the benefit of malt for feeding purposes, I desire to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that nearly all artificial feeds which are sold so largely in Canada, and are used so extensively for the fattening of cattle, have malt for their principal ingredient. We find that when grain is malted its feeding qualities are much increased, and that cattle can be fed upon such food at less cost, and fattened more rapidly. I hope the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue will bestow attention to this matter. I presume it is rather late in the Session to have the change made; but if he can possibly see his way clear to have the alteration effected, I think it would be an immense benefit to the farmers of this country, as well as to the brewers. It is very true that some large brewers in the cities prefer the old plan of collecting duty on malt. It is very well known that the brewers in Great Britain fought against the farmers on this question, and insisted on having the duty collected on malt, for the large and wealthy brewers thus prevented small brewers from starting in business; and the same feeling exists in this country. The wealthy brewers in our large cities prefer to have the duty upon malt, but the small brewers in the rural districts desire to have the duty taken off malt and placed upon beer. I may say that a very strong feeling is felt by agriculturists engaged in feeding cattle with reference to this question, and I have been urged by a great many leading agriculturists of Ontario to press this question on the Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This section will stand over.

Mr. DUNDAS. I might just say that if the proposed change were made in the manner of collecting the revenue—if the Excise duty were placed on beer instead of on malt—I think this would be a good argument and a good reason why the Government should grant a rebate or drawback on malt exported; but while the duty is collected as it now is, I do not think the change should be made.

Mr. ORTON. I am urging that the duty should be collected, not on the malt, but on the beer.

Mr. DUNDAS. I think that it would be bad policy to grant a drawback on malt at the present time, owing to the action of the American Government recently, in changing the duty upon barley and malt. We can, of course, carry this system of drawbacks too far; and I think that while it is well to have our legislation regulated in accordance with our convenience and requirements, under the present circumstances it would not be good policy to grant a drawback on malt exported to the other side, since no revenue is collected on the malt which is now exported.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move that the word "eight" in the forty-fifth line, thirteenth page, be changed to "four;" this duty refers to revenue collected on fermented beverages made in imitation of beer or malt liquor.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What effect will this have on the revenue?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The revenue from this source does not amount to anything.

On section 236,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Sub-section N provides for the affixing of cigar stamps on packages of cigars. The old law required the stamps to be fixed by an officer of the Department. I wish to know if the hon. Minister intends that rule to be continued.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The whole system of stamping will be changed after the 1st of July. It will be made more convenient for the manufacturer than before. It will be hardly fair to make the officers affix the stamps.

On section 239,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the manufacturers will give a statement of the number of hands employed, in a monthly return.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; in the monthly returns.

On section 244,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under this, a manufacturer might be prohibited running a broom factory in connection with a tobacco factory. I can understand keeping cigars and tobacco separate, because that is the intent of the law; but I presume the Department will exercise discretion in this matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; it leaves the Department to judge. If it be a business not incompatible with the manufacture of cigars or tobacco the Department will not interfere.

On section 246,

Mr. PATERSON. "The Inland Revenue Act provides," &c.: is that all to be put in this notice down to the bottom of the clause?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes; all that will be in the notice. The four words "Raw Leaf Tobacco Entrance" are to be over the entrance, and the rest is the notice showing the requirements of the law.

On section 248,

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a new item which I explained when the resolutions were introduced. A drawback of 2 per cent. on the value of the stamps used shall be allowed to manufacturers of foreign leaf tobacco, on the ground that they have to pay in advance a large amount of money. When they pay in advance of course we can run no risk, and as a sort of indemnity to them we allow that drawback.

On section 258,

Mr. PATERSON. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the 25 lbs. standard? My own impression is that it is ample.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We find, from the experience of the Department, that 25 lbs. of leaf should produce 1,000 cigars. Should that be found too high an estimate the Governor in Council takes power to change it.

On section 294,

Mr. DUGAS. The sum of \$10 seems to be rather high for a producer's license, and altogether disproportionate. It is certainly very unjust to place it at this figure, and it ought to be made nominal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I agree with the hon. gentleman. It was not intended to fix this license at \$10, but at a lower rate; and I think that \$2 would meet the case, while we will not, in my opinion, lose anything by the substitution.

On section 299,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause is as follows:—

"All raw leaf tobacco imported shall be bonded at one or other of the above-named ports of entry, in a Customs warehouse, which shall be subject to the approval of the Collector of Customs at the port of entry."

And the next clause is thus worded:

"All imported raw leaf tobacco shall be weighed by the proper officer of Customs at the port where it enters the Dominion; and the importer or owner thereof shall provide all necessary appliances for weighing the packages and their contents, and all labor necessary for moving, piling or handing such packages."

On section 323,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would just say, once for all, that many of these penalties seem to be unduly severe. I quite admit the difficulty the Department is under in not being able to distinguish between neglect and fraud. In a clear case of fraud I am quite willing that a heavy penalty should be imposed; but the danger is that the penalty might sometimes be imposed for a mere omission or mistake, which the Department might take to be a fraud.

That a man should be laid under penalties for a simple omission to put up a notice in his office, or because a box should have found its way into his place without his knowledge or design, does seem to me to be rather harsh. I quite admit the difficulty in discriminating between the fraudulent dealer and the man who merely makes a mistake. I think there ought to be some latitude taken by the Department to itself. Some discretion should be given to its superior officers to exercise in these matters. They can generally tell whether there has been fraud or not through the character of the individual, or the nature of the circumstances.

On section 326,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is an illustration of what I have just said. An omission on the part of a manufacturer's clerk involves him in a penalty of \$1,000, and not less. No latitude whatever is allowed the Department to judge whether this is a mere accidental omission or error, or a fraudulent one.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose that this section be altered by making it read not less than \$200 or more than \$1,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I have never manifested at any time so much confidence in the Government, but I really do not like them to tie themselves up so that they have no discretionary power. If a case occurred in which they knew the party was not to blame they would have no choice but to impose the penalty.

On section 37,

Mr. PATERSON. The difficulty I mentioned before was, that after the oath is signed by the manufacturer the Department thereafter might bring up a person who had been in his employ, to give testimony, and if this person should testify contrary to the testimony of the manufacturer it would be taken instead of the testimony of the latter. It is possible that an employé who has been discharged in order to vent his spite might go and allege that so-and-so was the case, and might not hesitate to swear in that way. It seems to me there is a value given to his testimony greater than that given to the other man. I think the testimony of one man should not be sufficient.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is a provision of the old Act, and as the public has not suffered anything from it up to the present time, I think we may as well let it go. The manufacturer might make a false oath, or do something wrong, and this gives the Department some latitude in such cases.

On section 46,

Mr. PATERSON. I took a well-founded objection to this point and I think the hon. Minister might very well yield it. It would be hard to make a man pay duty on goods that have been destroyed. Suppose a fire destroys the warehouse where goods are stored upon which duty has not been paid; the party not only loses his goods but he has to lose his duty as well. The goods have never gone into consumption, but the law proceeds on the assumption that the duty shall be paid by the parties who consume the goods.

Mr. HESSON. I think my hon. friend's objection is well taken. It is loss enough for the man to lose his stock without having to pay the Inland Revenue charge. I know cases myself where men have lost their goods after paying the duty, and they thought they were entitled to get it back.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the duty is once paid it becomes a portion of the Consolidated Revenue, and can only be taken out by vote of Parliament. But I think this clause might be amended. We know that, as a matter of fact, there are continual applications made to the Department of Inland Revenue to refund the duty when the goods

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

have been lost. I would propose, therefore, that the clause be amended by striking out all before the words "if destroyed or wasted" and adding "all goods warehoused shall be at the risk of the owner," and unless destroyed by fire duties shall be payable thereon as if they were entered for consumption.

Bill reported.

#### FIRST READING.

The following Bill, from the Senate, was read the first time:—

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Canadian Rapid Telegraph Company limited.—(Mr. Davies).

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 108) further to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of Pictou.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee.

121. Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia. .... \$63,350.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is Cow Bay \$12,000, to provide a new block of crib work 250 feet in length, and twenty-five feet in width, and to repair the north side of the breakwater, placing hardwood piles in all parts of it where they are worm-eaten and liable at any time to be destroyed. The fact is, that this work will be destroyed if not repaired as proposed. Benacadie Pond, Cape Breton, \$7,000, to complete the open passage and protect the sides of the same with crib work. South Ingonish, \$10,000. There is here required, in addition to the appropriation of last year, extensive repairs indispensable to place this work in safety, according to the estimate of the engineer. Cheverie, \$7,500, to extend the wharf northwards, to complete the arm 250 feet westward, and to form a harbor with a depth of twenty-two feet of water. This is to continue the work. Parrsborough or Partridge Island River, \$2,500 — to complete. This work was begun in 1881; it is to complete the deepening of the channel, which is used for the shipment of coal from the Springhill mines. The excavations were only pursued during low water each day, and consequently several seasons were taken up in performing the whole work required. Port Hood, \$12,500, to complete the work of repairing the pier with the view of restoring it to its former usefulness, in accordance with the estimate of the Chief Engineer.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Which of the piers is this—the mainland, or the one from the Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Engineer, on the 24th of last February, stated that this work was very seriously damaged during the gales of the latter part of the year 1881; and so much so as to render it useless as a landing pier, unless it is repaired to the extent of \$16,000; while to place this wharf in a thoroughly efficient condition a further sum of \$9,000 will be needed. The inhabitants of New Glasgow petitioned, in 1882, for a grant of money to repair the Port Hood breakwater. The petitioners state that the repairs prayed for are absolutely necessary to accommodate the steamers plying between Pictou and Port Hood. A considerable trade is carried on between the counties of Pictou and Inverness, &c.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is this wharf on the mainland?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is a breakwater.

Mr. CAMERON. Is the old pier on the mainland?

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not a breakwater.



Mr. CAMERON. It is the only breakwater there.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One was commenced on the Island, was there not?

Mr. CAMERON. No. One was proposed in 1878, but not built. Tenders were asked for, but the contract was never awarded.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This wharf is called a breakwater, at all events in the report of the Engineer. Coffin's Island, \$2,900, to complete the work begun a year ago. Fort Lorne, \$500, to complete the work. Three Fathom Harbor, \$1,000, to make additions required to the present breakwater, in a north-westerly direction, on the same plan as is followed by the present work for the purpose of strengthening the beach, as at present the sea during south-easterly storms breaks through.

Mr. VAIL. I understood the hon. Minister to say that this \$2,000 for Westport pier will be expended within the financial year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. I would just remind the hon. gentleman that I have the same complaint with regard to these grants which I made with respect to public buildings, namely, that they are all, or nearly all, in eastern Nova Scotia. There are works of quite as much importance required to be done in the west as in the east.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no intention of discriminating between the east and the west, and I have no doubt that the wind which carried me to the east will bring me back to the west.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what proportion of the money granted last year was expended, and how much he intends to expend of the present votes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to spend every dollar that may be usefully employed. Of course, if we find that the vote is too large we will expend only what is absolutely necessary.

Mr. KIRK. What proportion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say, because these votes for harbors and other works go on all the time. The amounts put at the disposal of my Department are intended to be expended, and will be expended within the time fixed by Parliament.

Mr. KIRK. I notice that the whole grant this year for Nova Scotia amounts to \$63,350, while last year it was \$109,450, or a difference of \$46,100. I fancy there are as many harbors in the Province of Nova Scotia as last year, but I do not think the Government have completed a great many breakwaters in those harbors. There were many grants made last year which were not expended—two in my own county, \$3,000 for New Harbor, in the county of Guysborough, another for Indian Harbor in the same county. The hon. Minister stated, some time ago, in reply to a question of mine, that it was found that the works would cost so much that it would be useless to expend the money. This may be true, and so far as the reports of the engineer go there is reason in what he says. But I fail to find that there has been any report laid before the Government since the grant was made. The matter stands in the same position to-day as when the vote was taken, and I cannot see how it was that the hon. Minister made up his mind, on information received since, that the work would cost so much. It is true that the engineer reported, in 1874, that the breakwater at New Harbor would cost \$53,500—that is such a breakwater as the Government sent the engineer to report upon. At that time it was the policy of the Government only to construct such breakwaters as were necessary for harbors of refuge

for general shipping. That is not the kind of breakwater which is wanted at that place, and, moreover, since 1874, the Government have changed their policy and have granted smaller sums for the protection of fishing craft. I notice that my predecessor last year, in applying to the Government, said he, too, thought \$4,000 would be sufficient to build a breakwater at New Harbor. I think that estimate was rather low; but I believe that \$10,000 would be sufficient for all necessary purposes. To show their interest in the matter, the people in the locality have actually subscribed \$15,000, and are prepared to work out that amount if the Government would make up the balance. I hope the Government will alter its decision with regard to this harbor. I should be perfectly satisfied, and I think the people would be satisfied, with \$3,000 to begin with, and if \$3,000 were voted next year I think it would be quite sufficient to build a breakwater. I do hope the hon. Minister will reconsider his decision, and recommend this sum now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I will give my consideration again to this matter; but I must state generally that when I obtain from Parliament a vote of money for a certain work, and I find afterwards that it will cost a great deal more, I do not go on with the work, because I do not think that would be fair to Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that our predecessors voted \$3,000 for this work. That is quite possible, but I may have found afterwards that it would cost a great deal more, and did not undertake it under the circumstances.

Mr. BLAKE. The observation of the hon. gentleman is very just, and I am very glad to hear that he adopts that course. I think I can see into the true inwardness of this matter. My hon. friend says that an officer of the Department stated that a very large sum—some \$53,000—would be required for this work. Of course, it was not on that report that my hon. friend acted in proposing the vote, but on the information of acting chief engineer Ogden, who told him that the \$3,000 would be enough. He also had certain confidence in acting chief engineer Ogden; but when he was no longer here to represent his views, he felt that he could no longer repose implicit confidence in him, and so he does not ask for the vote. I hope, however, that he will bestow equal favor on the views of acting engineer Kirk, as he did on those of acting chief engineer Ogden.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will not discuss this matter beyond this. I have expressed my willingness to listen to the hon. gentlemen now; but if the work is to cost \$10,000, or \$15,000, I certainly will not undertake it with \$3,000. That is the proper principle, and that is the principle upon which I intend acting in the Department.

Mr. KIRK. I am not finding fault with the hon. Minister for acting as he has done. The fact that the engineer of the Department reported that this work would cost \$53,000, was, I think, a sufficient reason for refusing to undertake it with \$3,000. But this report was given while the policy of the Government was not to undertake any work of a local nature. This policy, however, has been changed by the Government, they having decided to build smaller breakwaters for the benefit of the fishermen. What I would suggest is, that the Government send their engineer there again to see what a breakwater would cost that would be serviceable for the fishermen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a proper suggestion, and I will do that.

Mr. KEEFLER. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to an appropriation of \$5,000 that was made last year for a breakwater in the county of Lunenburg. I believe the money was not expended, and I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to expend it this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I see no reason why that vote should not be expended. Some of these votes are not expended, or only partially so, during the first portion of the fiscal year, but when the spring comes, we usually expend the vote.

Mr. KEEFLER. Am I to understand that this sum will be expended this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Mr. KIRK. The item of \$1,000 for Indian Harbor is in the same position as the vote for New Harbor, and I would like the hon. Minister to treat it in the same way.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say as to that; but if the engineer goes, he will report on that harbor as well as the other.

122. Cascumpec Harbor, P.E.I..... \$5,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. "Towards the deepening of the channel, 14 feet deep at low water from the inner bar of sandstone, from which there is now but from 10 to 11 feet deep, necessitating the removal by submarine blasting and so on." The work that is asked is only to make a smaller channel, because the other would cost too much.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it the intention to spend the appropriation of last year, also, during the present summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there will be \$10,000 expended this year. I could not ask for a larger sum, but kept the vote last year in order to have the two votes together and make something worth while.

Mr. DAVIES. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the appropriation of last year for Restigouche Harbor. The breakwater, which is a very valuable work, was about being finished last year when a schooner laden with coal was driven against it in a storm and damaged it to the extent of \$3,000 or \$4,000. The contractor sent a petition asking for compensation for this damage, which was not due to any fault of his. I would like to know if the hon. Minister has received that petition and will give it his consideration?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may have received the petition, but do not recollect it now. Of course it is in the Department. When was it sent?

Mr. DAVIES. At the beginning of the Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will understand that my time is fully occupied during the Session in Parliament and at the Council. After the Session I will take up these matters.

Mr. DAVIES. I am quite aware of that. Of course it is a very unfortunate accident for the contractor, and is hampering him so that he may be unable to complete the work, unless he receives some assistance at the hands of the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it.

Mr. DAVIES. With reference to the appropriation last year for Wood Island Breakwater, of \$3,000, no tenders have ever been called for to complete the work. Unless the money is expended there a good deal of damage will be done to it in its unfinished state. Does the hon. gentleman intend to spend that \$3,000 this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this matter has come again under my notice lately, for the purpose of increasing the vote, but I am not now in a position to give the information on this matter until the Supplementary Estimates come down. I will take a note of it.

Mr. DAVIES. I have received communications from the local members and other inhabitants, stating that unless some moneys are expended in protecting the existing breakwater during the coming summer, a great deal of loss will

Mr. KEEFLER.

ensue. A great deal had been expended by the Local Government on this work before this Government took charge of it. There is no harbor for eighteen or twenty miles, and this expenditure would give something of a harbor.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to ascertain whether the sum of \$4,000 appropriated for Campbell's Cove has been expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has not. There was some difficulty about the contribution of the local authorities, and correspondence has been going on with the view of getting that contribution. If the local authorities furnished stone and timber, &c., which, after being examined by the engineer was reported to be of the value of their contribution, of course I would accept that, but I must have the report.

Mr. McINTYRE. I always understood that the work constructed by the Local Government was equivalent to this \$4,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The money expended before Confederation had nothing to do with this vote. This must be an amount to be provided for by the local authorities on account of this vote of Parliament.

Mr. McINTYRE. What authority was there in granting the \$4,000 that they were to contribute \$4,100.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There must have been some assurance given by the local authorities or the parties who could speak for the people that this amount would be given, and therefore this condition was inserted. Whether the assurance was given or not I must stand by the condition imposed by Parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The vote says: "Campbell's Cove (the local authorities having already expended \$1,100.)" That is not a condition that they should raise another \$4,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may be that or this, that after having examined the matter we may have found it was a mistake. At all events the hon. gentleman may be sure that the money having been voted by Parliament it will be expended in accordance with the desire of Parliament in that respect.

Mr. McINTYRE. Have I the assurance that this \$4,000 will be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote says so.

Mr. McINTYRE. This is a very useful work, and I hope the sum placed in the Estimates last year will be expended on it as soon as possible, for if the work is not looked after, what is already done will be destroyed. It is the only work of the kind in that section of the country, and I only regret there was not a further appropriation this year. With regard to the South River, Murray Harbor grant, has this \$5,000 been expended for what it was granted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. I can hardly be expected to carry all these things in my head since last year. I might have ascertained if the hon. gentleman had given me notice.

123. Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick..... \$93,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$71,000 is to complete the breakwater at Negro Point. It was begun in 1877. Since this was begun about \$350,000 in round numbers have been expended.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A large portion of the expenditure is in consequence of a very violent storm that took place two or three years after it was built.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is the ordinary vote for River St. John, for the Madawaska River, and the

Rocher Bay Creakwater. At Rocher Bay an addition is to be constructed to the breakwater of 200 feet. The vote of \$5,000 for St. Mary's is towards the construction of a wharf 200 feet long by 20 wide. This is in Albert county. The \$5,000 for Grand Lake and Jemseg is for dredging the river at the outlet to the depth of 11 feet at the low summer water level.

Mr. WELDON. In what county is this Anderson's Hollow where \$4,000 is voted for addition to a pier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a question of geography I did not suppose I would be called upon to answer. The hon. gentleman knows better than I can tell him where these places are.

124. Harbors and Rivers in Maritime Provinces generally \$10,000 00

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman say how much of this was spent last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we must have expended \$5,000 or \$6,000.

125. Harbors and Rivers, Quebec .....\$177,700.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$6,000 for New Carlisle is to continue the pier that was begun two years ago. Then at Trois Pistoles, \$1,500 is to build a pier there. At Rivière du Loup (*en bas*), this \$1,000 is to finish the planking. Then \$7,000 is devoted to the dredging the channel between Chicoutimi on the River Saguenay, which has been going on for three years. Then there is a vote of \$5,000 for the enlargement of "La Grande Décharge" from Lake St. John. This vote will probably be the last for this purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. Will this make the channel from Chicoutimi to Lake St. John?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. The hon. gentleman will remember that it is between Chicoutimi. It had become so shallow that steamers could hardly get up there in ordinary weather.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would suggest that tenders be asked for the walls as soon as possible, in order that the work may be done during the proper season, as the weather during the fall is very trying.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is being attended to. The next vote is, Lake St. John surveys, \$4,000. There has been no survey of that lake and of the channel, and petitions have been presented asking that such shall be done in order to ascertain what improvement might be needed by the population settled along the lake shores; and therefore we ask for this small vote for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. What kind of survey is intended to be made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is proposed to ascertain, for example, the depth of water in the channel and between the island, in order that we may ascertain what are the best channels, and, if a wharf or more is necessary, where they should be built.

Mr. SCRIVER. Are there any boats on the lake now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are only small boats. With respect to Baie St. Paul, \$3,000 or \$4,000 will be required to complete the pier there. With respect to the removal of chains, anchors, boulders, &c., in the St. Lawrence River, I thought we could reduce that vote by half this year, because the work is very far advanced. The vote for harbor refuge at River Nicolet is to continue the work.

Mr. LAURIER. Has anything of the amount of \$20,000 voted last year been expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A portion of it, but not so much as I would have desired. The work has not pro-

gressed with sufficient rapidity, and the contractor has been called upon to show more vigor, and if he fails to do so the contract will be taken from his hands and given to another. The works at River Yamaska are progressing very rapidly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What class of vessels take refuge at these places?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At Nicolet, vessels which ply on the St. Lawrence take refuge. There is a long shoal extending there, and the improvements in progress of construction at the mouth of the river will make it a harbor of refuge. A number of vessels and lives have been lost in that neighborhood for lack of such harbor.

Mr. LAURIER. Has anything except dredging been done at Yamaska?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there have been a dam and lock built, in order to give a long stretch of navigation. When the reports were made, I reduced the work to one section, and this was undertaken. The vote of \$13,000 will be about sufficient to complete the work. With respect to Rivière du Lièvre, \$1,000 were voted last year. We will not spend more than \$1,000 during this fiscal year, and we ask for a revote of the \$4,000. There is a good deal of navigation up to the falls. The usual vote of \$10,000 is taken for general repairs and improvements of the harbors and rivers of Quebec.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I hope out of that vote the hon. Minister will be able to devote some amount in order to continue the dredging of the channel between Boucherville and Long Pointe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Petitions were presented to me asking that some dredging be done, and no doubt I will be able, with the consent of my colleagues, to do some dredging which will not cost much, but will be a great benefit to the population in the neighborhood. Philipsburg Harbor, Missisquoi Bay, Lake Champlain, locality furnishing an equal amount, \$4,000; this is only a revote. Etang du Nord, in the Magdalen Islands, \$9,000 to continue the work. A harbor of refuge by building up and sinking into position 175 feet of breakwater for which the timber is prepared, and 200 feet additional for which the timber was ordered to be cut last winter. I understand that this will be a very useful work. St. François, Island of Orleans, \$6,000. Quebec, Marine Hospital Wharves, \$2,000, to renew these wharves.

Mr. LAURIER. Was the whole of the \$4,000 expended last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. Matane, \$5,000. This work was undertaken by the hon. member for East York. Last year I asked for it, \$3,500, and this year I require \$5,000, with which I think I will be able to make good work of what has been done there up to the present time, and to complete the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This was an extension of the pier originally.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, towards the shore with which there was no communication; and consequently it was of no use to the people. A couple of the blocks were canted over by the ice, and these had to be righted at some expense. We will now extend and complete the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman will remember, that the timber and material were there for the purpose of performing this work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember this work perfectly well.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But these materials were sold by the hon. gentleman's orders. There was enough timber there, I believe, to complete the work, but the hon. gentleman did not allow this to be done.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. There were some toolst at this place, which were sold, as the hon. gentleman says, in 1879, I think; but after that and until last year, nothing was done. The information which I had about these piers was this: that the ice would certainly destroy them or cant them over. I found that this was correct, and money was asked for last year. What will be expended this year will not only complete the work, but will give a good entrance to the river to vessels which frequent that neighborhood. Isle aux Coudres, \$500, to complete a small work there undertaken. Berthier (*en bas*) \$7,500, to provide for the extension of the pier. River Blanche, which is four or five parishes below Rimouski, \$5,000. This is another work which the hon. member for East York undertook in his day, and which these \$5,000 will complete, by giving a landing from the shore. River St. Louis, \$10,000. This is to be applied towards the improvement of the River St. Louis, in the county of Beauharnois, with the view of increasing the supply of water, which will encourage manufactures and prevent the annual overflow of a large area of country.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether these \$10,000 will complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I am not sure of that; but we expect to do so with \$3,000 or \$4,000 more. The engineer, however, thinks it possible, that these \$10,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether any examination has been made of this territory, now overflowed, and whether the engineer is of opinion that any material benefit will be caused by the improvements on the river to this overflowed territory?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes. It will stop that altogether, and be a complete remedy for it.

Mr. SCRIVER. I hope so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Surely it is no part of our duty to undertake to drain lands. Upon what ground does the hon. gentleman propose this vote to this Parliament?

Mr. SCRIVER. That is an indirect advantage, as I understand it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It improves the river and by that means it remedies the evil of which the farmers have long been complaining. There is an old weir which was built there, but the work on which was never completed. The water flows there and thus drowns a large area of country. By the improvement proposed, the water will flow down and deepen the river, and all that part of the country will cease to be overflowed. This will turn a large volume of water into the River St. Louis, and thus this volume of water will create new water powers and increase the number of sites where manufactories may be created and begun.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then the object is to create water powers and to drain land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, it will produce that effect certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that the object of the vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, yes, that is the object of the vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then I think that this vote ought not to be made. It is altogether beyond our province.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, it is for as good a purpose as the taking of a few boulders from a river, or the deepening of a harbor, or anything of that kind. It is for the benefit of the public—for the general benefit. This comes under the same head. It is not for the advantage of one individual, but of a large extent of country, and also for the improvement of this river.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not the point. In many parts of Canada, the people are expending hundreds of

Mr. MACKENZIE.

hundreds of dollars, from municipal taxation, for the purpose of draining land. It is no part of our business to undertake the municipal work of the country. This is a municipal work. It is not to make this river navigable at all, that the money is asked for, but to create water powers and to drain the land, which is altogether beyond our province.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that it is for a good purpose and object. It is for the advantage of the public, in the same way that we build a pier, or improve the mouth of a river, or the navigation of a river. I think that this is a proper employment of the public money. Chicoutimi Pier, which is to be heightened a little, \$1,500; at Lanoraie, \$5,000 is to be expended on a pier, the locality furnishing \$1,500. At Percé, the county town of Gaspé, there is no accommodation of any kind in the way of a landing, and, in high winds, the people are exposed to being drowned. We ask for a vote of \$10,000 for this place. At River Batiscan, \$2,000 is to be spent for dredging and removing boulders at the mouth of the river. Then there is \$3,200 for Queen's Wharf, Quebec, for the purpose of removing some worn out face timber, driving piles to protect the front of the wharf, taking down a portion of the face timbers, &c. At Bic Pier we propose to expend \$7,500. At this place there is a large harbor where vessels may come in, and this is to make a small landing. The last item is \$1,500, for the River St. Francis, to remove boulders, and do a little dredging, to make the river more floatable.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman inform me how far up the river he intends dredging?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the improvement of Spicer's Rapid, where the greatest obstructions exist.

116. Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... \$267,300.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is to continue the work undertaken some years ago in Cobourg Harbor. This amount of \$20,000 will not complete the work. The plan is the one which was begun in my time and continued afterwards during the time of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). When the work is completed it will be one of the best harbors on the rivers or lakes. I think it will cost about \$50,000 more to complete. The next item is \$14,000 for Port Hope Harbor, a work which was undertaken some two or three years ago. This will not cover the whole expenditure, but I think a few thousand dollars more will complete the work.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is this for deepening the harbor and extending the piers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is first for completing the extension of the works on the east pier, \$3,000; then there is the amount of the contract for a breakwater from the western pier; and there is a sum for dredging.

Mr. SCRIVER. In looking through some of the accounts for these harbors last year, I notice that the work was almost all done by days' labor, and that the supplies appear to be purchased here and there from different store-keepers. Could not these improvements be done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to ask for tenders for this work. There may have been some expenditures, of that kind for small improvements coming in at the last moment, but there was a contract, and the intention is to have a contract for this work. The grant for Toronto Harbor, amounting to \$117,500, is to continue the work we began last year.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is the contract let, and for how much?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract is let to Messrs. Cook & Jones, but I cannot say at the moment for how much.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I believe one Mr. Eads, an American, was appointed to inspect the harbor. How much was he paid for this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$5,000.

Mr. ROSS. How long was he engaged?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He must have been engaged seven or eight months. The hon. gentleman may know that Captain Eads is a very eminent engineer in the United States. He distinguished himself by his works on the Mississippi River, which he succeeded in making navigable for very large vessels. Of course we had to pay, not only for the work he did, but for his position. His report was laid before the Government and also before the House. We are going on with a portion of that work, but we did not undertake all the works at the same time. We thought the first thing was to protect the harbor—to prevent the Island from being carried away, and thus leaving Toronto open to the Lake. That work is now going on, and I understand from my Chief Engineer, with great success. I hope that the work, when completed, will be a credit to the Government, and will secure to the citizens of Toronto that Island which they are justly so proud of.

Mr. ROSS. Is any work being done at the eastern end of the Island with the view of keeping open the gap?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The opinion was felt in Toronto that the eastern entrance should be closed. The engineers are not of that opinion. They think that an entrance should be left there, and that it will not damage the harbor, but be of great benefit to it. At all events if, at any time, it is thought proper to close it, it will always be easy to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did Captain Eads condemn the work that had been done last year at the western end of the harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; not that I know of.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understand that the entrance at the Queen's Wharf is all filled up again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I think not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. During my incumbency, I endeavoured to widen that channel; but the hon. gentleman cut across the neck extending to the Island, in a place where it was impossible to accomplish any results. That, I understand, has not only been abandoned but is absolutely filled up. I see from a late newspaper, that the land is made so fast that it is now within 200 yards of the wharf. Has the hon. gentleman any information about that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What the hon. gentleman says may be quite correct, but I have not been so informed. I know that after one or two storms, a great change has occurred in the formation of the island; but that cannot be avoided until our works are completed. I understand that the works we have undertaken have withstood the force of the storms, and that they are likely to remain permanent.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I would say to the hon. Minister, with reference to that harbor, that the channel is not now more than 200 or 300 feet wide, and it is filling up very fast—so fast that unless the passage at the eastern gap is kept open, in a very short time the western gap will be filled up.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The next item is \$4,000 for Rondeau Harbor; the money is required for dredging, as recommended by the Chief Engineer. The \$7,000 asked for Kincardine Harbor is for repairing and rebuilding.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is there any expenditure for dredging in Kincardine Harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, there is nothing in this vote; but there will be some dredging.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to speak about a harbor, in the immediate neighborhood of Rondeau Harbor, in regard to

which I moved for papers some time ago—I mean the harbor of Morpeth. I have been informed that, since I moved in that matter, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Smyth) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Hawkins), and certain gentlemen of the neighborhood, have been interesting themselves in the matter, and that some decision has been arrived at by the Government. I would like to know if the hon. Minister has any information on that subject?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman to-day. He will have to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down; and when I say that, I do not intend it offensively, because I cannot give the information now.

Mr. CASEY. I believe the case in favor of that harbor is very strong. As I said before, the people of the neighborhood contributed a considerable sum of money out of their pockets by private subscription, and this money has been lying useless, because not available for the purpose for which it was contributed until now; and I think, as a matter of justice, that the people of that district have a claim on the Government for a vote for that harbor. I do not know what influenced the hon. gentlemen from the neighboring ridings to interest themselves so much in my riding. I suppose they had reasons, but whatever they are, they matter very little to me; as long as they assist in inducing the Government to do justice, I will not complain. I would like to bring another matter to the attention of the hon. Minister. There is a place, in the same neighborhood, known as Port New Glasgow, to which my attention has been drawn by correspondence during the Session. It is at some distance east of Rondeau, and would afford a very desirable harbor of refuge; I am informed that there is a very good natural basin there. I hope the many harbors along that part of Lake Erie will engage his attention between now and next Session. They are places of considerable importance and deserve more attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case the hon. gentleman should be satisfied, because after all, the answer being not exactly no, he must still hope, *dum spiro spero*.

Mr. CASEY. I said, when the Government did intend to put items in the Estimates they should say so. In this case it has been said there was going to be a vote, and information that might be given to the House has been given to private members and the press.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt those hon. gentlemen, finding their case was good, thought the Government could not do otherwise than meet their case, but they cannot have stated this as a positive fact. I keep my own counsel, under my oath of office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They may have stated it as a prospective fact.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They see a long way in advance. A deputation came to me from that place, and I told them the matter would be taken into the consideration of the Government, as I stated to the hon. gentleman in the House. As for the new place, New Glasgow, I have not heard of it before. Port Elgin, this is to complete the work. Goderich Harbor, this is a revote of \$5,000 on the \$16,000 voted last year, as we could not complete the work last Session. Collingwood Harbor, this is a continuation of the works begun some three years ago. Warton Harbor, is a revote of \$5,000; the money expended has been about \$30,000, and with the \$5,000, we expect to complete the work. We thought it might strengthen, especially a portion of the pier, because the railway company intend, I think, putting an elevator there; and therefore it will be a great benefit to the place. Besides, Warton Harbor, as far as I know, not having visited the place, is a beautiful harbor. Meaford, to complete, \$3,000. Kingston Harbor, continuation of the work of deepening the harbor, \$12,500.

Little Current, also to complete the work, \$10,000. The next is the general repairs and improvements, Harbors and Rivers, Ontario, \$8,000; Maritime Provinces, \$10,000; Kingsville, Lake Erie, \$5,000 additional; River Sydenham, \$5,000, to continue the dredging of the river. The next is the Newcastle Harbor, to complete, \$8,000; Chantry Island, \$5,000; another sum may be required in the Supplementary Estimates, because the damage to the island and the damage to the lighthouse were such, that an additional amount will be required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is not the proper name Southampton?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not really Southampton, but Chantry Island proper. Most likely there will be another vote for Southampton. Besides the two large piers, we make a harbor of refuge. There is an inside pier of landing at Southampton that must be extended to deep water in order to prevent the accumulation of sand or refuse. Then we have the Otonabee River, \$1,200 required for dredging. Little Bear Creek, \$5,000; this is towards dredging to eight feet in depth at low water, for a distance of a mile from the junction of the creek with the Chenal Ecarté. The Little Bear Creek goes through the township of Dover, and flows into the Chenal Ecarté of the River Sydenham. The river when it goes towards the St. Ann's Island has two channels, the one on the right, and the other on the left, and the one on the left is called the Chenal Ecarté.

Mr. PLATT. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to state what portion, if any, of the appropriation of last year, of \$4,000, has been expended on the harbors of Conseccon and Wellington, Lake Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Only a portion has been expended for Wellington, but not for the other, because an examination that I caused to be made showed that the intended works would cost too much.

127. Harbors and Rivers, Manitoba..... \$13,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a revote of \$12,000 for the mouth of Red River. It has been voted for two years, but we were unable to expend it because we had no dredge. The intention is to have a small dredge and try to improve the mouth of the river.

Mr. WATSON. Has the \$5,000 voted last year for the Waterhen River all been expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. It is found to be a much larger question than appeared at first, because there is not only the Waterhen River but Lake Manitoba to consider. The hon. gentleman will remember, from the report of Mr. Guerin, the engineer who examined the river and took the levels, that the works that would be required to improve the navigation and lower the water of the lake, would be of great magnitude, and we were not in a position to decide upon undertaking them. When you undertake a work of that kind, dealing with the water, you do not know where you may stop. If we make a deep cut and bring the waters of that lake into another lake we do not know what the result may be. There are creeks and rivers to consider, and the matter requires a great deal of attention; and the chief engineer told me that he was not in a position to recommend me to undertake that work now.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If I recollect aright the waters of the northern Lake Winnipegosis are eighteen feet and nine inches higher than Lake Manitoba, while the Waterhen River is a somewhat circuitous river and communicates between the two lakes. The complaint is not that Lake Winnipegosis is too high, but that Lake Manitoba is too high, and if the Waterhen River is lowered it will bring an additional stream of water from the upper lake into the lower lake and aggravate the fault which is complained of by people on Lake

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Manitoba. In 1874 we had the whole country surveyed and examined from the Saskatchewan south to the Assiniboine, and the result was such that I should not venture to deal with the subject in the way some people desired. It would be very difficult to avoid doing damage on account of the peculiar position the lakes occupy towards each other.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. We have been pressed about this matter. There is a large tract of land that is flooded, and we have been pressed to reclaim that land by turning off the water, on the ground that the value of the land saved would cover the expense of the work. But it is a question whether by draining those lands we will not do more damage still. Therefore we are not in a position to say to the hon. gentleman that the Government will undertake that work. If, after careful study, we find that the project is feasible, we will ask a vote of money for it if we can afford it.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for East York has just stated his objections to cleaning out this Waterhen River, because it would raise the water of Lake Manitoba. But I have never heard it complained that the water in Lake Winnipeg was too high or was flooding the adjoining lands, and if Lake Manitoba could be lowered without doing any injury to Lake Winnipeg, I think it will be in the interest of the country to do so. In that report the hon. Minister spoke of, it is estimated that it would cost \$281,000 to lower Lake Manitoba four feet and a half. It has been calculated that 696,320 acres of land would be reclaimed, which, at the estimated value of \$2 per acre, would be \$1,392,640, which, certainly, would be a very good investment for the Government. I have just received a petition from the County Council of Portage la Prairie, which the south end of this lake floods, memorializing the Government to take some action in this matter; and I know from personal knowledge that the country is very much injured by the rising of the water of Lake Manitoba. I know that six years ago where where there were first-class farms with grain growing upon them, there are two feet of water at present. The water has been rising for the last five years. It is not the deepening of the channel that is required, but the widening of it, for I believe, the cause of the mouth of the river closing up is on account of the high water carrying boulders to the mouth of the stream in the spring. A larger quantity of water flows into Lake Manitoba than the mouth of the river will allow to go out, and the mouth requires to be widened in order to carry off the water. It would not do to have the water lowered to any considerable extent, as it would spoil navigation on Lake Manitoba. During the recent wet season, the settlers have experienced great hardships on account of the height of the water in the lake, and if the Government can see their way to reducing the level, much benefit will accrue. The action of the Government in providing a dredge is a step in the right direction, and the works in Manitoba should be commenced as soon as possible.

129. Harbors and Rivers, British Columbia.....\$17,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is the ordinary vote of \$2,000 for general repairs and improvements. There is an item of \$2,000 for the improvement of Cottonwood Canyon, Upper Fraser River, to continue the work which was undertaken some years ago. An item of \$2,000 is to remove snags in Stickeen River. An item of \$3,000 is to make a complete examination of Victoria Harbor.

Mr. BAKER. Is the \$3,000 more particularly for an examination of Fraser Rock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for an examination of the harbor, and especially of Fraser Rock?

## 130. Harbors and Rivers generally ..... \$6,000.00

Mr. KEEFLER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter with respect to the breakwater at Blandford. I had the honor of sending a petition to the hon. Minister of Public Works this Session, respecting this question. It is a matter of great importance to a large number of people, there being one thousand interested in it. The present pier is only 80 feet long, and the petition asks that it be increased 100 feet. The people have hitherto been engaged in fishing with boats, but the fish having moved away into deeper water, they are obliged to resort to large schooners, and the effect is that they have no place of refuge for their vessels. With the permission of the Committee, I will read extracts from some of the letters which I have received on the subject. One of my correspondents says:

"In the settlement of Blandford, there are between 500 and 600 people, and about the same number on the Tancook Islands, which lay about one mile off the coast, and which makes over 1,000 inhabitants, all depending on the Harbor of Blandford for a refuge for their vessels. The fishermen have been using small boats, as they had to haul them up in bad weather, but the fish now becoming scarce, the people have to get larger vessels for fishing, and require a safe harbor to keep their vessels in. There is an old breakwater about 80 feet long, which is not half the length required, and it being much out of repair, we want the old work repaired and an addition of 100 feet, which could all be done for about \$2,000. There is 14 feet of water at the breakwater clay bottom; the breakwater could be built with crib work and stone ballast. There is about 200 boats, 60 seines and 400 nets now in use by the people in this neighborhood, but with all this gear the people, to make a living, are getting larger vessels, hence the need of a breakwater."

Another letter says:

"The vessels from Blandford fish on the banks off the coast, which distance is from fifty to one hundred miles. We have now ten vessels engaged in the bank fishing, and we would have three times that number if we had a breakwater to protect them when in port. There is an average catch of about 6,000 quintals yearly of codfish taken in vessels, and about 5,000 quintals of codfish taken in boats. The fish now becoming scarce near the shore, the people must have larger vessels to go to the banks for them now. Average of fish taken yearly at Blandford and Tancook: Codfish, about 11,000 quintals; barrels mackerel, 5,000; barrels herring, 3,000."

Another letter says:

"Your valued favors of the 11th instant duly received, and I am sorry to hear the prospect is small for getting any help for our breakwater. About forty feet of the outer end was damaged in the Wiggins storm. We intended to repair it ourselves to try and keep what we have, and I am expending sixty dollars myself in putting down a pier on the outside of the breakwater to protect it from going further; and I trust the hon. Minister of Public Works will yet have compassion on us, and grant us a small sum of money to make our harbor a safe one. In my previous letter I forgot to say that the bank fishermen resort to this place for bait very much during the season, which makes it more important that the harbor should be safe."

I trust the hon. Minister will make a grant of \$2,000, so as to assist these poor people.

## 131. Dredging..... \$253,600.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote of \$64,000 is to provide for new dredging plant, which the Chief Engineer recommends to be purchased. Steam tugs are absolutely required, because we are expending every year large sums of money in hiring tugs, and when we have our own, we will probably do the work both cheaper and better. In Ontario, we found that we required a new dredge on account of the calls on the Department for dredging, &c.; and for this purpose, \$27,000 are required out of the \$64,000.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Where is this dredge being built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not being built, because I have no money to pay for it. As soon as the money is in my hands I will call for tenders.

Mr. ROSS. Where does the hon. gentleman intend building it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt that it will be built somewhere in Ontario. New dredging, Manitoba,

\$37,500, in connection with the works which were just now mentioned by an hon. gentleman. A dredge will have to be built, and scows, and a tug, for which we had no money, and which will be provided by this vote.

Mr. WATSON. What work is to be done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Improvements are to be made on the Red River and Lake Winnipeg, connecting the waters of Lake Manitoba, &c. Saag-boat, British Columbia, \$15,000. This vessel is absolutely necessary, especially in that country, not to remove boulders but snags, which are constantly found there in spring and summer; and of course, if we had a vessel of this kind it could be taken from one river to another and used thus, avoiding heavy expenses and doing a great deal more work than we can perform otherwise with the money placed at our disposal. Dredge vessels, repairs \$25,100. Repairs of this kind are made every year, but this sum is larger than usual, because the repairs are this year somewhat more extensive. The ordinary votes are asked for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Ontario and Quebec, for dredging, but for British Columbia we have to double the vote, \$15,000. We have there a dredge, and we must have money to work it. General service, \$5,000, making altogether for dredging, \$253,600.

Mr. McINTYRE. Where is the dredge to be used this summer in Prince Edward Island, in King's county?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, this dredge will be used where it will be absolutely required during summer, but I am unable to say where. As soon as spring comes the dredges will leave their winter quarters, and we will try to use them to the best advantage, losing as little time and money as possible in taking them from one place to another. We will not send a dredge 300 or 400 miles to execute work, but we will try to work them from port to port. Certain works have to be undertaken, and I have no doubt that we will give as good an account of the dredges next summer as we have given during the last few years.

Mr. McINTYRE. The reason I ask the question is this. The dredge was brought to Murray River on the eve of the last election, and I believe that it did a little service there, but shortly after the election was over it was taken to Pictou, though I do not know for what purpose, and she is there yet as far as I can ascertain. I wish to learn whether or not she is going back to finish that work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If she was taken to Pictou it was probably because work had to be done there. That is all.

Mr. DAVIES. Who directs the movements of these dredges? Who gives the instructions?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are sent from headquarters.

Mr. DAVIES. Because I wish to call attention—that being the case—to Burnham River, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will make a note of it. The dredge was sent to Burnham River a year or two ago, and did excellent service in dredging the river, but for about 100 yards below the bridge, the channel is very narrow and crooked, being a great hindrance to navigation. It left a small ridge of the work unfinished, which prevents the harbor getting the benefit of all the work which was done there; and if it is possible, in the event of the dredge being ordered to that neighborhood, at all, to give one or two weeks at the outside to complete this work, it would confer a great benefit; but as it is now, a small ridge which prevents shipping getting the benefit of the work already done, is left.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of the circumstance.

Mr. KIRK. Has the hon. gentleman made arrangements regarding the harbors which are to be dredged in Nova Scotia, during next season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; of course not. Certain engagements have been made, because we have undertaken certain works which must be completed. We try to give the best service possible with our dredges, in order that they may accomplish more work during the season. For example, if by employing a dredge at one place during six or eight months, we would complete the work there, I would say I would not do so unless I had two or three dredges; but if I have only one dredge, I cannot keep it at one place and deprive the others of the benefit of it. We are trying to do all we can at ten or twelve different places, and then we begin again next year; in this way, the dredge does better service than if it was kept at only one place.

Mr. KIRK. Application has been made for the dredge to be sent to Laney's River, or Tor Bay, in the county of Guysborough. Can the hon. gentleman hold out any hope that they will get the use of it during the coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. I do not know whether or not these places were brought under the notice of the Department.

Mr. McINTYRE. I have brought the matter to the notice of the Department lately.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman has brought it to the notice of the Department since he came here, it would be very difficult to make the examination through the ice and snow.

Mr. McINTYRE. That examination was made years ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case, as the hon. gentleman has complained that there are boulders and an accumulation of silt, another examination would have to be made.

132. Roads and Bridges..... \$15,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is \$10,000 to complete the bridge at Des Joachims Rapids, Ottawa River; and the next item is \$4,000 for trails, bridges, &c., North-West Territories.

Mr. WATSON. What is this \$4,000 for? Are you reducing the amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$4,000 is a revote, and we propose to reduce it to only \$1,800. The hon. gentleman must see that it leaves a balance to be expended during the current year.

Mr. WATSON. But is there not a certain amount to be expended on the bridge between Manitoba and the new Province of Assiniboia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not in this estimate. This is for trails, bridges, &c., in the North-West Territories last year, and would not apply to the case he speaks of.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that a deputation came down here and that the hon. Minister gave them to understand that the Government would give them assistance if the municipality would vote an equal amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right. A deputation did come down here; but these estimates were completed, so the amount could not be included in them. The hon. gentleman will allow me to keep silent in the meantime, and when the Supplementary Estimates come down he will see.

133. Telegraphs..... \$87,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is for repairing the cable between the mainland and Grand Manan. The cable was broken by some vessel. Then we have \$28,000 to connect Pointe des Montes with a telegraph line constructed and in operation along the north shore of the St. Lawrence by cables and land lines, and towards extension of land line

Mr. KIRK.

to River Moisie. That work has already been sanctioned by Parliament, and this is for the purpose of continuing it. Then we have \$3,000 for the telegraph line from Chatham to Escuminac. That is to give communication between the town of Chatham and the lighthouse, and so with the vessels which are passing outside. The next item is for a telegraph line from Prince Arthur's Landing, *via* Winnipeg and Qu'Appelle Junction, to British Columbia, \$10,000. This is for the purpose of completing that line. Then we have a telegraph line, Saskatchewan to Prince Albert, the poles being furnished free to the Government, \$7,000. This is a new line. This line will go through a number of places, and put them in communication with the older portions of the world.

Mr. CASEY. What is the length of new line?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Between eighty and ninety miles.

Mr. WATSON. Is this line from the south branch to the north branch?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The line comes from Edmonton to Humboldt. Further, we bring the line down from Qu'Appelle to the Pacific Railway, between Humboldt and Battleford, at the River Saskatchewan. The next item is telegraph lines, British Columbia. New submarine cable route between Vancouver Island and Washington Territory *via* Victoria and Point Angelos, or land route from Victoria to Cape Beale, *via* San Juan Harbor, with cable thence to Neesh Harbor, Cape Flattery, Washington Territory, \$18,500. This vote is for the purpose of having a double cable to communicate between British Columbia and the other portions of Canada, through the United States, until the lines are completed through our own territory. We cannot leave that Province without communication, and if the cable were to break to-morrow, communication would be completely out off.

134. Miscellaneous..... \$95,240.85

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is for miscellaneous works not otherwise provided for—the usual vote; the next is surveys and inspections, then we have arbitrations and awards, and repairs, and improvements and construction of military works and buildings. This applies to all military works in the Provinces besides the special votes which were required for large works. Then there is a revote of \$9,000 for the monument to the memory of the late Sir George E. Cartier. After the separation of the Department of Public Works from the Department of Railways and Canals a number of records and books had to be copied, and a vote of \$1,650 is asked for this work.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I understand that the Department is about to issue a report or sketch of all the Public Works of the Dominion. This vote is not for that purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. That will be a report to Parliament in the ordinary form. I had hoped to be able to lay it before Parliament before to-day; but the printers have been delayed, and I have not been able to do so. It will be a very interesting history of all our Public Works since Confederation. A similar report was published before Confederation, so that the two volumes will give the best history that we can have of all our Public Works, except railways.

Mr. ROSS. Is it being printed by the Parliamentary Printers?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course. I do not say that I have not been pressed to have it printed elsewhere, but I thought it best to have it printed in the ordinary way. A vote of \$1,500 is asked for the National Art Gallery. It is a small beginning, but, I think, that after a few years, we shall have a number of good pictures that will be a credit to the country. At present the place is visited constantly



by a large number of visitors, and by some young artists who wish to copy the pictures.

Mr. ROSS. Does the hon. Minister intend to transfer to the Art Gallery the portraits of the Speakers and the ex-Speakers that are hung around our walls?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we shall keep them for our own benefit. This vote is to pay a caretaker, to pay for cleaning the rooms, for fitting up the gallery, for insurance, and \$300 for purchasing pictures. I suppose this may be called the wedge; I hope Parliament will give us a larger vote after a while. The next item is to pay a claim of W. L. Macaulay, in connection with barrack buildings erected by him at Fort Garry, \$5,590.85.

Mr. ROSS. Was this the award of the arbitrators?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it was the officers that reported upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. How long has this claim been standing?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Since 1873.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it was in consequence of the misfortune that happened to him in connection with his timber limit?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; he was pressed to go on with his contract late in the fall, and the officer in charge led him to understand that if he went on and employed more men, he would receive more money. We thought the man was entitled to this sum, and we put it in the Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. What officers reported in favor of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The architect of the Department, the local architect there, Mr. Lacour, and another officer connected with the Department there, whose name I do not remember.

Mr. BLAKE. The Government have taken a very long time, indeed, to make up their minds to recognize this claim. Not only several Sessions of Parliament, but several Parliaments have intervened before that was done. I think we ought to have the documents on Concurrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With regard to the Art Gallery, when I say pictures the hon. gentleman must be sure I do not mean oil paintings, because \$300 would not go far in that respect. I suppose these will be engravings.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:20 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 2nd May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) presented the Fifth Report of the Committee on the Official Reporting of the Debates of the House.

### ADJOURNMENTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Friday next, at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I beg to move that when the House adjourns on Friday next, it will stand adjourned until Saturday, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Canada Civil Service Act, 1882.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the provisions of the Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of these amendments is to try and reduce the expenses connected with the duties of the Board of Examiners. We have tried the law as it stands on the Statute-book for a year, and we think that by these amendments we can reduce the expenses considerably. Under these circumstances, we propose to repeal the third section of the Canada Civil Service Act of 1882, and to insert a new clause. There will be the same number of examiners, but as the hon. gentleman will see by the resolutions which, by the permission of the House, I will move after the second reading for reference to the Committee of the Whole—that the salary of the Secretary of the Board, who is one of the Commissioners, will be \$1,000, while the other two Commissioners will receive each \$5 a day. If these gentlemen were not officers in the public service, their pay would probably have to be doubled; but we thought that as they were members of the Civil Service, \$5 a day whilst they performed these duties, in addition to their ordinary salaries, would be sufficient. The number of days is fixed as I will state further on, when I come to the money resolutions. The provisions as to persons to be employed in the different places, will remain unchanged, save that we ask for power to abstain from holding public examinations in every town or city mentioned in the Bill. If an examination is only required at one place, this alone will be held. Appointments in the Civil Service shall be during pleasure, and a probationary term must be served before an official can be confirmed in his position. The maximum age of candidates is fixed at thirty-five, and the minimum at fifteen. The latter is made for this reason: We can thus employ youths as messengers for instance, as packers when they are very active, they can grow up with the service, and we will have the advantage of their activity for a much longer period than would otherwise be the case. Clause twenty-four relates to the promotion of officials which shall be by examination. We have found, under the law as it stands, that an officer in the outside service cannot be brought into the inside service, and *vice versa*. This is the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, and, therefore, we have provided that this exchange can take place; but as persons can enter the outside service when over thirty-five, it is provided that no outside official shall be brought into the inside service unless he entered the outside service while under thirty-five years of age. Another clause provides that the oath of allegiance shall be taken by all officers who have not already done so; and they shall be sworn by the Clerk of the Queen's Privy Council, who shall keep a register of all these oaths. An exchange of positions between officers may take place with the concurrence of the Head of the Department, and by Order in Council. The thirteenth clause provides:

A vacancy which would otherwise be filled by a first appointment, after an examination, may, by Order in Council and without an examination, be filled by a transfer from another division of the Department in which the vacancy exists, or from another Department; provided that the transfer shall be made without increasing the salary of the person transferred, and that no person shall be transferred from an outside to an inside division, whose age at the date of his first appointment exceeded thirty-five years.

Then we have the schedule which concludes the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. There are one or two points to which the hon. gentleman did not refer, and which, it seems to me, might properly be adverted to on this occasion. For example, there is the provision altering the arrangements as to examinations for vacancies. The clause as in this Bill alters the law recently passed—the language is changed, and the hon. gentleman has not explained to us why the change has been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason we substituted the words "wholly or in part, professional or technical," for the words of the Act of last year, was, that the word "peculiar," used in the old Act of last year, we thought gave too much latitude.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman provides in the same clause, sub-section three, that city postmasters and collectors and preventive officers in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments may be appointed without examination, and without reference to the rules for promotion herein prescribed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With regard to city postmasters, they are in much the same position in that respect as sub-heads of Departments at headquarters. As to the collectors and preventive officers in the Customs, perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will explain the reasons of the change.

Mr. BOWELL. Difficulties have arisen in this way. Many of the preventive officers receive very low salaries, and they are stationed along the shores of the Maritime Provinces, as well as the frontier, where they receive, perhaps, from \$60 to \$200 a year. It is difficult to get men at these salaries, who are merely engaged in preventing smuggling in their respective localities to go to the different centres and pass examinations, particularly as they have no power to collect duties. Other difficulties have arisen under the Act, particularly with our sub-collectors. Sub-collectors at an outpost receive, say \$200, or \$300, or \$400 a year, which is a grade a little higher in the service than that of landing waiter; yet the Civil Service Act provided that these positions must be filled by promotion—that is, from the lockers or messengers, or landing waiters. But there are few landing waiters who receive less than \$400, and some receive \$600, \$700, and \$800. It was, therefore, utterly impossible to work the law while the provisions of the Statute remained as they are. For example, I could not take a man from Hamilton or Toronto, who, say, is getting \$600, or \$700 a year, and send him to Kincardine where the salary is only \$40. Still, I have no power to appoint a man unless he passed an examination, and I could then only appoint him from the service by means of promotion. The object of this change is to enable the Department to fill such positions without the necessity of having an examination.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the collectors? The reasons which have been given are elastic, and, perhaps, a little contradictory. The city postmasters are omitted because the appointments are too good.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing about them.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill did. On the other hand, the preventive officers are too low. You may examine a man who is going to be a packer or messenger, but not a landing waiter. I think the hon. gentleman has probably explained some of the difficulties of the old clause as applied to the outside machinery of his Department, and, so far as I can see, his explanation is a plausible, and, perhaps, a sound one with reference to the hon. Minister or officer; but I do not think it applies to the collectors, and I do not know that it applies to all preventive officers. Collectorships are of all grades; some of them are very high offices, and there are some of a less important character, but all collectors and all preventive officers

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

are to be given irrespective of qualifications and irrespective of promotions. Now, it seems to me that that would be an unfortunate departure from the principles we tried to lay down with regard to the elevation of the service. If there are exceptional cases, if there are some officers too high and others too low, if you cannot expect men to come from the outside parts to be examined, surely some one has ingenuity enough to frame a clause which would dispense with the application of the rules in these particular cases. But because there is a desire on the one side, and a desire on the other side, to dispense with the rule, I do not think we should block it out altogether as to all city postmasters, all collectors, and all preventive officers, whether inside or outside.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong as to the city postmasters. If they were to apply the rule, he would see at once that it is a proper thing to have city postmasters who are paid by salary appointed without examination. Of course, the Government when they make the appointment, will always take care that the person so appointed is one whose qualifications are such that he can perform the duties of his office. Take, for example, the case of the city postmaster of Montreal. A man is appointed there, in whom the Government of the day have confidence—a business man who is able to direct the machinery of that office; and it is not to be supposed that he should be required to pass an examination as a mere clerk. A position of that kind should never be given to a youngster, but it must be given to a man of position, one who—I hope the hon. gentleman will not object to my saying—has rendered service to his country. With regard to the preventive officers, we must treat them as we treat lighthouse keepers. We do not call upon a man who wants to be a lighthouse keeper to pass an examination, because his work is not of a very scientific character; we only want a man who is able to keep a lighthouse properly. For that reason, I think the provision of this sub-section is one that should be adopted by the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to discuss the matter further at present, but I wish to point out that sub-section four provides that in the case of temporary or supernumerary officers actually employed at the time this Act comes into force, the qualifying examination may be dispensed with. Some time ago the hon. gentleman, in replying to the hon. member for Montreal Centre, gave reasons why the qualifying examinations should not be dispensed with; but he seems to have changed his mind. The hon. member made an appeal on behalf of some well-conducted supernumeraries, which the hon. gentleman at that time would not accede to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. friend from Montreal Centre was suggesting that these men should be made permanent clerks. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will see that this provision is desirable, so far as it is practicable. These officers, who have been doing their work well for three or four years, are on that account likely to be as well qualified as if they had passed an examination. If a man is not a good officer, of course he will not be promoted.

Mr. CASEY. I very much regret to see that such changes as the Government think fit to make in this Bill, are rather going further away from the principle which I have always advocated than coming nearer to it. I had really some hope, when I heard that the Act was to be amended, that the Government were about to follow the example set by our neighbors across the border. We have for many years looked upon the United States as the stronghold of the system of favoritism in appointments to the Civil Service—as the country where the system of competitive examinations was least likely to come into force. But since last Session that great nation has taken a step in advance, and

in spite of the immense influence there exercised in favor of the retention of the system of patronage, it has passed a very thorough and comprehensive Act, introducing the competitive examinations. Of course, it has not been tried to a great extent yet, but seems likely to greatly improve the service. I am sorry, therefore, that our Government, who have seen fit to follow the example of the American Government with regard to its financial policy, seem to hang back from following it in this step, especially when they would have the advantage of walking in the steps, not only of the United States, but of the Mother Country. I do not intend to discuss the details of the Bill further than to point out, with regard to sub-section three of section thirty-four, that the officers here treated of are those from whom a particularly severe examination should be required. The offices of city postmaster, collector, and preventive officer, are offices which should be filled by men who are not only reasonably well educated, but have some special knowledge to fit them for their positions.

Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions respecting the Civil Service Act of Canada, 1882:—

1. Resolved,—That it is expedient to amend "The Canada Civil Service Act, 1882," by providing that the Secretary of the Board of Examiners under the third section thereof, shall be one of the members of the Board.

2. Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal the fifth section of the said Act, and to enact the following section in lieu thereof:—

"5. The Secretary of the Board shall be paid a salary not exceeding one thousand dollars per annum. He shall render such services as the nature of the office requires, and as may from time to time be prescribed by Order in Council. The other members of the Board shall be paid five dollars per diem when actually engaged in their work, not, however, to exceed sixty days in any one year.

"2. The members of the Board shall, on authority of an Order in Council, be paid their actual travelling expenses incurred while so engaged in their work.

"3. Such persons as may be selected by the Board to assist them in the conduct of examination, may receive such sum not exceeding five dollars per diem, as may be fixed by Order in Council."

3. Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal the sixth section of the said Act, and to enact the following in lieu thereof:—

"6. The Board of Examiners may obtain the assistance of persons who have had experience in the education of the youth of the Dominion, and with such assistance shall hold or cause to be held periodical examinations for admission to the Civil Service, in the cities of Halifax, St. John, New Brunswick, Charlottetown, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Winnipeg, Victoria and such other places as may be determined by Order in Council. It shall not be necessary to hold each examination in all the said places, but the times and places at which the examinations shall be held, shall be determined from time to time by Order in Council. Examinations as far as possible shall be in writing. Their cost shall be defrayed out of moneys previously voted by Parliament for that purpose."

4. Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal the thirteenth section of the said Act, and to enact the following in lieu thereof:—

"13. The minimum salary paid to a Chief Clerk shall be one thousand eight hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to twenty-four hundred dollars."

"2. No salary shall be increased under the provision of this section before the first day of July next."

5. Resolved,—That it is expedient to make the following provision in amendment to the said Act:—

"The Officers, Clerks and employés mentioned in Schedule B of the said Act shall be paid according to the scale thereby established. The salaries of Officers, Clerks and Employés in the Second or Outside Division of Departments other than the Customs, Inland Revenue and Post Office Departments shall, subject to the provisions of any Act relating thereto, be fixed in each case by Order in Council."

"2. That part of Schedule B to the said Act which relates to 'Departments Generally' shall be repealed."

6. Resolved,—That it is expedient to provide that Schedule B of the said Act shall be amended as follows:—

"(a) By striking out so much of the Schedule as relate to Custom and Inland Revenue, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:—

CUSTOMS.

	Scale of Salaries
Inspectors .....	Salary from \$1,600 to \$2,500
Collectors .....	" 400 to 4,000
Surveyors .....	" 1,200 to 2,500
Chief Clerks .....	" 1,200 to 2,000

Clerks .....	Salary from \$400 to \$1,200
Chief Landing Waiters .....	" 800 to 1,200
Landing Waiters .....	" 400 to 1,000
Gaugers .....	" 600 to 1,200
Chiefs Lockers .....	" 800 to 1,200
Lockers .....	" 400 to 800
Tide Surveyors .....	" 800 to 1,000
Tide Waiters .....	" 400 to 600
Messengers .....	" 200 to 500
Appraisers .....	" 800 to 2,000
Assistant Appraisers .....	" 600 to 1,500

INLAND REVENUE.

Chief Inspector .....	\$2,800
Inspectors .....	\$1,600 to 2,500
Collectors .....	500 to 2,200
Deputy Collectors .....	400 to 1,500
Clerks (Accountants) .....	600 to 1,200
Special Class Excisemen .....	1,200
First, Second and Third Class Excisemen .....	600 to 1,000
Probationary Excisemen .....	500
Messengers .....	200 to 500

"(b) And by striking out so much of the Schedule as relates to Railway Mail Clerks, and inserting the following in lieu thereof:—

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

	On Appointment.		After 2 years service in any class of Railway Mail Clerks.		After 5 years service in any class of Railway Mail Clerks.		After 10 years service in any class of Railway Mail Clerks.	
	Day Service.	Night Service.	Day Service.	Night Service.	Day Service.	Night Service.	Day Service.	Night Service.
Chief Clerks.	\$ 1,000	.....	\$ 1,200	.....	\$ 1,350	.....	\$ 1,500	.....
1st Class.....	720	880	800	1,000	880	1,100	960	1,200
2nd Class.....	600	720	640	800	720	880	800	1,000
3rd Class.....	480	600	520	640	560	700	640	800

To Clerks other than Chief Clerks, in addition to regular salary, an allowance not exceeding half a cent per mile for every mile travelled on duty in the Post Office cars. To which may be added for surveys of important Manufactories, an additional salary for this special class of Excisemen, who perform that duty, not exceeding \$200 per annum.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. The Secretary shall be one of the members of the Board.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he a Civil servant?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. A superannuated officer.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is it proposed to give him a salary as secretary, in addition to the superannuation allowance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We would not do that if he received, with salary and superannuation, more than by his salary before superannuation. That is the law. As it is, we save half his salary, for we get him for half what we would have to give to anyone else.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The members of the Board are Decelles, Thorburn, and LeSueur. Do the Government consider the latter as competent as the others?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, he is considered a good officer; though superannuated, he can perform this duty. He was superannuated some years ago—I do not think by our Government. This duty is not as arduous as what he would have to perform in the Department,

and, besides being a literary man, he is specially gifted for the office.

Mr. BLAKE. With regard to holding examinations, I think the Government should take some latitude, and not pledge themselves to hold examinations where there may be no candidates. It would be unfortunate if a rule were adopted by which young men would be obliged to travel a considerable distance to attend examinations. Some places should be named where examinations would always be held, and the Governor in Council should take the power of choosing other places at which there might be a sufficient number of candidates to make it reasonable to hold one there, and save expense. It is ridiculous to have examinations both at Hamilton and Toronto.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the proper course to follow is, that we should have, at least once a year, if not twice a year, an examination in the ten or twelve places mentioned in the Act, so as to give an opportunity to the people who wish to enter the Civil Service, to pass their examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see why there should be examinations both in Toronto and Hamilton, so little distance from each other. In Nova Scotia, all have to go to Halifax, and some from long distances; in New Brunswick, all have to go to St. John. As it is only about an hour and a quarter's distance from Hamilton to Toronto it seems to me like having an extra examiner at an extra cost who is not needed. London, Ottawa, and Toronto, seem to be quite sufficient for all the purposes of Ontario.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In a large Province like Ontario, where a great number of young men want to compete, it would be difficult to have too large a number competing under one examiner, in which case you would have to change the law and have two examiners at the same place. If we are to have the same number of examiners, it is better to give extra facilities to the young men, who, as a rule, have not their pockets lined with bank notes. If we give them a chance of passing their examination nearer home, it costs them so much less for travelling expenses and board. In a populous district like that of Hamilton, for instance, great numbers could go to town and pass their examination and return home in the evening. I think it will be better to leave the clause as it is.

On resolution 5,

Mr. BLAKE. This seems to be rather an important clause. We know that the theory of this \$50 increase is very different from the practice. The theory of this \$50 increase was that there should be an eligibility to receive a reward for good service, and that those who were industrious and deserving should get it; we know that in practice this theory is almost always disregarded, and the increase is given to all applicants. This has become a regular system, whatever party is in power. When I was in office those officers who received an increase were officers to whom the Government might assign a salary between certain limits. There are some chief clerks, no doubt, of special qualification to whom you would be obliged to pay salaries ranging from \$1,800 to \$2,400; but to apply the \$50 increase to the chief clerks is practically to raise the expense of the service by a graduated scale which, in a few years, would raise the pay of all the chief clerks in the service up to the maximum. No doubt there are many chief clerks—or were in my time, I will not say now—of varying qualifications, of varying earning power: some entitled to the full salary they have been receiving, some entitled to less, and some who ought not to be paid as much as \$2,400. But your proposed plan of paying this \$50 increase annually will be to increase all salaries to the maximum—unless for good cause, such as some scandalous or gross neglect, which I hope hardly ever occurs—there-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

fore, I think it is a serious change in point of expense, and I doubt its expediency.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The law, as it stands to-day, says that the minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be \$1,800, and the maximum, \$2,400 per annum. The hon. gentleman must know, from his experience in Ontario, and afterwards at Ottawa, that pressure is always brought to bear upon hon. Ministers, not only by their clerks, deserving ones, no doubt, but outside influence is brought to bear upon them to obtain an increased salary. The man is a good man, who has fulfilled his duties well; he is an old officer, therefore he should be promoted—such are the arguments used. Under the law, as it stands, there is pressure upon the hon. Ministers. They are convinced that the increase is required, but, instead of raising the salary by \$50 annually, they probably raise it by \$200 or \$400 at a time. If, instead of that, we adopted this provision, increasing the salary at the rate of \$50 a year, how long will it take him to reach the maximum? It would take him twelve years to reach the \$2,400. During all that time he must be a good officer and faithfully fulfil his duties, otherwise he cannot get the increase. We thus place before him a constant stimulus to good conduct, which is more effective than would be the chance of an arbitrary increase of several hundred dollars at a time. Moreover, when he knows the increase is to be regular, if he will measure his salary, he will measure his expenses thereupon. I think if we allow him to depend upon what personal or outside influence he can exercise upon hon. Ministers, we will have less regard for his position as a public officer than if we give him a definite yearly increase.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman propose to make this increase arbitrarily, whether the officer is good, bad, or indifferent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have the discretion of granting it or not.

Mr. ROSS. The annual increase seems to follow from the starting sum of \$1,800. Now, if the hon. Minister, or the deputy-head of the Department, has it in his discretion to say whether the increase should be granted or not, matters would appear very different from what they appear to me by reading the Bill. It is quite right that the increase should depend upon the good conduct of the officer; but it seems to me absurd to treat good, bad, and indifferent officers in the same way, and allow them all an increase of \$50 a year, irrespective entirely of the conduct of the officer.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has not remembered a provision of the Act. The Act says, in the first instance, that the chief clerks shall have an increase, all of them, and then it provides generally that it shall not be authorized unless the head of the Department concurs in the representation of the Department's deputy-head that the clerk is deserving of the increase, and that will apply to all. Of course, my difficulty has been mitigated by the statement of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman sets forth that a good deal of money is required to be provided by Parliament in connection with the service, and he requires to be protected by this House against swerving from the path of duty, and I suppose he will receive that protection.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thank the hon. gentleman for his protection in that respect; but the hon. gentleman, I suppose, expects some day to occupy these benches, and when he does so, he will have the same protection as he is giving us to-day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any first-class clerk at \$1,800 in the service, to whom an increase of salary has been refused on the ground of inefficiency?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the hon. Minister is prepared to say that all the first-class clerks in the several Departments are equally efficient.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has asked a question that I am sure no one can answer. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that I have gone through all the Departments and ascertained whether all the first-class clerks are equally efficient; but I can say this: That the Civil Service of Canada is as good, honorable, and able a service as can be found anywhere. There may be some exceptions, such exceptions you will find anywhere; but as a whole it is a service which is a credit to the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for asking the question was this: The hon. Minister said it was in the power of the deputy-head of the Department to refuse to grant the increase, and I was anxious to know if there was any instance in which it had been refused.

On resolution 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister explain the grounds on which the salaries of inspectors have been raised from a scale of from \$1,600 to \$2,000, to one of from \$2,000 to \$2,500?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those are inspectors of Customs. The old law placed their salary at from \$1,600 to \$2,000. By the present Bill they will range from \$1,600 to \$2,500. The chief clerks' salaries are \$1,200 now, and will remain the same; clerks, instead of receiving from \$600 to \$1,200, will receive from \$400 to \$1,200. The Chief Inspector of Inland Revenue, who formerly received \$3,000, will receive, under this Bill, \$2,800. The inspectors who were at fixed salaries of \$2,500 are placed here at from \$1,600 to \$2,500.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Customs will explain why the inspectors of Customs will receive from \$2,000 to \$2,500, instead of from \$1,600 to \$2,000, the amount fixed last year.

Mr. BOWELL. The only reason why the salaries have been raised so as to range from \$2,000 to \$2,500 is because the inspectors of Inland Revenue and the inspectors of the Post Office receive larger salaries, and the duties of an inspector of Customs are just as responsible, and require men of equal capacity and experience to fill them, as do other branches of the service. It is, therefore, proposed to place the inspectors of the different branches, having similar duties to perform, as near on an equality as possible. Under the old law the Custom House inspectors received a maximum salary of \$2,000, while Inland Revenue inspectors received \$2,500, and the head inspector \$2,800, and the Post Office inspectors received still larger sums.

Resolutions reported, and referred to the Committee of the Whole to which Bill (No. 90) was referred.

#### BOOMS AND OTHER WORKS BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 96) respecting booms and other works constructed in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts or otherwise.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I may say that certain works were constructed under the authority of Acts of the old Parliament of Canada, and the rights of the owners of them ought to be preserved in this Bill, unless it is in the public interest that they should be taken away. A clause to this effect was suggested in Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. On a careful investigation of the clause of the Act, the hon. gentleman will see that the amendment is

unnecessary, because the Act does not apply to these booms. It applies, in the first clause, to booms hereafter constructed under the authority of an Act of a Legislature of a Province of Canada; and, in the second clause, to any boom heretofore or hereafter constructed under the authority of an Act of a Legislature of a Province of Canada. I understand from that that it does not deal with what was done with New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or old Canada before the Union.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). But suppose the works have been constructed since Confederation under the authority of Acts passed prior to Confederation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. friend is needlessly afraid. I do not think there is any danger of what he fears, or that it will interfere in any way with the works he speaks of.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific coast of Canada and Asia.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

#### DOMINION LANDS ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 45) to amend, and consolidate as so amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 20, sub-section 5,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a reenactment of a provision in one of the old Acts by which, in case any school lot should be wanted as a site for a town, the Government were empowered to take it, and pay the school fund the highest value the land would bring if sold for agricultural purposes. I do not see any reason why the school fund should not have the advantage of any accidental circumstance of that kind, and, therefore, I propose to strike that portion out. There was a good deal of discussion upon sub-section three of section thirty-one, which provides that any person who makes an entry after the 1st of September should be allowed until the 15th of the following May to perfect his entry. I propose to extend the time to the 1st of June.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. members from Manitoba have discussed this matter pretty fully, and they are of opinion that the 1st of September should be changed to the 15th of July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have consulted some persons who have had considerable experience in that matter, and they say that that would be out of the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. The proposal was, that the three years should date from the 1st of June, when the settler enters upon his homestead.

Mr. WATSON. In a great many cases, when a poor man goes to that country, he wants, in the first year, to earn some money; besides, a great many Ontario people go there after seeding time, and if they had to go on their farms within six months after entering for them, they would be brought about to the beginning of the winter. I think they might be allowed the privilege of securing the land without being required to go on until the first of the following June, their entry dating from that time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If a man enters for a homestead and does not go upon it for a year, the actual settler is kept out of it during that time. If a man finds, on going up there, that he can do better by working as a mechanic, or a laborer, than by going on his farm, let him do so, and take up land afterwards; there is land enough in that country to provide a homestead for everybody who wants it for the next fifty years. The whole object of the homestead is to get the settler upon it. There was some discussion about hamlets, and it was said that twenty families was too large a number. The object of the clause providing for them is not that people should go up there and settle in one spot, and neglect their homesteads; but the object is that when people who are in the habit of living in villages come here, and want to settle together in a village, they must first come and make the proposition to the Government. They make their application, and we give permission, but it is a permission that must be carefully considered before being given. The main object and principle is to have on every quarter-section, if possible, a house and an occupant. To meet the proclivities and habits of people from Europe, and perhaps in a certain sense from Lower Canada, if twenty families go into a township and undertake to build a village in place of a house on each quarter-section—if they make out a case, permission will be granted to them.

Mr. ROYAL. Are we to understand this clause will only apply to incoming settlers, and that those now in the territories will be debarred from taking possession of it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause explains itself: "In case a certain number of homestead settlers, &c."

Mr. CHARLTON. With reference to the cultivation of homesteads for the owners, the hon. gentleman gave no definite answer on the previous occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am strongly opposed to that, which would simply mean the getting rid of actual settlers. There would not be a man in Ontario who would not have a lot under cultivation, or pretended cultivation. The land would disappear, and the people would not go there.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention of the Government that the preemptions will still exist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was agreed unanimously that preemptions should cease to exist from January 1st, 1883.

Mr. WATSON. The stand that the Manitoba members took, was that the cultivation of homesteads should not take the place of preemptions. We wish to substitute a cultivation for five years, at the rate of twenty acres per year before a patent would be given for a homestead, for the preemption clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By doing away with preemptions, we will have four settlers on each section instead of two. The Government do not want to make money out of it, and, I take it, will hold all the even-numbered sections for homesteads. If we allowed this cultivation system, a person wanting a large farm could engage 40 or 100 persons to work for him, and we know as a matter of fact that individuals have employed persons to make entries for them, being their agents and servants though nominally settlers. Under the cultivation system, any person with money could get people to enter in his name for quarter-sections and obtain a very large farm, as in the Western States, where it takes a man sometimes a day to plough a furrow from one end of his farm to the other. Cultivation without residence is not what we want.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one point which the hon. Minister did not decide, the other night, as to compensation.

Mr. WATSON.

to be given to homestead settlers who have settled on worthless land. Will they be allowed a second homestead?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is provided in the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated he supposed the Government would use the sections not available for free entry for settlers. The Act should be made clear on this point. We did not propose to abolish preemptions with a view of limiting the number of homesteads, but in order that we might be able to give two homesteads, instead of one homestead and a preemption. If the clause does not bear this out already, I have sufficient experience of the change of mind to which the Government is subject, to desire that this should be specifically stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The law has always been that a person going up there with a family, any of whose male members are eighteen years of age or over, these can get a homestead, but they have no right to one particular homestead, or one particular lot. There are ample provisions in the first Act by which the Government can withdraw, if they wish to do so, any portion from settlement. The Government may want it to raise money to pay the debt, or for military purposes. No immigrant has a vested right in any given section of the country, or in any given quarter-section; all he has a right to is to know that when he goes there there will be accessible places and quarter-sections of good arable land where he can find a home.

Mr. BLAKE. But at present there is a provision in the law under which the Government can withdraw a particular locality among the even-numbered sections; but the law is that, subject to that power of withdrawal, the even-numbered sections are applicable to the homesteads, and that preemptions are pertinent to homesteads. We are now going to abolish preemptions within a certain time, and I want the even-numbered sections still to remain under the law, subject to the same power of withdrawal in the general sense that the Government has now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no difficulty. I said that I presumed it would be so, and I have no doubt it will be so.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Bill passes its third reading, I wish to move an amendment upon a matter that I consider of vital importance, and in respect of which the Bill is seriously defective. I do not need, Mr. Speaker, to descant upon the bearing that the great North-West will have upon the future of this Dominion, upon the bearing that it will have upon the establishment of a nationality there, provided we do not, by bad legislation, drive that country out of the Union. I do not need to say that in dealing with this great question, in dealing with the future of our empire, we should approach the discussion without any reference to party interests, or any desire to advance the interests of personal or party friends. When we look at that great country in its present condition, the conclusion is at once forced upon our minds that something is required there in order to make it available, and a real source of strength and power to this Dominion. Now, the question is: what is required to produce that result? Certainly it is not the operations and manipulations of speculators—speculators in lands, in coal licenses, in timber limits, in pasture lands even; these, on the whole, do little or nothing to develop the resources of the great North-West. That country can only be made what we desire to see it become by the intervention of the settler. Labor alone will develop that country; labor alone will convert those wastes into fields of wheat and other crops, instead of the prairie grass that now grows there. Well,

Sir, if this is the case, then the one and sole instrumentality that can make that country what we desire to see it become is an instrumentality that should receive our particular regard as a Parliament discussing the laws and regulations that shall apply to the great North-West. Now, that instrumentality is clearly the settler. The settler is the foundation rock upon which the superstructure of a great country must be built in the North-West. It is by his labor alone that the North-West can be developed, and in our legislation upon this matter we should have special regard to the interests of the settler. Of course, when the settler goes into that country and develops, other classes will follow him—the artisans, the merchants, and the speculators. These last will all take care of themselves, their interests do not need our fostering care. But we should, at least, give to the settler justice; if we give him no exceptional privileges we should, at least, see that he is not trampled upon, that his rights are not tramped upon, that his rights are not made subordinate to the interests of others; we should see, in short, to use a vulgarism, that he had a fair show in that country. It is essential, if we would secure the development of the North-West, that no obstacle is put in the way of the settlers getting land. The Government have, in their policy, in effect conceded this principle by adopting a preemption system, and a homestead system. They have conceded the principle that it is proper and necessary to facilitate the settlement of the North-West by giving to the settler advantages and inducements to go into that country. Now, if the Government, after having made provisions for homestead and preemption settlement in the North-West, then turns round, and, with reference to the other lands in that country, in place of favoring the settler and giving him justice, favors the interests of the speculators to his detriment, then I say the Government has stopped short in its duty, has not gone as far as it should have gone, and in reference to that question has proved derelict in its duty. In discussing this land Bill a few nights ago, we took occasion, on this side of the House, to give certain qualified commendations to the right hon. gentleman, with reference to this Bill. The Bill is a consolidation of all the various land laws, and, in that respect, the efforts of the hon. gentleman are praiseworthy, and we very properly thanked him. We also had occasion to acknowledge that the changes in the Bill in the main, were commendable changes. In fact, we were desirous of securing the elimination of some features in this Bill that we considered bad, and of substituting good features in their place; and we very properly considered that indulging in invectives against the Government was not likely to produce the result we desired. Consequently, we approached the discussion of this question in as persuasive a spirit as we were master of, and we hoped, from the suavity with which the hon. First Minister treated us, that we would obtain great concessions. Well, Sir, we have not obtained very great concessions, in fact the concessions the hon. gentleman has given us are very inconsiderable. There are still several features in which I consider this Bill is radically wrong—several provisions that we have attacked before. There are provisions that we would have been glad to see the Government remove, but they have not seen fit to remove them. This Bill is lacking in one essential particular, it affords no special protection to the settler. The duty of the Government should be to hold the land in the North-West for the settler. It is no object to sell the land a few years in advance of the time the settler would occupy it; it should be held by the Government to be sold direct to the settler—the Government should allow no party to come between the Government and the man who would ultimately occupy the soil. The speculator should not be encouraged, he should not be permitted to make purchase of the public lands in the North-West; the Government should hold that

public land as a sacred trust to be handed direct to the man who would cultivate the land; and in this respect the Bill is radically deficient. In this respect we condemned the policy of the Government before, and we hoped to find a reform; but the Government have given us no reform, and consequently we shall be called upon to record our sentiments on this matter in a protest against the Government's policy. The Bill is also deficient in the matter of refusing to afford competition in the sale of pasture licenses, coal licenses, and timber berths. It is also deficient, and lamentably deficient, in that it provides no adequate remedy for the vacillation and changes that have hitherto applied to the regulations and policy of the Government in respect to lands in the North-West. The trouble is that the powers which belong legitimately to Parliament, and ought to be exercised after due deliberation by all the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, are exercised by a small body of men, and for some reason or other these powers are exercised in such a way as to leave their policy open to the charge of vacillation and change. That vacillating policy has been productive of very great difficulty and trouble in the North-West. We know the settlers in that country have been in the main ignorant as to what the policy of the Government was, and in fact the local land agents in various portions of the North-West have also been ignorant of the changes made in the regulations at Ottawa. The exercise of this power that properly pertains to Parliament by the Ministry, or rather by one member of the Ministry—because, of course, the decision of the hon. First Minister, who is head of the Department of Interior, is what guides and governs in all matters pertaining to it—is an evil. It is an evil under the peculiar circumstances of the case, and is aggravated by the fact that the right hon. gentleman, although he bears his years well and shows a wonderful degree of vitality and physical and mental energy for a man of his age, is a man well stricken in years, and consequently is incapable of the severe physical and mental exertion necessary on the part of the head of a great department like the Department of the Interior, with its multifarious interests and duties. No hon. gentleman will pretend to say that Department does not require the undivided efforts of a man in the full vigor of life, and when an hon. Minister, in addition to the duties of that Department, has to discharge the duties of Premier, he will be overworked. What are the consequences? They are, that the duty of establishing and carrying out regulations amounting in point of fact to legislation having to do with the future of an empire, is placed in the hands of whom? In the hands of subordinates and clerks who are called upon to discharge functions that properly pertain to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled—I characterize that as an abuse of power; and I say that the functions of Parliament have been usurped, and that Parliament should proceed to assert its power and exercise its functions in the matter of establishing regulations and other matters connected with the management of the public lands in the North-West. We, then take the ground that the Government should sell to the settler direct, that he should not be liable to the intervention of the middleman; and, further than that, it should not permit the intervention of the middleman, that it should allow no party to stand between themselves and the men who wish to acquire the land for purposes of cultivation. The Government so far from doing this has actually promoted speculation. It has promoted speculations in farming land, in timber, and coal lands. And it is a very suspicious circumstance that this was done just upon the eve of a General Election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon members say "hear, hear." We have the evidence that members of Parliament were

applicants for favors from the Government, that they were applicants for lands under the colonization schemes, they were applicants for timber limits, and for coal leases; that they acted on their own behalf, and as agents for others, that they added to the functions of members of Parliament, the functions of lobbyists, and this condition of things, especially on the eve of a General Election, can only be characterized as a lamentable condition of affairs, and one not calculated to promote public morality in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HESSON. If the Reform party had been in power, it would have been all right.

Mr. CHARLTON. We hear that assertion until it actually has become almost idiotic—"You're another"—"You did it,"—consequently as one wrong has been committed, another is justifiable. This is worthy of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Hesson). I wish to call attention to the character of some of these land speculation schemes. I wish to call attention briefly to the character of these colonization schemes which were planned and entered upon just at the opening of the new year of 1882. I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the admirable character of the regulations, if the object in view was to promote speculation and to benefit speculators. Under plan No. 1, townships, or a block of townships, in belt "D,"—that is the belt north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and outside of the railway belt—could be granted to applicants; that is to say, the land amounting to sixteen sections in each township not reserved for homesteads and pre-emptions. Those lands were sold to the actual settler at \$2 per acre, but they were sold to the speculator at \$2, but with conditions which reduced the price to \$1 per acre. If he placed thirty-two settlers on his lands in each township within five years, and secured the placing of thirty-two settlers on the homestead and preemption reserves in the township, he would receive the land for half the price; and if he failed to place the entire required number, \$160 would be allowed for each settler placed there during the five years. This was a scheme giving speculators land at one-half the price settlers would have to pay for it; and it was not to be supposed that the speculators would be satisfied with 100 per cent. profit, and sell the land at \$2 per acre, for the settler was left at the mercy of the speculator, who would wring from him the last cent he could pay. That was plan No. 1. Plan No. 2 was still worse. It provided that townships outside of the railway belt, and in belt "D," might be granted to speculators, not the odd-numbered sections only, but the sections reserved for homestead and preemption entry were all to be granted. The homestead, the pre-emption entry—all should be swept away, and the whole granted, except the school sections and the Hudson Bay sections, leaving thirty-two sections, in each township granted, on payment of \$2 per acre with the same provisions as to rebate on placing two settlers on each section, and if less than the stipulated number were placed, then \$160 rebate for every settler placed in the township. These are the two schemes adopted on the eve of the General Election for the sake of attracting to the side of the Government speculators and capitalists who desired to embark in land speculation in the North-West. And I judge, from the returns brought down, that the result of the plan more than justified the expectations of my hon. friend the First Minister. I find that, under plan No. 1, there were 257 applications which covered 2,301 townships. This, at the rate of sixteen sections to each township, amounted to application for land, under plan No. 1, covering 23,562,000 acres; of these applications there were allotted 119, covering 720 townships, and embracing an area, counting sixteen sections to each township granted, of 7,321,000 acres of land. Well, some of these men failed to make

Mr. CHARLTON.

their payments, and I do not know how long my hon. friend gave them an extension, I do not know how long some of them had to pay, but we will see how many. I see that the number of allotments on which the first instalment was paid was twenty-six, covering 137 townships, and embracing an area of 1,402,800 acres of land. The number of allotments upon which the first instalment is not yet due—I suppose that an extension of time was given in some cases—and upon which the first instalment presumably will be paid, is six, covering 168 townships, and embracing an area of 1,720,300 acres of land. The number of townships on which the first instalment is not paid, or not yet due, and will probably be paid, is 305, covering an area of 3,123,000 acres of land. What is this equal to? It is equal to 31,232 farms of 100 acres each. It is equal to a territory furnishing homes for a population, amounting to five to each family, of 156,000—placed in the hands of these speculative companies for the purpose of enabling them to get this land at 50 per cent. discount, and to turn round and sell it to settlers at as large an advance as they can secure—that is the result under plan No. 1. Now, plan No. 2 was scarcely as favorable a plan with speculators, because it required a larger payment in cash. Under plan No. 2 there were nine applications, covering 78 townships, which, with thirty-two sections to each township, cover 1,597,000 acres of land. I presume that the considerations of these applications have been complied with, although this fact is not mentioned. This will cover an area of 1,596,800 acres of land, sufficient for 15,940 farms of 100 acres each, providing homes for 80,000 people in families of five. Under these two plans, we have placed in the hands of these speculative companies an area of land sufficient for 47,200 farms of 100 acres each, which would support a population of 236,000, in families of five each. Well, now, I would ask, if it is not time to call a halt on this thing. Here is an evil infinitely greater than any evil of the kind ever complained of in Canada before; and infinitely greater than that inflicted on Ontario by the Canada Company. That was a matter of trivial consequence in comparison with the evil of which I am treating this afternoon; and it is for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to cognate evils, that I propose placing a resolution in your hands this afternoon, calling on the Government to restrict sales of land to settlers who desire to occupy these lands. Now, if we look through the list of these applications, we will find that members of Parliament have been applicants for—I will not say favors—but for grants, which were given at the pleasure of the Government. Under these colonization plans, I find that five days after the date of the regulations, which established plans Nos. 1 and 2, a certain Colonel Williams applied for five and a-quarter townships. I find that on the 9th of February, 1882, one Robert Hay applied for six and one-half townships. I find that on the 15th of February, the said Col. Williams applied for a further grant of six townships. On the 15th of February, one Adam Brown, who is not a member of this House, but who, I believe, is a friend of this Government, applied for one township. On the 13th of February, Robert Hay and associates applied for two townships more. On the 25th of February, George Elliott applied for two townships. On the 27th of February, one George S. Drew, now a Judge in the Province of Ontario, applied for four townships. On the 30th of March, John White and associates applied for four townships. On the 30th of March, C. F. Ferguson applied for three townships. On the 7th of March, Robert Hay and associates applied for five townships. On the 10th of March, P. Valin & Ross applied for two townships. On the 10th of March, Thomas Arkell, who knows this place no more, and associates, applied for six townships. On the 11th of March, George Elliott and others applied for five townships. On April 4th, P. Valin applied for one township.



On March 4th, the amiable member for Stanstead and associates applied for six townships. On May 12th, Senator Almon applied for twelve townships. On June 26th, Sir A. T. Galt applied for fifty townships. When this gentleman went up to the North-West to see about his colonization grants, he had a gentleman deputed to accompany him, namely, Colonel Dennis, whose expenses were charged to the Dominion of Canada. They were something like \$400, while the High Commissioner charged the Dominion with \$1,500 as his expenses, so that we have some \$1,800 or \$1,900, as the cost to Canada for the great benefit conferred upon us of allowing Sir A. T. Galt to get fifty townships at half price. I might ask the question: "Men and brethren, should these things be so?" Is it conducive to public morality and to the public interests, that members of this Parliament—and all of them sitting on that side of the Chamber—should be dancing attendance in the office of the hon. Minister of the Interior, waiting for their turns, as applicants in their own behalf and in behalf of their friends, for those favors which the Government had to dispense under its land regulations adopted on the 23rd of December, 1881; and I ask, if we are to suppose that all these gentlemen, to use another phrase of common parlance, showed their hand, are we not justified in supposing that hundreds of applications were made, and that many of them were made where members of Parliament were interested, and where their names do not show on the face of the records? Well, it is high time, I re-assert, that this state of things should be brought to an end. It is high time that an empire should not be put up for sale and bartered away, by being given to political favorites and others by the hon. First Minister at his pleasure in the way in which these lands have been bestowed. I say that it is a crying abuse; and I say, that if political morality in this Dominion of Canada had not been deadened by the condition of things existing here for many years, we would have had an uprising on account of this abuse, which would have swept these men from power; and this is one of the most lamentable indications of the future, that our public virtue is not sufficiently alive to rebuke this state of things, as they ought to have been rebuked. It might be said—I do not make the charge definitely—that these grants were made corruptly, for the purpose of securing political influence. I do not make these charges definitely, but I say that no Government with a desire to preserve its character before the country—no Government that stood in fear of having imputations of dishonesty laid at its door—would do things of that kind. I say that there are several suspicious circumstances connected with these applications, and that the portion of them which I have read over are made invariably by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Invariably?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think so. I do not find, in the whole list, any member in the House of Commons who is in opposition to the right hon. gentleman. If there are such, I may have overlooked them, but I do not recall the case of one applicant, who is a member of this House, opposed to the Government. Now, Sir, not only might there be favoritism in the granting of applications—not only might some political favoritism be exercised in the withholding of these favors, and some favoritism be exercised in the cancellation or the declining to cancel these grants, but these men making application might fall in arrears, and it is within the power of the hon. First Minister either to enforce the regulations of the Department rigorously, or to be lenient in the exercise of those powers which have been placed in the hands of the hon. Minister. I say it is a dangerous power to give any Minister of the Crown the discretion of whether he shall enforce rigidly the regulations of the Department, or whether he shall act with lenity in the matter of cancelling claims of this kind. Another objection we have to this law,

as it now stands, is that the right of the homestead settler is held by a frail, insecure tenure. There is nothing to prevent the hon. First Minister, at any time, by a Departmental order, from abrogating the privilege of the homesteader—the privilege of withdrawing from settlement all homestead entries. By one sweep of his pen this right can be taken from the homestead settler. I hold that, in a matter of such vital importance, in a matter so vitally affecting the interests of the North-West, no Minister should have the right of abrogating such a privilege. I hold that this is a matter that should be dealt with by Parliament alone—that it should require the solemn deliberate declaration of the House of Commons to withdraw that privilege from the homestead settler, and in that respect the law requires amendment. I say that between the railway grant and the colonization companies grants, there is danger that the whole North-West will be taken from the settler.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister laughs, but there are applications covering over 23,000,000 of acres, and with the immense grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the grants of various other lines in the North-West who are clamoring for land appropriations—I repeat that between railway grants made and in prospect, and the colonization grants made and in prospect, the *bonâ fide* settler in the North-West will not have a place whereon to put his foot. He will have to choose between the colonization companies and the railway company. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but I say that this is matter fraught not only with interest but with danger to the North-West. That the hon. gentleman is trifling with the interests of the North-West settler, he is playing ducks and drakes with millions of acres of the public domain, which is passing to railway and colonization companies—that he is dealing with it as if it were practically exhaustless—

Mr. HESSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he says that the Government are allowing the even-numbered sections to pass out of their hands to the colonization companies?

Mr. CHARLTON. I regret to say that I am under the disadvantage of not having heard the remark of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson).

Mr. HESSON. I asked the hon. gentleman the question whether the Government were allowing to pass out of their hands the even-numbered sections to these colonization companies?

Mr. CHARLTON. Under plan No. 2, the Government may grant the even numbered sections in belt "D."

An hon. MEMBER. But did they do it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think they did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has not been one single grant made under plan No. 2.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman say that they have not power?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so. But the hon. gentleman said in his speech that there were nine applications made under this plan; but I say that not one of them was granted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not make his correction sooner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would not presume to break into the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. The regulations were made by the Government with the intention of carrying them out; they are giving force to these regulations, and if they have concluded that these regulations are wrong, that the policy of granting these lands in that way was injurious, we may

assume that the regulations would have been abrogated before now, but they are in force to-day. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the House. I allude to the fact that the Government have withdrawn all public lands for sale south of the Canada Pacific Railway. I am told that these lands were advertised for sale by auction, and I think that the Government certainly deserve a reprimand from this House for their policy with reference to those lands. I cannot understand why a vast extent of the public domains south of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be withheld from the settler; and these lands having been withheld we say that the settler has a right to allege that a cruel wrong has been done to him; that the Government should have offered these lands for sale, thus allowing the settler to deal with the Government, by which, we may assume, he would have been fairly dealt with, and not with these speculators whom the Government has allowed to intervene and obtain the land for the purpose of making a profit out of the actual settlers. As I said a few moments ago, this system gives a temptation to members of Parliament to act as lobbyists; and I find that a good many hon. members have acted in that capacity. I read a letter here the other night from an hon. gentleman who was not present at the time, but whom I am now happy to see in his place—I refer to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I went through the applications for coal licenses, and I find that the hon. member for Lincoln was an applicant on behalf of other parties on fifteen occasions. I find that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) was an applicant in ten instances.

An hon. MEMBER. Was that all?

Mr. CHARLTON. So far as I saw, that was all. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) and the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) figured in the same category.

Mr. COLBY. Have any of the applications been granted?

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not enquire. It was not necessary to do so, and, besides, it was sufficient to know that hon. gentlemen were acting in their own behalf and in behalf of others as lobbyists in this matter. I took occasion at that time to read a letter from my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to the Department of the Interior. That letter was, I think, dated the 29th of June last, very shortly after the elections. It proceeded to enquire:

"Will you kindly endeavor to have the Order in Council granted for the coal licenses, applied for in the Souris district, for which I sent an application, a list of which I herewith enclose. Our people are very desirous of leaving next week to explore and take immediate action. I also applied for a timber license for W. Thomas, on English River, and which, I was informed by Mr. Riley, was first. Will you please urge this present at the same time. What do you think of the National Policy now? They tried very hard to defeat me."

Now, the hon. gentleman is here, and perhaps he will be kind enough to tell us what connection the National Policy had with timber licenses, and coal lands. Did he wish to remind the Government that he was a good boy, that he had fought the fight and conquered the foe, and that he was entitled to the timber license? If that was not his object, perhaps he will inform us why he made this remark in the letter; and although it is not altogether pertinent to this matter, it may be well to mention that a timber license was granted to him on payment of \$5 per square mile, and that a very short time afterwards it was sold again at \$2,000 per square mile. Perhaps some one who is good at figures will tell us the amount of profit derived from that transaction; but this is a condition of things which those who are not interested in obtaining the license have certainly reason to find fault with. The hon. gentleman, it is claimed, was acting as the agent of others. I do not know whether he pocketed any proportion of the profits, although it is reported that he received, ostensibly as a fee, about one-third of the whole

Mr. CHARLTON.

amount. In conclusion, I have to say, in relation to this matter, that we find fault with this Bill because, in many cases, it usurps to the Government the power that belongs to Parliament, because it presumes to deal, in a Star Chamber fashion, with interests of such vast magnitude that the control of them should be entrusted only to the representatives of the people in Parliament. We find fault with this Bill because the settler's interests are uncared for except in the matter of homestead and pre-emptions, and preemption is shortly to be taken from him. The Government instead of protecting his interests, play into the hands of speculators, and allow them to buy great portions of the public domain for the purpose of selling the land again to the settler at an advance. I think the hon. gentlemen might have allowed the privilege of second entry to that class of hardy men who are the pioneers in the North-West, and who, after fulfilling the regulations for one or more years, should have a chance to sell out and move further on in the wilderness. I think the functions these men perform are of the highest importance in the development of that country. The Government have also done wrong in refusing to give a definite assurance to the homestead settler that if he settles upon worthless land, he will have the privilege of a second homestead entry. I believe that the only policy the Government can adopt that will protect the settler from his natural enemy, the land-grabber and speculator, is one that will reserve the land from sale until it is required for settlement. I think this is a primary duty resting on the Government, and no part of this land policy would more redound to the interests of the North-West. Although I can scarcely hope that the Government will adopt that policy now, I believe the time is coming when the force of public sentiment will compel them to do so; and I only hope that irreparable injury will not be done to the North-West before that time by the Government in placing the public domain to a large extent in the hands of speculative companies. I move in amendment thereto that the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend the same, by striking out all after the words "Governor in Council," in line five, sub-section one, section twenty-four, and substituting the following:—

Provided that all sales of agricultural lands, shall, unless under exceptional circumstances, applicable to particular lots, be made on condition of actual settlement by the purchaser, and in quantities limited to the numbers of acres, which can be reasonably occupied by one settler.

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

### After Recess.

#### QUINZE PIER, BOOM AND IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. TASSÉ moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Company.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before the House goes into Committee, I would like to say a few words on the Bill. It proposes to grant to two gentlemen, Mr. Allan Grant and Mr. Taggart, the right to construct certain works upon that portion of the Ottawa River—a river that is declared by an Act of this Parliament to be a navigable stream—almost 200 miles from above the head of Lake Temiscamingue, through which the timber for a very considerable portion of territory will require to pass. I say this Bill gives this right to those two gentlemen, because although five names appear in the Bill—and I presume also in the petition for it—three of them are the names of employés of Mr. Grant—mere men of straw—and are put there in order to complete the number required to secure an Act of incorporation. I do not

believe it to be in the public interest that the control of so considerable a portion of a river like the Ottawa should be placed in the hands of private individuals, and I am informed licenses have been issued over an extent of from 1,200 to 1,500 square miles above the point where those works are to be constructed. It was stated by the hon. gentleman who appeared on behalf of the incorporators before the Private Bills Committee, that the works, the power to construct which are asked by this Bill, extend over a distance of upwards of 200 miles; yet I am informed that the interests of those two gentlemen who ask for these powers only extend twelve, fifteen, or twenty miles from the head of Lake Temiscamingue. My strong impression is that those works ought to be constructed by the Government; and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, that, inasmuch as no person, except the two gentlemen who have applied for this Act, will use those works during the present season, and which must have been constructed to enable them to get their timber down this stream, he should not press the Bill this Session, and if, during Recess, the Government, upon examination and after full consideration of the circumstances, should come to the conclusion that they will not improve that portion of the river, I will offer no objection next Session to the charter being given to them, or any other gentlemen who may undertake to make the improvements. Although I will be the last to place any obstructions in the way of parties who, by their private enterprise, should have constructed works of this nature, from reaping the advantages they ought to derive by being able to collect tolls from those, other than themselves, who use them; yet, under the circumstances, I am of the opinion the course I suggest should be followed. So far as I am able to learn, some of the license holders in that locality object to these powers being given; but should the House decide to pass this Bill, I will move, in Committee, an amendment, giving to the Government the right to acquire those works at any time they may deem expedient in the public interest to do so.

Mr. TASSÉ. I do not think the hon. member is justified in stating that, but two gentlemen have applied for this Bill, because, in its very preamble, appear the names of Allan Grant, George Taggart, W. G. McVicar, Fred. Fraser, and James Tackle, as applicants for the Act of incorporation. The promoters of this Bill have deserved much from the lumber interests. They have been the pioneers in that part of the Ottawa Valley, and instead of their petition for this Bill being opposed by the lumbering interests there, I may say I hold in my hand letters from eight or ten of the most important men interested in the lumbering interests in that place, proving the contrary.

Mr. WHITE. Name them.

Mr. TASSÉ. I have a letter, signed by Mr. Eagan, who says:

"As a limit holder in that vicinity, I do not see anything objectionable in said Bill, but, on the contrary, consider it most essential that such improvements should be made. In my opinion, public works of this description, particularly in the main Ottawa, should be constructed and controlled by the Government, yet they are so essential to the interests of the lumberers working in that locality that I would be glad to see you succeed in getting incorporated.

"(Signed) H. H. EAGAN."

I have another letter signed by Mr. David Moore, one of the most important lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley. He says:

"I have just seen and carefully read over the Bill as passed before the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons, and, as a limit holder on the Ottawa River, I have no objection to its being passed. I trust every reasonable protection is given to all persons desirous of navigating the river, or enabling them to use the improvements, as I think, moreover, that unless the Government, as a part of the future policy of the country, is prepared to undertake that it will undertake at the public expense to open up and render floatable the Ottawa above Lake Temiscamingue, that portion of the country must remain a sealed book, and the lumber wealth undeveloped for all time, unless such

joint action as is represented by this Bill as managed by the public men of this country and the lumber trade. I certainly believe that the limit holders above Lake Temiscamingue could well afford to grant a bonus to your company, as it will at once put a value upon their property now proportionately valueless owing to the impracticable character of the river as a channel for the timber trade."

I may state that I have a letter also from a gentleman who resides in that locality to which my hon. friend belongs, Mr. Thistle. He says:

"As somewhat interested in the improvement of the Quinze, having an interest in limits on Block A, I have no hesitation in expressing my approval of the work you have in view, and for which you ask a charter under the name of the Quinze Pier and Boom Improvement Company—certainly as far as improving the stream to Lac Expance; and should it not be the policy of the Government to take the improvement of the main Ottawa beyond that point into their own hands with the view of pressing the work on to its completion, I consider it but justice to the limit holders north of Lac Expance that their wishes to have the Bill pass, be assented to. Mr. J. K. Ward, of Montreal, who is largely interested in Quinze limit property writes me that he is favorable to the work, with a clause that charges shall be reasonable and not show a profit of over 10 per cent."

"I am, yours truly,  
"W. R. THISTLE."

Here is a letter from Allan Gilmour, who is also one of the leading lumbermen of this country:

"I have looked over the Bill of the Quinze Pier and Boom Improvement Company, and, as a limit holder on the Ottawa, I see no objection to its being passed; on the contrary, I think, it will be a great benefit to limit holders in that part of the country, if the tolls for passing through the improvements are under the control of the Government."

"Yours truly,  
"ALLAN GILMOUR."

The very thing asked by Mr. Gilmour is proposed to be granted in the Bill now before the House. In fact, all the toils of the company will be under the control and at the risk of the Government, who may change them from time to time. I have also a letter signed by Mr. Conroy; another from Dr. Church, who is a limit holder in that locality; another from Alexander Fraser, and one from Mr. Richard Nagle, also one of the leading lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley. Those letters show that the leading men of the Ottawa Valley interested in the lumber trade instead of being opposed to this charter being granted rather favor it, as being calculated to advance the interests of the lumber trade in this direction. When the House is in Committee I will be prepared to meet the views, to some extent, in limiting the operations of the company. Instead of asking, as is provided in the second clause, that the company shall have power at ninety-five separate and distinct points on the Ottawa River, I will ask the House to substitute the following: "The Company will have power at such separate and distinct points on the River Ottawa at which it may be necessary to attach said booms to the shore of or on such river as far as Lake Temiscamingue;" and instead of "sources of said river," I will put a provision which shall restrict the operations of the company from the foot of Lac Expance to an extent of about thirty or forty miles. I would have no objection if the Government were prepared to go on with the work, but I do not suppose they are ready now. At all events, I am prepared to accept the amendment of which notice has been given by my hon. friend, to the effect that the Government may at any time when they think proper in the public interest take hold of the works. With these remarks, I move the House into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BRYSON. I consider it my duty at this time to express my views on this subject. I have had some little experience in the lumber trade, and I think that the Bill is not in the interests of the public. In the first place, I contend that it has been wrongfully alleged as to the number of places requiring improvements on the Ottawa river; and, secondly, the magnitude and importance of the interests involved in this Bill is something that deserves great consideration. There is a very large expanse of country north

and east of this portion of the Ottawa River, which is known as the Quinze River, because there are some fifteen portages on this portion of the Ottawa River, and from these portages the river derives its name. It is true this portion of the river is very rough and requires improvement. It has been stated by the hon. member for North Renfrew that the promoters of this Bill, although five in number, who appear to have asked to be incorporated, are really but two men. These two gentlemen are lumbering on the upper portion of the Ottawa River in the vicinity of Quinze Rapids, and last year they had their timber and logs driven through this portion of the river in almost its natural condition. This year they are doing the same thing, and have constructed some temporary improvements. They found very little difficulty, I understand from one of the promoters of the Bill, in using that portion of the river last season, and I would suggest, before this company become incorporated, that the Government should send their engineer and make a report of that portion of the river, and submit the specifications; and then if the Government does not feel disposed next year to go on and improve this portion of the river I should be satisfied to support this Bill. But, Sir, at the present time I consider it premature to go on and incorporate this company, because I do not consider it will benefit those holding limits above this portion of the Ottawa River called Quinze. This private company may go on and improve this portion of the river temporarily, but these improvements may not be properly constructed as has been the case with several companies that have already endeavoured to improve the streams and tributaries of the Ottawa, whose efforts have been a total failure. Several instances might be quoted where private companies have attempted to improve the tributaries of the Ottawa and have failed. It might be the same in this case, but I contend that the improvements of a navigable river, such as the Ottawa, should belong to the Government, as is the case in the improvements from the Roche Capitaine to the foot of the Hull slide. The dues and slideage are paid by the lumbermen without any difficulty whatever; whereas, if the company were incorporated, and those holding limits on the upper portion of the Ottawa were obliged to pay these tolls at the head of Lake Temiscamingue, it might cause serious difficulty. As for the letters which have been read by the hon. member in charge of this Bill, I may say in respect of the letter from Mr. Nagle that I am not aware that that gentleman is interested in that portion of the Ottawa. Mr. Fraser, it is true, has some limits in that portion of the Ottawa, but I do not know that they are drained into that river at that point, and I think the timber from his limits will have to come by the Rivière du Moine. Mr. Allan Gilmour is also reported as in favor of the incorporation of this company. I am not aware that Mr. Allan Gilmour has anything at stake in that section of the country whatever. I do not know that his limits touch that portion of the Ottawa. I am satisfied that if the Government would allow this matter to remain over till next year, and if they were not then prepared to go on and build the necessary improvements, after having a report from their engineer, I, for one, will support this Bill. But as it stands at the present time I do not consider it would be in the public interest to now enact it into law.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it this Bill was to remain in the form in which it has been introduced from the other House, it would give power to the company to construct works on a very long stretch of river above Lake Temiscamingue; but the promoter of the Bill has explained that he intends in Committee to limit its operation altogether to that small portion of the river between Lake Temiscamingue and Lac Expance. That is just at the place where the petitioners have their work and their timber.

Mr. BRYSON.

The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) wished that the Government should build this work. I am not sure whether we should undertake this work or not; we have other works of the same kind on the Ottawa. We have on the Upper and Lower Ottawa works which belong to two different companies, not to the Government, and I do not see any difference between the cases of those companies and the case of incorporating this company, where the parties have limits and lumbering establishments. It shows great spirit of enterprise on their part to propose to do this work without asking any aid from the Government. Moreover, by a clause in the Bill, the Government may at any time, if they choose, purchase the work at its value at that time, and if they cannot agree, the matter has to be decided by the Dominion arbitrators. If the public interest would be served one, two or three years hence by the Government acquiring the work, they would have power to do so under this Bill. With respect to limit owners on Lac Expance, if they work their limits, their logs would come down the river, and when they came to that portion of the river improved by the incorporators under this Bill, the property would come under the tariff to be established by the Bill. The charges and dues were to be approved by the Governor in Council, and they might be from time to time, altered and amended. I believe, therefore, the provisions of the Bill are sufficient to guarantee the floating of logs through this work at fair tolls compared with its cost. It has also been objected that the works constructed may not be of a substantial nature. But the plans and specifications have to be approved by the Governor in Council; and it was not in the interest of the company that the work should be of a temporary character, so that they might be carried away by logs or water. I think the provisions of the Bill should be considered in Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. The objections taken by hon. members on both sides of the House are reducible to this: that there is danger that those two gentlemen, who it is said are to represent two lumber firms, may make an undue use of the advantages they will obtain by the incorporation of the company. The whole capital of the company is placed at \$50,000, and this is for a much larger work than the hon. gentlemen now contemplate they should carry out. If the hon. gentleman would make provision in the Bill for the opening of stock books for a certain amount of stock, and give an opportunity to limits holder who are afraid of a monopoly to subscribe and take a portion of stock in the enterprise, the difficulty would be obviated, for they would have a chance to protect their own interests. I do not think they could complain of undue hardship if they were thus allowed to make an investment and share in the control and management of the work.

Mr. DAWSON. I am not opposed to the principle of the Bill, and I am happy to see the very liberal view which the hon. Minister of Public Works has presented in respect to a work of this nature. It is quite evident that lumbermen must have booms in connection with their limits, and it is clear they should have power by law to construct those booms in order to protect themselves. But while admitting this principle, I cannot but recollect that I had a Bill under my charge of precisely a similar nature the other day. It was for booms required at a place where they are as much needed as on the Upper Ottawa, indeed more so, and the Bill was precisely like this now before the House. That Bill was, however, not allowed to go through Committee. I am perfectly aware that an objection was raised that it was on the boundary line; but lumbermen did not wish to take logs except in Canada. While I heartily approve of the principle of the Bill, I must say that it is a bad rule which cannot work both ways, and I much regret that the other Boom Company's Bill could not also have become law.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move in amendment that after the words, "the capital stock of the Company shall be \$50,000 divided into 500 shares of \$100 each," be added: "and after one month's notice in the *Canada Gazette* a book shall be opened at the chief place of business of the Company, in which any person may subscribe for shares of the said capital stock, and in case a larger number than 500 shares shall be subscribed for, then there shall be an allotment of shares among the subscribers, so that no subscriber shall be excluded."

Motion agreed to; and Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No 118) to amend the Act incorporating the European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Company, limited, and to change the name of the Company to the American, British and Continental Cable Company, limited.—(Mr. Colby).

### SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate The Canadian Rapid Telegraph Company, limited.—(Mr. Davies).

### DOMINION LANDS ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker: I cannot congratulate the hon. member for the tone and spirit of the speech in which he introduced the resolution now in your hands. He stated that this was a subject that affected the future of the country and should be removed from the arena of party politics. I would appeal to hon. members on both sides of this House if ever there was a speech delivered in a narrower spirit of partisan attack than that of the hon. gentleman himself. There were no new arguments adduced, no new statements made, no new facts presented, and it was quite easy to see that the motion and the speech were got up for the purpose of making an attack on some gentlemen who sit on the opposite side from the mover of the resolution. I, Sir, shall not condescend to adopt that ignoble course; I shall not condescend to state to this House, as I might do, that there are hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who have made applications for privileges in land, for grants to colonization companies, for timber licenses, and so on. It is an ignoble warfare, Sir, and I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his skill in showing, even in a matter which he himself says should be removed from party politics, what a mere partisan he is. Sir, there is nothing wrong in any gentleman on either side of this House purchasing lands or entering into speculations, or trying to get leases, or developing the country by mines; there is nothing wrong in any hon. member of this House, or any man in the country or out of it, attempting to have a hand, with the prospect of profit, in the work of developing the great North-West; and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have forgotten what very thin ice he walks on when he makes a speech of the kind he did. The hon. gentleman brought in the names of some of my hon. friends who sit behind me. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, have no more interest in these applications than you have, because they made them in the interest of their friends. I would ask you to look, for instance, at my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay); does he look like a land shark or a

land speculator. He was made, as I happen to know, the medium of communication for some of the people in his constituency, some of them very good political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, who asked him to forward their application, and he as their representative did so. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has attacked the policy of the Government on every possible ground. In the first place, he says the honest settler, the homesteader, is not protected. Who is protected in the North-West if the homesteader is not? He can go there and can select his land in any part of the country where it is open for settlement; he can choose according to his own fancy, whether the land is grazing land, heavy clay, or light loam; he can make his selection anywhere in that vast country, and he gets his land free. The sheriff cannot follow him, his creditors cannot follow him, no one can follow him; no matter whether he was an insolvent or not when he left the older Provinces of this country, or Europe, his property is protected there; he can begin a new life of usefulness, and will be surrounded with all the protections of the law that are possible. The hon. gentleman said that the colonization system and this vast system of railway monopoly, are going to swallow up that whole country. Why, Sir, that country is as large, nearly, as all Europe; and to say that two or three or fifty colonization companies, or twenty or thirty or fifty railway companies should be able to do that, is absurd—to use the hon. gentleman's Parliamentary language, is idiotic. The hon. gentleman especially objected to grants to railways. Does the hon. gentleman not remember when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) sat at the head of the Government, and when he himself was, I do not say a slavish, but an obsequious follower of that hon. gentleman, that the Government introduced a Bill by which any fifteen men could build a railway from any point to any point in the North-West, and should receive a grant of 10,000 acres a mile? The Land Act also provided that all land must be sold at \$1 an acre; and this Act of Mr. Mills provides that the Government, instead of giving these companies the land itself, may give them \$1 an acre in money, that is, \$10,000 a mile. That was the policy of the Government. I do not object to that policy; it is no part of my business to object to it now at all; but the hon. gentleman did not object to it, he did not then think that these railway monopolies were going to drive out the honest settler, and that the Government were handing over to speculative companies what ought to belong to the hardy sons of toil. Let me read from the debate on that occasion. There was considerable discussion, and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) opposed the Bill in some of its clauses. But Mr. Charlton said:

"He considered this measure, notwithstanding the unmeasured denunciations it had received at the hands of the hon. member for Northumberland, was a statesmanlike measure and embodied a wise policy. It was essential to the development of the North-West that that country should be furnished with railways. The rivers flowing through that region all flowed to the northward, and thus this region had no natural highways to market as was furnished to the Western States by the Mississippi and the Great Lakes; and if railways were essential to the development of the Western States, they were tenfold more essential to the development of the North-West. It was useless to think of opening up and settling this country without furnishing it with railway facilities. Now, it had been said that the American railways were subsidized to a greater extent than necessary; perhaps that had, in some instances, been the case. Reference had been made to the Illinois Central Railway. At the time that road was projected, nearly the whole interior portion of the State was a wilderness. Farmers living fifty miles from Chicago were in the habit of teaming wheat to the market often, when the roads were bad, at a cost of one-half the value of the wheat. The country had a few struggling settlements in the interior, but there was no extent of population."

Is the hon. gentleman not describing our North-West?

"The country would never have been opened and settled as it has been, but for the construction of a system of railways, of which the Central was the chief. That railway had populated the vast prairie region."

Was it keeping the people out, driving away the homesteaders? No. This railway—

"had contributed in an important degree to make Illinois the third State in the American Union, with a population of over three millions. He recollected paying a visit to Iowa about twenty years ago. Then it had but a few miles of railway, and but a sparse population, chiefly located along the line of the Mississippi: yet by means of a liberal railway policy, by subsidizing several lines crossing the State from east to west, it had suddenly risen into an important State, with a population of nearly, if not quite, 1,500,000. Some of the railways had perhaps been subsidized more than was necessary, perhaps more land had been given than was advisable; but capitalists would not embark their money unless they had a prospect of a fair return, and it was folly to haggle with them about an unimportant difference, when important interests were at stake."

I could pick out a number of very choice *morceaux* in this speech, for the hon. gentleman was there as strong and as convincing as to the necessity, for the sake of settling the country, by subsidizing railways, as he was some years ago, that the only way to produce prosperity in this country was to adopt a system of protection to our native industries. But the hon. gentleman also says, not only the railways but the colonization companies. Well, there are a few of these companies and I consider that every one of them is for the advantage of the North-West. They have put in their capital as the railway speculators have put in theirs and built their railways—for it would be a folly, to use the language of the hon. gentleman, to haggle at any fair return that may be made by them. It may be idiotic; but I tell you, in carrying out the policy of establishing colonization companies, we only follow the example of his leader and the Government which he supported. The whole principle is laid down in the Act that was passed by that Government in 1874, the first Session they came into power. The hon. gentleman says under plan No. 1 we bring in middlemen. Well railways are middlemen and colonization companies are middlemen, but they are to be the agents, the means of assisting immigration, of bringing them out from the old countries or the older Provinces and showing them the land. The hon. gentleman says: You charge nominally \$2, but you give a rebate of \$1. Well, it must be remembered that by the law, until it was altered last year, the land could only be sold for \$1 per acre. By the Dominion Lands Act the price of all lands open for sale was fixed at \$1 per acre. What is our plan? We offer to colonization companies, after putting in capital and bringing in immigrants—and they can only get their money back by bringing in immigrants—land at \$2 per acre, and for every immigrant they actually settle on the lands they get \$1 back. The country therefore gets the original price fixed by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, and continued by us until a late day as being the nominal price of agricultural lands. What is the clause of the law as passed in 1874:

"If any person or persons undertake to settle any of the public lands of the Dominion free of expense to the Government, in the proportion of every family to each alternate quarter-section, or not less than sixty-four families in any one township"—

That is our system:

"Under the homestead provision of this Act hereby amended, the Governor in Council may withdraw any such township."

The hon. gentleman says, the land ought to be thrown open to the settler—no middlemen—at a reduced price, and charges us with introducing the policy of helping the speculator, the middleman, and the handing over to him the lands of the country. The policy established by the Government, supported by the hon. gentleman in that respect, I have shown most conclusively to be the same. We approved of it, because we have simply carried it out and developed it. As regards these colonization companies, I have not any doubt that those who have organized and paid in their money—in the first place, we get all the money the law ever contemplated—will be an efficient means of bringing immigrants into this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

They must have all their capital unless they bring in immigrants, when they will get \$1 back on the \$2 per acre they pay up. I wonder if any greater inducement could be offered by any Government to make these companies bring in immigrants. There was, as everyone knows, a boom, a craze, for colonization companies, and any amount of applications on their behalf. I will not condescend, as I have said before, to say whether these were Conservatives or Reformers, whether they belonged to one side or the other. I know, on going over the whole list, they belonged to both sides. There was a general idea in older Canada, that the North-West was an El Dorado, that gold could be raked up in the streets of Winnipeg. There were many applications, and the Government entertained every application backed by respectable men, whose names were a guarantee that it was *bona fide* and not a fraud. The Government entertained all the applications, but the conditions were so stringent and so well calculated to prevent speculation, and to prevent land sharks from obtaining wealth at the expense of the immigrant, that with these few exceptions the hon. gentleman has mentioned, the rest of the companies have failed to organize. After the first blush was over, the first furore was over, and on calmly considering the project of the Government, the majority of them said: We see there is no money to be made out of it. They never completed their applications, they never organized, and they never paid their money. But those companies who have done so, who have handed their money over and who can get it back, are now energetically proceeding; and I have occasion to know that some of the companies have their agents in Europe, and I have occasion to know that last year one of the companies brought out their immigrants and settled them within the one year. Some of them have not yet done so; but, at all events, we have got their money, and if they do not settle the immigrant upon this land, why, then, we have got the money, and we have got the lands for the homesteads. Now, Sir, as I have endeavored to explain, both in the last Parliament and in this, the effect of granting to the colonization companies a tract of land under plan No. 1 has not kept out a single homesteader. Every even-numbered lot in any one of the colonization grants is open to a homesteader; he can go in, and the company cannot keep him out. If the company brought him there and settled him there they will get the rebate for that man; if the man forces his way in against their consent they will not get the rebate. They are bound to settle men on even-numbered lots, and for every man they put on an even-numbered lot they will get a rebate of \$1 an acre. So they are agents, just as the railway companies of the Western States were agents; all those companies that had large grants of land. There is only one railway yet of any importance, the Pacific Railway, but this and the other railways which are to be subsidized will get grants of land; and with the help of all these companies will the North-West be settled. The hon. gentleman says we should open the country, and let the people go in. Why, Mr. Speaker, after having made these large grants to the railway companies in the first place they are opening up the country, and all these companies, being anxious to get a return for their capital, are bringing immigrants out and are acting agents for that purpose, and without their help that country would never have been settled. Now, these colonization companies are doing precisely the same thing; they will do it, they must do it, or they will lose every farthing they have put into it; and the Government, under the supervision of this House, will force these companies to perform all the conditions under which they have got these grants. I say that the Government will compel them, force them, to perform their conditions under penalties which are provided by the regulations, by the utter forfeiture of all the advantages which they hope to gain. But the hon. gentleman objected to plan No. 2. Well, plan No. 2 has proved a failure; not

one single company has been organized under it. And why? Because there was no money in it. As was explained to Parliament before, plan No. 2 provided that a party obtaining a grant under that plan should pay \$2 for every acre, and in case they paid \$2 in cash for the whole of the area, they were to get a rebate of one-half if they put on 128 immigrants, twice the number of settlers required under plan No. 1. The reason for adopting plan No. 2 was, that it had been represented to us that there were large capitalists in Europe and in Great Britain, who were desirous to get large tracts, and to bring out a body of their people and place them on that land. In order to assist them, plan No. 2 was adopted. But the regulations were so stringent, so much against the speculator, that although on the first blush nine applications were made, not one single company was organized under it, because there was no money in it. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman insinuated—he ventured to insinuate that all these arrangements were made before an election, and for election purposes; at the same time he quoted gentlemen on this side who did not want to be bribed; they were Conservatives, they had been Conservatives and would be Conservatives, grant or no grant. They were unworthy insinuations, but they were insinuations such as do not come unfrequently from that hon. gentleman. I do not think that those who surround him will feel themselves, or their party, elevated in public opinion, or in the opinion of those in their ranks, by an hon. gentleman who, from the best and most Parliamentary motives makes the basest and grossest insinuations. But it was before an election, forsooth! Why, Mr. Speaker, since 1874 a law was passed carrying out the same policy. We all know that there was a boom and a rush, and in order to check and regulate and restrict speculation, these negotiations were made. They were not wanted for the purpose of authorizing the Government to establish colonization companies, they were regulations so to restrict them that the settlement was sure and assured, that the land sharks should not get possession of the land under pretext of being a colonization company. They were regulations, not empowering the Government to establish companies, but they were passed to restrain and restrict the power that had been given and had run throughout the whole Statutes since 1874—I presume before that—but at all events under the Statutes, as I now have them before me, of 1874. So it was unworthy of the hon. gentleman to make such an insinuation, to make such a charge. But the hon. gentleman said also that we ought only to give those lands away to actual settlers. Why, we give every even-numbered lot in that country, we give them away for nothing. Railway lands we give to the railways, and they are paid for. We give lands to the Pacific Railway Company, and the even-numbered lots are no doubt, offered to the homesteader. “But,” says the hon. gentleman, “some lands are reserved.” Does not the hon. gentleman know that when the Government came to Parliament and asked the people to commit themselves to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; when the Government asked Parliament, as the representatives of the people, to undertake the burden of paying \$25,000,000 in cash besides what had been expended previously on the road—does the hon. gentleman not know that in order to induce Parliament to undertake such an immense road, there was a reservation of 100,000,000 acres, and by Statute? And this 100,000,000 acres were pledged by Act of Parliament to be sold for the purpose of recouping to the taxpayers of the older Provinces the money they were advancing for the purpose of opening up and developing the great West. Of those 100,000,000 of acres, 25,000,000 are given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is the duty of the Government as trustees—they are obliged to do it as faithful guardians of the public interests, and as provided for under the law of the land—to take 75,000,000 acres and to sell them

to the best advantage and apply the money for the purpose of repaying what we are now paying out of the hard-earned money of the people for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When we came down with our scheme I ventured to pledge myself, although I was told I was Quixotic and extravagant in my ideas, that the North-West country could build its own railways, that the soil was rich enough and the future people independent enough to desire that their own railways should be built by themselves, out of their own means, and we in the older Provinces were merely advancing money—on mortgage of those 100,000,000 acres; and I pledged myself that there would not be a single farthing taken from the pockets of the people that would not be returned from the proceeds of those lands. And therefore it was that we put into the market good land and offered it for sale on fair terms, and we hope, and in fact we know we will get good prices; and within the limitation of the existence of the present Parliament if it lasts its legal term there will be derived from the proceeds of these land sales sufficient to repay the people of Canada for all advances made in connection with that work. This was a wise and true policy, and yet it has been carpied at by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) as being a corrupt arrangement, as being carried out for party purposes and objects, and as being an encouragement to speculators and land sharks to keep out immigration. Why, our policy is infinitely superior to the policy of the United States, and infinitely more liberal. We give 160 acres and preemption, and will do so for a year and a-half. The United States do not give both. They only give 160 acres. The settler may have either a preemption or a homestead, but he cannot have both; he may change his homestead for a preemption, but he cannot have both. We give homestead and preemption. Instead of five years residence and cultivation of the soil, we make a man a freeholder if he cultivates honestly and fairly his farm for three years. I say this policy is the true one. I do not at all claim a monopoly of credit for it; it was the sensible policy of the Government in 1870-71, so far as in that early embryonic stage of the North-West, we may be said to have had a policy. It was carried out by the former Government of which I was a member; it was carried out by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power, and it has been developed fully and perfectly, and made a complete system under the present Administration. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) said there was favoritism in regard to timber limits. The law before 1874, and it was the law passed by the Administration of which I was formerly a member, was, that all timber limits should be put up to auction and should be disposed of to the highest bidder. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they assumed office, altered that law and did away with the principle of offering timber limits for competition, and provided that timber limits should be given under the provisions that now obtain, namely: \$5 a mile annually, and 5 per cent. on the gross receipts from the timber. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was right in thus altering the law. He and the hon. members of his Government found out that in that new country, into which timber had to be brought from the United States, and which was dependent on Minnesota and Minneapolis mills for its supply, there was no means of inducing lumbermen to go there but by giving them liberal terms and coaxing them to go into the country. Before we went out of power in 1873 I had, after great difficulty, persuaded Mr. William J. Macaulay, whom everyone knows in the North-West—I had known him before, when he was a successful lumberer in eastern Canada—to go to the North-West, and I believe he has done very well, having made a competency, if not a fortune. I felt, to use the expressive language of the hon. member, that it was useless to haggle with him, as I was desirous of bringing down the price of lumber, from God knows what price, to

a reasonable figure. The people want lumber. The Government said to any respectable man, whatever his name and antecedents—and I say distinctly, that the Government did not ask what his politics were—that if you can give to the Department reasonable assurance that you will carry out the undertaking, erect a saw-mill capable of cutting a certain quantity of lumber during the year, you will obtain a district. The only difference we made was that we altered the law allowing licenses for twenty-one years—a good many of such licenses were issued by hon. gentlemen opposite—and we limited them to one year only, at the same time intimating that, not as a matter of legal obligation, but as a matter of practice, we would carry out the practice existing so long, both in Ontario and Quebec, that unless public policy and other high interests demanded it, if the party performed all the obligations and paid rental and stumpage, he would get a renewal. That has been the policy of the Government, and it has been a true policy. The consequence was that the Government were saved the expense of surveys, for those lumbermen went into the country, took their surveyors with them, and did the work of explorers; they found where the lumber was, and some found after their licenses were granted that there was not sufficient lumber to make it worth while to execute their lease. Those explorers went all over the North-West; they found the lumber, as I have said, they got the area surveyed, they obtained a license; and if at the end of the year they had not fulfilled the conditions, they lost their license, but if they erected a mill there and fulfilled the conditions, who got the benefit of it? Why, the settlers going in there. Lumber is like the breath of life to them. Unless they get it they must remain without houses and the means of becoming settlers; and if the Government do not obtain one farthing of return in money, they will obtain a substantial return if, as a consequence of granting those timber licenses, the price of lumber shall be brought down within reasonable limits, so that settlers would not ruin themselves to obtain lumber to erect houses, and for other purposes. As regards timber licenses, most of the holders will find no money in them. The railway will be carrying lumber from Thunder Bay, the finest lumber in the world, into that country, within two years—at the end of this year, in fact—and so soon as, within five years, the line north of Lake Superior is finished. Recent discoveries show its timber to be very valuable. This timber is shown to be of good quality, and to exist to a great extent; and when this lumber is poured in from the east, and more than that, when the railway gets through the gorges of the Rocky Mountains, and the magnificent timber of British Columbia is poured in eastward, then we will find very many of these speculators, who have got hold of the Government, and bribed the Government, and been bribed by the Government, according to the hon. gentleman, by the enormous fortunes which they are going to make out of these licenses, coming back and begging us to take them off their hands, and to remit the dues, declaring they are ruined, and that they have lost money by their enterprises, which had proved mistaken and unfortunate. So I might go on at considerable length on this matter, but I do not think that I ought really to pay such a compliment to the hon. gentleman, who I see has introduced a resolution for the purpose of making an attack, which outside of this House would be called an ungentlemanly attack, on men sitting in the same society with himself, and in the same House, trying to drag their names before the public in order that these may be published in the *Hansard*, and in the newspapers, as not being independent members of Parliament. Independent! Heaven save the mark! That hon. gentleman talks of independence! I say it is paying him an undue compliment to delay longer on this subject. And now let us read the resolution which he says should be put

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

in the Act. In the fifth line, sub-section one, section twenty-four, he desires this to be substituted:

“Provided that all sales of agricultural lands shall, unless under exceptional circumstances,—”

Now, this is to form part of an Act of Parliament—

“Applicable to particular lots,—”

I ask the hon. gentleman, who is to judge of the exceptional circumstances, what are the particular lots to which the exceptional circumstances are to be applied? Who is to be the judge of it? Why surely the hon. gentleman does not want that this corrupt Government, which bribes their friends, and which is bribed by their friends, shall be the judge of these exceptional circumstances! The hon. gentleman said, in his speech, that the Government is taking out of the hands of Parliament, what belongs to Parliament. I had always understood that according to the principles of the British Constitution, Parliament had to legislate and to legislate only; and it would be an abuse of the Constitution—and the law lays this down—it would be a fracture, a breach of the Constitution, whenever the Legislature would attempt to usurp the province of the Executive. That is the principle in the United States, and the hon. gentleman likes it. The Senate, one of the branches of the Legislature there, is a portion of the Executive. The hon. gentleman draws his inspiration from the United States. It was only the other day, on this Bill, that he said that the sections must be numbered from north to south; and why should we start from north to south? Why?—because they do it in the States. When we had a most magnificent system of arrangement of surveys in the world; when from Red River throughout Manitoba to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, we had one uniform system, so complete and so readily intelligible, that no man could make a mistake, the hon. gentleman said: “It is not so very good.” Why?—because they have it otherwise in the States, where they mark off Territories, and each Territory has its own survey and system. But this was what it ought to be, because they had it in the States. Well, when we belong to the States, we shall do as Statesmen do; but in the meantime, we will stick to the present system, which is perfect. I am not an expert in these matters myself; but let any geometrician or person connected with surveying and the arrangement of land be consulted, and he will say that our system is the finest in the world. We had the advantage of a country not broken up into Territories and States. We had complete control of the whole country, and consequently, we adopted this simple and magnificent system, which has been carried out. But it seems:

“That all sales of agricultural lands shall, unless under exceptional circumstances, applicable to particular lots—”

What lots? No. 1 or No. 2?

“Be made on condition of actual settlement by the purchaser.”

Well, the purchaser pays the money, and how will you compel him to settle. If he once pays the money, you cannot ask him to take it back. He will not do it. You must give him credit. The hon. gentleman wishes to allow a number of years to run, when the land is to be forfeited if he does not cultivate it. Then we can take it back; and last of all, we are to compel him to cultivate it. No, we do better than that. We give at least one-half of the whole country to the actual settler for nothing, and the balance is sold at the best price, the money going into the public treasury and being returned to the pockets of the people. Then, it is to

“Be made on condition of actual settlement by the purchaser, and in quantities limited to the number of acres which can be reasonably occupied by one settler.”

Now, how much land can one man reasonably occupy? One man may reasonably occupy 10,000 acres if he has money



enough; and if a poor cotter or crofter coming from his own country, or an Irishman from the west of Ireland, one acre may perhaps be a reasonable quantity. But the Government is to see to this. And this is the hon. gentleman's first attempt at Parliamentary legislation. This is a specimen of the Bill that the hon. gentleman will introduce when he is Minister of the Interior. This is a specimen of the legal acumen and power of drafting of the hon. gentleman! Why, this resolution, not to put it too strongly, is, to use the expressive language of the hon. gentleman, "idiotic," and there I leave it.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the motion is put I would like to say a few words, although I can scarcely hope to add one thing additional to the very able speech of the hon. First Minister. I think, on reading the resolution and drawing a few inferences relating to the speech made previous to six o'clock by the hon. member for Norfolk, one would be led to suppose that some great wrong was being perpetrated on the settler going into Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The comparison drawn as to what would be the result of the policy which is being carried out so successfully at the present time, and what would be the result from the change proposed by the hon. gentleman, is suggestive. I will only touch on a few points to which the hon. gentleman referred. He said that this system was an evil—worse than anything which had ever been introduced by the Canada Company of Ontario. Now, I happen to live in a part of the country where the Canada Company operated very largely; and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman and this House if they are aware of the conditions upon which land was sold by that company? They were these: The land was simply leased to a party for a term of years, and the occupant had to pay about four times as much as the Government was selling land for, and this had to be done before a certain number of years went by, sometimes four, sometimes six, and sometimes eight. If they fail to pay for the land inside of those years, then, no matter what improvements were made—they counted for nothing—the Canada Company took the lands into their own hands, and then they advanced it in price according to improvements. I know of cases where I am living in which land was originally bought for \$4 an acre, and the farmer, after working hard upon it for seven years, could not meet the payments, the land was taken from him and raised to \$12 an acre. I would ask if the poor settler in that case was any better off than the man who goes to the North-West and gets a homestead for \$10, or whatever is the cost of making the necessary entries. I say that with regard to the Canada Company there is no comparison, because to-day it is almost impossible to buy from that company in the old settled portions of the country. I say that there are no evils connected with the land system of to-day which can at all compare with those which were felt under the sway of the Canada Company. I believe it was recognized by the past, as it is by the present Government that the North-West country should be settled up. The only difference between them was as to the best means of accomplishing that object. Let us compare the means adopted by the late Government with those which are employed by the present Administration. Two years ago we had occasion to examine before the Committee of Immigration and Colonization, gentlemen who were engaged in getting settlers into that country under the late Government—I refer to Mr. Prittie and Mr. Archibald Young of Sarnia. I have the evidence before me which was adduced in the Committee. He told the Committee that he was engaged under an agreement with the late Government, arranged by an Order in Council by which Mr. Young was to get 80 acres of land for every settler he put in the country. Had he brought these settlers from Europe we might have made no great objection, but his plan was to take settlers from Ontario and the other older Provinces, and to depopulate these Provinces by trans-

planting the people to the North-West. In his evidence he did not tell us how many he had taken up in 1877, but in 1878 he took up 700; in 1879, 1,000; in 1881, 1,033; and these settlers were not placed as those colonization companies are placing them to-day, twenty miles from the railway, but wherever he could find a place for them; and for each settler he received eighty acres of land. I have gone into a calculation to ascertain how much land that would realize him, according to his own evidence, in three years, and I find that it was no less than 218,649 acres. He told us that this land was worth \$6 an acre at least, so that the amount he received was \$1,311,843 for the three years, or at the rate of \$480 for each immigrant. We would consider that a dear figure even if he had brought the immigrants from Europe; but, as I said before, he thinned the population of the older Provinces for the purpose of settling up the North-West. I know that in every portion of my own county advertisements were put in the papers asking families to join Prittie's excursion, and I know that in my own neighborhood several families were taken to the North-West in this way. Some of these families had already sold out their property with the intention of going there, and yet, for every individual, they received eighty acres of good land in Manitoba. I say that, in comparison with such a system as this, colonization companies are a great advantage to the country, because they not only take up the settlers but they build mills, construct railways, open roads, and secure postal advantages, and many other conveniences. I think there is a very strong argument in favor of the present scheme, because, as we judge by the light of experience, many men are going up into that country and the country is being settled up. From 1875 to 1878 few men went into that country, and it was comparatively at a standstill. Now it is progressing more rapidly than any other country under the sun. There is no parallel in the civilized world to the advancement which that country has made within the last few years. The people who are going up there are forming nuclei of settlement away from the railway. An hon. member opposite said that the timber policy of the present Government was a bad one, because it allowed every man to go and get a limit and build a mill. If the hon. gentleman will look at the returns brought down from the Department of the Interior, he will find that very few mills have been built there—not more than one or two dozen within the last few years. The present regulations give fifty square miles to every man who goes in and manufactures the timber, but previously the quantity was 200 square miles, and it might be taken anywhere between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains. At present the settler gets the full advantage of these mills, which formerly were scattered at long distances throughout the country. What is it now? Lumber for building purposes can be got there now for from \$18 to \$35 a thousand. Why has the price come down? Because all these mills have been built, and millions of feet of lumber have been taken into the country. Again: Do the means of settlement require that a change should be made in the conditions of these leases? They are only for one year, so that there is every protection to the country under them; but formerly, when the leases were for twenty-one years, all the mills might be in one man's hands, and he could control all the lumbering operations in the North-West. At present, the erection of mills, and the increasing quantity of lumber produced every year, help the poor settler, and promote the interests of the country. This resolution says that there should be no middleman, but that the land should be sold for actual settlement; but several hon. gentlemen, including, I believe, the hon. gentleman himself, a few nights ago endeavored to induce the Government to grant land for cultivation, and not for settlement at all. I think some of the Manitoba members recommended that, when they knew that

if it were done, an army of speculators would rush into Manitoba and the North-West, and would take up millions of acres of land, and would never settle on it. They would cultivate for awhile, and then sell it to any man who would give them the highest figure for it; and the settlers would be scattered all over the country, and be unable to make their roads, to build their schools and churches, and to enjoy that society which is always so desirable in the early history of a country. No matter from what standpoint you view these land regulations, compared with the old regulations, you see how those of the present Government contrast with those of their predecessors in the interest of the settler. They have expunged everything that appeared to be injurious; they have accepted all the good points and abandoned all the bad ones, and they have made others that appeared to be in the interest of the country, as from time to time they appeared requisite. Now, taking the arguments advanced by the members for Manitoba during the discussion on this Bill, I do not think there is a single one in harmony with the resolutions of the hon. member for North Norfolk. I do not think his own arguments or speeches in this House on former occasions are in consonance with the speech he has made to-day. I think he is as much out to-day as he was a few years ago, because our experience shows that the regulations are being properly carried out, not only in the interest of the pioneer settler, but for the development of the country, the returns to the Government, and the prosperity of the Dominion.

Mr. BERGIN. I am sorry to be obliged to ask the indulgence of the House for a little while, as I feel it due to myself and to others to make some remarks in reply to what has been said by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Although that gentleman used the plural "we," thereby professing to speak for gentlemen on the other side of the House, I am sure that there cannot be one who did not hang his head in shame when he heard the cruel, unfeeling, unnatural attack that that hon. gentleman made on the right hon. leader of the Government. Why, Sir, there is no man in Canada, no matter what his personal or political feelings may be, who can deny that that venerable statesman has done more not only than any man, but than all men in this Parliament for this country, and it ill became one with the record of the hon. member for North Norfolk to make such an attack, either on the right hon. leader of the Government, or on any member of this House. What is his record for consistency? Consult the *Hansard* and see if there be a question on which he has not spoken on both sides. We do not forget that in the year 1876 a Colonization Bill was brought in by the then Minister of the Interior, and that that Bill was supported by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The right hon. leader of the Government quoted to-night from the speech of the hon. member on that occasion, and I shall take the liberty of quoting from it also. Remember, Sir, that this hon. gentleman, at the opening of his speech, deprecated, as he does on all occasions when insinuating slanders on gentlemen on this side of the House, anything of party feeling, and he used the same words in 1878 that he used to-night. He said on that occasion: "He hoped hon. gentlemen would not look at this matter in any party light." How has he treated it to-day? Had he anything but the vilest party motive in the speech he made? "He trusted they would not oppose the policy in order to gain a temporary advantage over the Government." From what other motive did he make that speech, and move that resolution, which was so justly characterized by the right hon. leader of the Government as idiotic. "But that they would view it from the broad standpoint of our national interest." Let me ask what interest, national, local, personal, or political, could be served by such a vile diatribe as that which he addressed to the House this afternoon? He went on to say that, "They would look with statesmanlike forethought to what were the real interests of Canada, and accord to this

Mr. SPOULE.

measure the generous support which it most certainly deserved." Has he who dared to speak this afternoon—not from a patriotic, but from a party point of view—has he viewed this question as he said it ought to be viewed, and given it the generous support he said it deserved? Far from it. In that usual hypocritical style that characterizes him, he dared to asperse the character of the right hon. leader of the Government with a dishonesty that no one else—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must request the hon. member to withdraw those words.

Mr. BERGIN. If the words that I have used are unparliamentary, I apologize to the House; but it must not be forgotten that it was in the heat of the moment, smarting under a baseless attack made upon me, I used the somewhat strong expression. When I call the attention of the House to the fact that when this hon. gentleman dared to charge me with having made ten applications for coal lands, in order that the House and the country might be led to believe that I had made these applications in my own interest, he knew he was insinuating that which was not correct; and let me say that the majority of the men for whom I made application—for I had not a particle of interest in their applications—belonged to his side of the House and not to this. The same may be said with regard to the applications made by the hon. member for Lincoln. If anything could show the dishonest style of attack which was made upon that hon. gentleman, and upon me, in connection with this matter, it would be the manner in which he gave to the House the letter written by that hon. gentleman to the right hon. leader of the Government. Who would suppose, on hearing the hon. gentleman this afternoon, but that the hon. member for Lincoln had asked the right hon. leader of the Government to give him coal lands and timber limits in reward for services he proposed to render at the election. Everybody understood—in fact the hon. gentleman said directly, and it was almost the only direct charge he made—that hon. members of Parliament received these coal lands and timber limits in reward for political services rendered at the elections, and that these regulations were framed for the purpose of inducing hon. members and others to support the Government during the elections. I find, upon looking at this letter to the right hon. leader of the Government, which ought not to have been brought down, for it was a private letter, that it was dated after the elections—

Mr. CHARLTON. So I said—June 29th.

Mr. BERGIN. Eight days after the election. Here is the letter. I will read it to the House to show how unfair was the manner in which this matter has been treated by the hon. gentleman. The letter is as follows:—

"MY DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly endeavor to have the Order in Council granted for the coal licenses in the Souris District, for which I sent an application, a list of which I herewith enclose."

A list of the names of his constituents who had through him—the proper party—applied for coal licenses.

"Our people are very desirous of leaving here next week to explore and take immediate action."

They had only waited until the election was over, I suppose, according to the hon. gentleman.

"I have applied for a timber license for St. Thomas, or on the English River, which I was informed by Mr. Ryley, was first. Will you please urge this present at the same time"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was the first application you see.

Mr. BERGIN.—

"What do you think of the National Policy? They tried hard to defeat me."

Now, he was jubilant over the carrying of the election, as showing that hon. gentlemen opposite had as usual prophesied falsely, and made statements they knew were not correct, and he says they tried very hard to defeat him. Yet the hon. member for North Norfolk tried to lead the country to believe, that because they had tried hard to defeat the hon. member for Lincoln, the right hon. leader of the Government should assist him with a timber limit to defray his expenses. That is the way the hon. member for North Norfolk distorts and twists public documents in the interest of his party, whilst exclaiming that he was speaking patriotically, and asking the House not to view this question in a party light. As regards the attack the hon. gentleman made upon myself, I could, I think, afford to treat it with contempt; but I have a constituency—a constituency which I think has a regard for the character of its representative, a constituency on which I hope never by act or word of mine to bring discredit or dishonor in any way. I hope that I shall never forget that, holding the position of a member of the House of Commons of Canada, I am here, not alone as an individual, with my own individual character to preserve, but as representing a great county which I must not discredit or disgrace by any act or word of mine. This hon. gentleman disapproves of the land policy. He says we have too many railways, and that there is not an acre of land in the North-West on which to settle; that we have been giving away the lands. A while ago, I told you there was not a question that came before this House since the hon. member for North Norfolk has had the honor of a seat here, upon which he has not spoken on both sides. He says that we are giving away the lands, that we are not getting enough for them, and that we have too many railways; but in 1878, he said:

"The United States Government held the alternate sections, which were reserved within the limits of railway land grants, at double the price of lands outside the limits of railway grants, and more distant for railway communication. These lands were denominated double minimum lands, and sold as readily at \$2.50 per acre as other land did at \$1.25; and the result of railway land grants, so far as land sales were concerned, was, that the Government had actually received as much for its lands as it would have been likely to have done if the whole area had been sold at the ordinary Government prices. Now, in the North-West there were involved millions of acres of land. They were told by the hon. member for Northumberland that this was the heritage of Canada, that it had been bought by the people's money; but in its present shape, of what value was this great, wild, lone land to us? The question was, how that land should be utilized, and for that purpose the hon. Minister of the Interior had devised a Bill which, in its conception, was admirable, and which, in his opinion, would, if carried out, attain the object of populating this vast country."

And what was this admirable Bill? The right hon. leader of the Government described it awhile ago—a Bill that placed in the hands of fifteen land sharks and railway speculators the power to gobble up all the important sections of the North-West; and if I were disposed to insinuate, if I were disposed so to degrade my position as to follow the example set me by the hon. member for North Norfolk, I might create a sensation in this House by calling to mind what has occurred on the other side of the line, that country which the hon. gentleman loves so well, and from which he draws his inspiration when he brings before this House—he, that great moral Reformer—measures which he thinks ought to be passed here because similar ones were passed in the United States. But I shall spare him. I do not know that I ought to pursue this subject much further. But I cannot avoid saying a word or two in regard to the timber limits of which this hon. gentleman seems to think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have too many. We all know that the regulations under which the timber limits are granted by the present Government are those under which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) granted timber licenses during his regime. We all know those timber regulations were framed by him. Who that read the return brought down last year, asked for

by the hon. member for West Durham, but must have noticed that out of twenty-six or twenty-eight licenses that were granted to cut timber, twenty-two of the berths were granted to Grits; and yet, Sir, we are to be told that upon this side of the House we have been robbing the timber lands of this country. Why, Sir, has he forgotten that only a day or two before the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government came into power upon the resignation of the hon. member for East York, 200 miles of the best limits in the North-West were given away—given away to the present member for Simcoe and the member for Selkirk? Who forgets, too, that these timber limits were not given *en bloc*, as they were given by the right hon. gentleman, but they were given in small parcels, with the privilege of selecting them wherever they chose. In fact, the whole of the North-West timber was given over to these two gentlemen, and for twenty-one years, and we have never from that day to this, heard a word of rebuke of that conduct by the hon. member for North Norfolk—the man who stands up in this House to-day and says, that upon great questions of this kind, we should throw aside party and speak and vote as patriotic Canadians. And we require, the hon. gentleman says, at the head of the Department of the Interior, not a worn-out, feeble old intellect, like that of the right hon. Premier, but we require a young and vigorous intellect like his. I ask this House, after listening to the right hon. gentleman to-night, and to the hon. gentleman this afternoon; and I ask the country, after they shall have read the two speeches, wherein his head is not as clear, his intellect as bright, his power of speech as great, as it was when he first entered Parliament, and his character as high, not only in Parliament, not only in the country, but throughout the civilized world? And the contrast with the hon. gentleman opposite, I leave with the country to make.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I just wish to correct the hon. gentleman who has spoken. I wish him to understand, and this House to understand, that I never made an application nor received a timber limit from the Mackenzie Government in my life.

Mr. BERGIN. Well, I am most unfortunate, it appears, in my allusions to the hon. member for Selkirk. The other night I mistook him for the member for L'Assar; to-night it appears I gave him credit for that which was due to his brother.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aware that if I say anything this time it must be by the courtesy of the House. But as attacks have been made upon me, and representations that are misleading, I claim the privilege of correcting them.

Mr. RYKERT. I rise to a point of order; he has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is upon the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do I understand that the gag laws are to be applied to me?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows that it is by the courtesy of the House if he is heard. It is not for me to decide.

Mr. CHARLTON. Three members have spoken on that side, and representations have been made with regard to myself to which I ought to have a chance of replying.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have another opportunity.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. In speaking upon this question I may be allowed to allude to one or two matters, perhaps not strictly pertinent to the motion for adjournment, but con-

nected with it. If the First Minister had treated my remarks fairly I should not have sought this opportunity of replying briefly to what he said. He attempted upon the very start to mislead the House, and mislead the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman, in any remarks he makes, to use parliamentary terms. He must know that it is unparliamentary to say that any hon. gentleman has attempted to mislead the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I stand corrected. I certainly intended to use no terms offensive to the hon. gentleman, or to the House, but I am dealing with the fact, that the hon. gentleman's language was calculated to convey an erroneous impression as to the course I took in the remarks made to this House. The hon. gentleman asserted that I had attacked the system of railway grants. I made no attack of the kind. I merely alluded incidentally to the fact that railway grants had been made. In criticising the policy of the Government in making large grants to the colonization companies, I incidentally mentioned that between grants of this kind, and grants to railway companies, I feared the public domain would be exhausted, and that was all I said with reference to railway grants. I made no attack upon that policy; but the hon. gentleman, building that foundation, proceeded to make a speech, to quote my speech of some years ago with reference to Bill introduced into this House by the hon. David Mills, a Bill styled the Colonization Railway Bill, a Bill which I supported, which I spoke in favor of, which I deemed then, and still deem to have been a proper and rightful measure. Now, Sir, as the character of that Bill has been called in question, and as my language upon that Bill has been cited here, let us enquire for a moment what were its features. Sir, it was a Bill that provided for the construction of railways in the North-West, not all east and west, not all leading to the one centre and under one monopoly, but a Bill for building railways in any direction that the wants of that country might require; a Bill that provided for subsidizing these railway lines by a grant not exceeding twenty sections per mile in the Peace River region, and not exceeding twelve sections per mile in that section of the country now being developed. The maximum grant in the Peace River district would be 12,800 acres to the mile, and in the other district 8,680 acres to the mile. But these are the gentlemen calling that Bill into question who have subsidized a road by granting 12,500 acres of selected land to the mile, and by granting \$12,500 in cash to the mile, and by giving in addition 730 miles of road, the most expensive in the North-West, together with the monopoly of the carrying trade of the North-West, and upon conditions so odious that the country, when it comes to understand them, will pronounce these men to have been derelict in their duty, and to have failed to protect the interests of the country. This is the comparison made, a comparison between that Bill granting at the utmost 12,800 acres to the mile in the Peace River region, and twelve sections to the mile in the country now being traversed by railways; these are the hon. gentlemen that make this comparison with their scheme for granting these sums of money and creating this great monopoly, granting 25,000,000 acres of selected land in the North-West. I do not wonder that the hon. gentlemen sought to divert attention from that Bill, but I do wonder at their making the comparisons they did make in this matter. I have nothing to retract in the speech I made then. I stand by the principles enunciated in that speech. The hon. gentleman, in quoting that speech, thought to create a false impression in this House—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order! I beg the hon. gentleman to withdraw that expression.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not use that word in the sense of designed falsehood, but I say an incorrect impression, an

Mr. CHARLTON.

impression not in accordance with the facts of the case. The right hon. gentlemen then proceeds to charge me with having made insinuations—mean, cowardly, wanton, dastardly—with regard to this policy, with regard to the effects of this policy that he has adopted, in placing the timber limits in the hands of those who applied for them without competition, in placing coal leases in the hands of those who applied for them without competition, and in making these colonization grants at half-price. I believe honestly and conscientiously from my inmost soul, that the interests of the country are threatened by this policy; I believe that policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite is one not calculated to foster the interests of this country, and I believe it is my duty as an independent member of Parliament, as the representative of a riding in this Dominion, to denounce this policy, and I do denounce it, and will denounce it. I do not do it for the satisfaction it affords me, for it is a painful duty to discharge. I believe this policy is calculated to bring the country into great and serious difficulties, and for that reason I denounce it. I have made no charges against any one. I gave a list of certain members who, either on their own behalf, or as agents, made application for coal land leases, and I did not seek to create a false impression as to those members, and I did not create such an impression. The hon. the First Minister, after making a misleading quotation as to the course I took with respect to denouncing railway grants, when I did not denounce them at all, and only mentioned them incidentally, attempted—I am sorry to see a man in his eminent position stoop to play on the Yankee string—to accuse me of drawing my inspiration from the United States, mentioning a circumstance in connection with the discussion in the Committee, in which I asked why a system of numbering the townships diametrically opposite to that of the United States had been adopted. The hon. gentleman says I drew my inspiration from the United States. Where did he draw his land system from? He copied his land system from that of the United States, the system of sections, townships, ranges, and in order that it might not be a slavish imitation, he changed the American system of numbering sections from north to south to one from south to north. Yet the hon. gentleman rises in his place and accuses me of having sought to introduce something copied from the United States with respect to the land system—a beautiful specimen of guilelessness on the part of the hon. gentleman. It is an old saying that, when you have no case, abuse the plaintiff's attorney. I regret that the hon. gentleman—I cannot say he has no case—was driven to abuse the plaintiff's attorney in this matter. I come to my hon. friend, the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), who endeavored to justify the hon. member for Lincoln, and read that letter, and said I had attempted to convey the impression to this House that it was written before the elections. I quoted the date of that letter when I read it. I stated that the hon. gentleman, in that letter, had asked the hon. First Minister what he thought of the National Policy now, and why he should introduce that reference in an application for a coal lease and timber lease. I cannot understand; perhaps he thought he might convince the hon. Minister that he had fought the good fight, that he had kept the Tory faith, and now was entitled to his timber lease, and such rewards, for his labor. This was what I stated, and it cannot be said that I read the letter and endeavored to show that it was written before the election. With respect to the patriotic motives of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), it is not a pleasure to allude to this; but when the denial is made that the hon. member for Lincoln had any personal motives in this matter, it is well that the facts should be known. I want to know if the hon. gentleman did not negotiate the transaction in connection with the timber limit in the Cypress Hills? I want to know if he did not, as agent for other

parties, get a timber limit there at \$5 a square mile, and sell it at \$2,000 a square mile ?

Mr. RYKERT. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to know if he did not get that on behalf of one Adams; if he did not go to Winnipeg in person and sell it to Louis Sand of Michigan ?

Mr. RYKERT. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to know if the price was not \$200,000; if \$90,000 was not paid in cash, one-third of which he put in his pocket ?

Mr. RYKERT. I did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I tell this House that the policy of the Government in placing such temptations in the way, is wrong. Members of Parliament should not be subjected to temptation of this kind, and I denounce the Government's policy for that reason. Those hon. gentlemen acted probably as other hon. gentlemen would have acted. I do not say one party is purer than another, or assert that purity is all on one side, and dishonesty on the other; but I say that the policy of the Government is wrong, and I condemn that policy as producing these fruits. I have but one word more to say. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) accused me of having spoken in a disparaging tone of the First Minister. I deny it. He says that I described him as having an old, feeble intellect. I said nothing of the kind. I complimented the hon. gentleman on the remarkable preservation of his intellectual and physical qualities. I complimented him on the fact, that for a man of his years, he was remarkable for his physical and intellectual vigor; but I said that the duties of the offices of Minister of the Interior and Premier, united in one person, were too much for any man in the prime of life, with full physical vigor, and too much for the hon. gentleman, and the consequence was, that important duties were performed by clerks and subordinates, that these men played ducks and drakes with the interests of a great empire which should be placed in the hands of the House. This is what I said with respect to the hon. First Minister. If I have given offence to any hon. member, I did it unintentionally, and I admit I am in the wrong. It is true I spoke warmly, for I feel warmly on this subject. I do not desire, however, to wound the feelings of any hon. member, and would not willingly do so; but I must condemn the policy of the Government, and the fruits of that policy, and if in doing so I am obliged to refer to actions of members of the House in the illustration of my point, I am only sorry I am compelled to do it.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman has asked me several questions, and I propose now to answer them. I neither directly nor indirectly drew the money he spoke of, nor put any sum in my pocket except professional fees, and professional fees only. I deny that I negotiated any timber lease for Mr. Adams, or any other person. On the contrary, Mr. Adams had his own agents to negotiate for him; he made his own bargain, and I had nothing to do with it, and did not pocket the money the hon. gentleman has spoken of. On the contrary, I advised Mr. Adams not to dispose of the limit, but to work it. The hon. gentleman on several occasions has made remarks outside of the House to the same effect, and I am glad now to have an opportunity to give it an emphatic denial. The hon. gentleman, through every county in the Province, has used as an argument against the Government, that limits have been sold for \$5 a square mile, when, as a matter of fact, he knew the statement was not correct, and if he did not know it he should have known it. The hon. gentleman knew right well what the regulations were, that they were framed by his own party when in power, and carried out by it, and that they did not provide for the sale of limits absolutely, but, on the contrary, provided for the payment of \$5 per square mile annually, and 5 per cent. on the gross receipts from the limits. The hon.

gentleman has attempted to convey to the House, and through it to the country, the impression that the Government had sold limits out-and-out for \$5 per square mile, which was not the case. I hope the hon. gentleman will not, in future, be so ready to retail slanders through the country. I am not ashamed to have the whole matter investigated; if he desires to have a Committee of Investigation to see how much I did make, I shall be most happy to give him an opportunity of so doing.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

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

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allen,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Gunn,	Pickard,
Béchar,	Holton,	Platt,
Bernier,	Innis,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Bourassa,	Keefier,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Springer,
Casey,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Lister,	Trow,
Catudal,	Livingstone,	Vail,
Chariton,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Davies,	McOraney,	Wells,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wheler, and
Fisher,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—49.
Fleming,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),	Dundas,	Moffat,
Bernard,	Dupont,	O'Brien,
Beaty,	Farrow,	Orton,
Bell,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Paint,
Benoit,	Ferguson (Welland),	Paterson (Essex),
Benson,	Fortin,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Pope,
Bergin,	Fréchette,	Ray,
Billy,	Gagné,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Gilgault,	Richey,
Bolduc,	Girouard (Kent),	Ross (Lisgar),
Bowell,	Gordon,	Royal,
Brecken,	Grandbois,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Scott,
Burns,	Hall,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hawkins,	Small,
Carling,	Hay,	Smyth,
Caron,	Hesson,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Hickey,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Cochrane,	Homer,	Tassé,
Colby,	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Jamieson,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Tupper (Pictou),
Curran,	Kinney,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Kranz,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Labrosse,	White (Cardwell),
Daoust,	Langevin,	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	Lesage,	White (Renfrew),
De Beaujeu,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dodd,	McDougald,	Wright.—101.
Dugas,	McNeill,	

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I wish to ask a question, which interests this House, and more particularly the Province of Quebec. Perhaps the Government will be able to tell us when we will have the pleasure of seeing the Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman is on his return, and we would like very much to see him on the floor of the House, especially before the close of this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only inform the hon. gentleman that I will be very glad indeed to have the advantage of the presence of my colleague during the

remainder of the Session, but it is quite uncertain that his health will allow him to be here before prorogation.

## SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

136. Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior..... \$10,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What company is subsidized on these lakes?

Mr. CARLING. The Canadian line, at Sarnia, receives \$6,000 a year, and two lines of steamers running from Collingwood receive each \$2,000 a year.

Mr. ROSS. Between what points do the Collingwood steamers ply?

Mr. CARLING. One steamer plys between Collingwood and Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, and the other one runs to Parry Sound and to the different ports on Georgian Bay.

138. Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands \$7,800.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is this communication carried on by the same line of steamers which did this service last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no arrangement made for next year, but I presume it is the same.

140. To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, to line of steamers to trade between Canada and West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government..... \$50,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Notwithstanding the very liberal appropriation which was made, this has been found rather a losing operation for the company connected with the service. The same company have a line of steamers, which they propose to put on, connecting France with the Maritime Provinces in the winter, and with Montreal in summer. The proposition is to make an arrangement to give the company \$25,000 or \$75,000 in all for a monthly line between France and Canada, and between Canada and Brazil. Mr. Bentley is now on his way to France, and I have no doubt that by this subsidy we will be able to establish a direct line between France and Canada, and Canada and Brazil, consisting of a superior class of boats. By this arrangement it will not only cost \$25,000 for the service between Canada and France, but we ask for \$50,000, because it may be possible during the summer to make fortnightly trips.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What port in Canada is to be the port of call?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Montreal during the summer, and Halifax during the winter.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the arrangements between Halifax and Brazil?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have a memorandum from the Auditor-General, that under the contract made with that company, if they have a May and June trip they will probably earn \$40,000 and not \$50,000, because they have not carried out the trip.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it a certain rate per trip?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; it is a certain proportion at the rate of twelve trips to the year to Brazil.

Mr. BLAKE. How long is the arrangement to extend?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The proposition is that it shall extend for five years.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not intended to make a binding bargain except subject to the approval of Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

141. For subsidy to line of steamers to run fortnightly between France and Quebec, provided the French Government appropriate \$50,000 for the same service..... \$50,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that after what the hon. gentleman has stated, that there may be the same difficulty in carrying out this arrangement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Canadian Government practically did it in an indirect form under the bounty they gave to French vessels.

Mr. BLAKE. The only authority to give the grant is on condition of the Government appropriating \$50,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They gave it according to the mileage; but I have no objection to substituting the words "equal to that contributed by Canada," and strike out the words "\$50,000."

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman calculated what the mileage would be which would come out about equal to this sum?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not at present able to answer the hon. gentleman, but the subsidy will be for a limited number of years.

142. For subsidy to line of steamers to run between Liverpool and St. John, N. B., and Liverpool and Halifax, N.S..... \$2,500.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This vote was taken last Session and the year before. The year before, I am sorry to say, circumstances were very unfortunate, as the steamer was lost and the company has not been reorganized. Arrangements were made that if they ran eight trips they would have \$1,500 for each trip, or \$12,000 for the year; but they ran only one trip. Arrangements are now in course of completion by which another company are in communication with this company by which a line of steamers will leave St. John, call at Halifax, and on returning call at Halifax and St. John. By this means the farmers of these two Provinces will be enabled to export their produce. There will be an opportunity for farmers and others wishing to export cattle and produce from these two Provinces, such as they have not had before. It is, therefore, proposed to continue the vote in case these companies will be in a position to avail themselves of it.

Mr. WELDON. Will the same class of steamers be on the route as before?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If these companies go on, they will have a better class.

Mr. WELDON. Will they be allowed the option of going to London?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; to Liverpool or London.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this compact intended to extend over a period of years?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; it is only made from year to year.

144. For steam communication between Cape Oanso and Port Hood, daily, touching at railway terminus, Port Mulgrave, and such other places within above limits as may be agreed upon... \$3,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I am informed that it was stated last year that Captain Beatty had offered to perform this service for \$4,000, and that his offer was refused. I would like to know who has the contract, were tenders asked for, how many months of service is required during the season, and how often are the contracts made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am under the impression that the arrangements are made with Captain Beatty for next year. I will state it on Concurrence.

147. To provide for a subsidy of \$1,500 a voyage, for five voyages, of steamers from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain or Continental ports.... \$7,500.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The steamer that was formerly employed on this service has been sold, and this appropriation may not be required, but the Government thought it best to place the sum in the Estimates so that the people of the Island, if they could get a vessel, would have the benefit of it.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he has had time to consider a memorial submitted to him from a number of representative men in the Maritime Provinces in favor of a subsidy for a steamer sailing between the Maritime Provinces and the West India Islands, and whether it is his intention to put a sum in the Estimates this year to provide for that service?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is one of the subjects which the Government have still under their consideration.

148. For steam communication from Halifax to Murray Harbor and Charlottetown alternately..... \$3,000.00

Mr. DAVIES. Is there a contract for this service for a term of years, or is it arranged from year to year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it is from year to year. Most of these arrangements are made from year to year.

Mr. DAVIES. The reason I ask is, that there has been a movement among some of the merchants to get the vessel to call at Souris, as well as at Murray Harbor. The matter is still open for this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say positively, but I know of no contract for next year. The proposition has been made by the Belgian Consul at Montreal, to establish a monthly line between Antwerp and Canada, going to Montreal, for seven trips in the year, and to Halifax and St. John the other five. The papers in connection with this have been laid before the House some time ago, and hon. members will therefore be in possession of the nature of the arrangements. He is communicating with the Star Line, I think. This is a very strong company, having steamers now plying between Antwerp and New York, and it is proposed to place upon the route a superior class of steamers, capable of carrying immigrants, because one of the objects of this appropriation is to obtain from that country as large an immigration as possible. Another company have made a proposal concerning which negotiations have been closed, and all that is required is the signing of the contract. The party, I believe, is on his way out now for the purpose of communicating with the Government, and ascertaining whether we can arrange for a contract for five years, which will give us a fortnightly trip between Antwerp and Canada, and a port in Germany and one in Canada. Their proposition, I think, is to leave Montreal in the summer, and Halifax in the winter. There have been some negotiations and a good deal of correspondence, which has been laid on the Table of the House, as to the privilege of taking part of their cargo at an American port, then completing at Halifax or St. John; but giving the preference to the Canadian ports, so as to ensure that all the cargo ready there shall be taken away. The scale of rates of freight will be the same at Halifax as those paid in the United States port, so that we will not be under any disadvantage in this respect. As a rule the freights from American ports are lower than they would be from Halifax or St. John, when there is only a limited quantity of freight, but it is arranged the freights shall be the same. It has been found, so far, that we have not fit cargoes for the steamers in our ports in the winter, and to obtain these arrangements at anything like a moderate sum, we had to make the concession, though we fought hard against it, that the steamers should take part of their cargoes at an American port.

Mr. BLAKE. Was any application made to the German Government with a view of ascertaining whether they would contribute?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We were led to believe the German Government were not anxious to send out their people as immigrants, and it would be useless to ask them to contribute.

Mr. McCRAANEY. Is it the intention of the Government to provide a small subsidy for a line of steamers from Hamilton and the Welland Canal to Point Lewis, to intersect the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have just had placed in my hands an argument on the subject, but have not yet taken it up.

151. Maintenance and repairs of Steamers *Napoleon III.*, *Druid*, *Newfield*, *Sir James Douglas*, *Northern Light*, and *Le Canadienne*..... \$125,000.00

Mr. BAKER. Out of this sum what will the *Sir James Douglas* cost for repairs?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. About \$7,000 or \$8,000.

Mr. BLAKE. In 1876 she cost over \$19,000; in 1877, over \$16,000; in 1878, over \$12,000; in 1879, \$8,000; in 1880, nearly \$10,000; in 1881, nearly \$12,000; in 1882, a little over \$11,000. Is it intended to repair the *Northern Light*, or replace her by another steamer.

Mr. BOWELL. The Department is to repair her for next season's work.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the vessel to replace the *Glendon*, my impression is that, last year, it was understood that a vessel called the *Fox Hound* was purchased. What has become of her?

Mr. BOWELL. The *Fox Hound* was purchased, and her name was changed to *Le Canadienne*, but she was not purchased to take the place of the *Glendon*. The vessel to replace the *Glendon* will cost about \$55,000 when completed. \$29,500 is all that is required now. The engine will be extra.

153. To provide for the examination of Masters and Mates..... \$5,000.00

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) Is that increase of \$750 intended to meet the expense incidental to the examination of masters and mates of coasters?

Mr. BOWELL. It is proposed to extend that service to the inland waters, and it will, consequently, cost about that amount.

Mr. PLATT. Can the hon. gentleman inform us with any precision where examinations will be held? It will be necessary for the convenience of master sailors that they should not be called a long distance, and if examinations can be held at various points, as we are given to understand will be the case, it will be a great convenience indeed to the sailors. The chief complaint I have heard since the law was amended, is, that the sailors are afraid they may be called to Ottawa, or some distant point, at great expense.

Mr. BOWELL. The object of the \$750 additional is to provide for the travelling expenses of examiners, in order to meet the cases to which my hon. friend has referred. They go to different parts of the country in order that those who desire to be examined may not be put to the travelling expenses to which he refers. I cannot just now say definitely where the examinations will be held, but they will be at points easily reached.

154. For purchase of Life Boats, Stations, and Life-preservers; maintenance of crews, and rewards for saving life..... \$5,000.00

Mr. DODD. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is the intention of the Government to provide life-saving

stations on the coast of Cape Breton? As he well knows, we are surrounded entirely by the waters of the Atlantic. Shipwrecks are frequent on our coast, and yet, I think, there is not on the whole Island one establishment where we can procure a life-boat. Within the last few years we have seen a ship wrecked on the coast in presence of hundreds of people, but with no means for rescuing her. I was told the other day by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries that they expected the fishermen to do the life-saving work of our coast. They can do so, but not efficiently. On the occasion I mentioned a boat was manned to go to the rescue of this ship, and out of a crew of six four were lost. I think, that out of this vote a sum should be taken to erect at least one or two life-saving stations upon our coast.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the necessity that exists for a similar station at the entrance to the Straits of Juan de Fuca. Shipwrecks frequently occur there, sometimes attended with loss of life. At present, the United States Government have a small station there, manned, I think, by Indians, and perhaps one or two white men. It has occurred to me, and I thought I would mention it to the Minister, that arrangements might be made with the United States Government to have an international life-saving station at this point. I think it would lessen the expense, and would certainly prove very valuable to the commerce in those waters.

Mr. SMALL. I would also like to ask the Minister for the charge of the life-boat on the Island in Toronto Harbor.

Mr. BOWELL. This is intended to include the continuance of that service. The Department has taken over the life-boat from the city of Toronto, and they propose to take a portion of this money in order to maintain that service. In reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd), I may say, that I believe there are two life-saving stations at present, one of which is at Sable Island. The intention is to extend this service. The amount spent last year was \$2,212, and it is proposed to increase the vote to \$5,000. However, I will see that the attention of the Department is called to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Cape Breton, as well as to that made by my hon. friend for Vancouver Island. It is a subject well worthy of the consideration of the Government, and if any arrangements can be made by which the American life-saving service could be utilized with the addition of our own, I assure the House the Government is alive to the necessity of assisting as much as possible in preventing accidents.

Mr. WELDON. The system in the United States is an admirable one, and I should like to see it extended to our coast; but I am afraid we will be unable to accomplish it except at great expense. I would suggest that a system of liberal rewards be instituted. The men of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are perfectly ready to volunteer their aid to save life, but it would be gratifying if the Government would establish a very liberal system of rewards, as these are poor men. I desire to know from the Government whether the steamers belonging to the Government are directed to proceed at once to wrecks, in case of disaster, and render assistance. In the United States, the revenue cutters, so soon as they hear of vessels being in distress, to whatever flag they may belong, go and render assistance, and that gratuitously. The timely assistance of American revenue cutters has been of great advantage in the saving of property and life. I do not see why the same system should not be applied to our Government steamers.

Mr. PLATT. Every hon. member will be pleased if the request of the hon. gentlemen can be complied with. But I think when we come to analyze the grant made last year and Mr. Dodd.

the extra grant made for life-saving service this year, it will be found that the Government are unable to comply with the request. I presume the Government intend that the same amount granted last year, \$3,000, will be consumed in the same manner as last year, in keeping up the life-boats then in use and granting rewards for saving life. If that is to be so consumed, there remains only \$2,000 to provide for the increased efficiency of the service; and I am given to understand—and I am very glad to hear it—that the Government have decided to place the new life-boats in the county of Prince Edward. If it is proposed to maintain and work the boats with anything like efficiency, \$2,000 will be required, to say nothing of the construction of the boats. I would like to ask if the Ministry have decided as to the location for the boats, and as to the experience of the men who are to become keepers of the life-saving stations, whether or not the men employed are to be put under a system of drill, and whether they are to have the assistance of experienced keepers, trained in some of the stations on the neighboring coast? We know that the cost of an ordinary self-righting boat is \$900, that some cost more, and that the boats used in England cost nearly double that sum, and therefore the cost of the two boats will be very much more than the extra amount placed in the Estimates. I fear the Government will secure a cheap life-boat, and such a one as would be available in ordinary water, but would be of very little service when most needed. In regard to selection of depots, I am given to understand by the Department that Wellington and Popular Point have been selected as the locations for the boats. I am sorry, from one point of view, that this decision has been arrived at, for while I would be glad to see a life-boat station at Wellington, I do not know why that point has been selected instead of Salmon Point. Very few lives have been lost at Wellington.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Where is Salmon Point?

Mr. PLATT. Salmon Point is from twelve to fifteen miles south-east of Wellington, and is nearly midway between Wellington and the proposed station at Popular Point. At Wellington, as I have said, few lives are lost; it is not a harbor of refuge and vessels have no business there unless they come in to load. Some wrecks have occurred from vessels driving on the beach, but no lives have been lost. On the contrary, whenever any wreck takes place at Salmon Point Reef, it is generally attended with loss of life. Not many lives have been lost off Popular Point, as there is a smooth bottom there. As I have stated, almost all the wrecks attended with loss of life occur on Salmon Point Reef, although fewer lives have been lost since the erection of a light there. That light would be much more useful if it was larger and higher; at the present time it is too low and too small. I was told by a captain that he almost stranded his vessel in consequence of the light, as he mistook it for the red light of a vessel and that he steered his vessel directly across the Reef and would have stranded except for the fact that she was light. In respect to the placing of a life-boat at Wellington it is stated that it could be carried on wheels to this dangerous point, and either east or west, and if west that it could be carried on a railway train if there was an engine at the depot at the time. I have been shown a report from a person who certainly is interested in having the boat stationed at Wellington, in which he says that it will take one hour to reach Salmon Point. It is a question whether the boat could be got there without travelling twenty or twenty-five miles. When the sea runs high it is not easy to drive on the beach, even with a horse and buggy, and it will be almost impossible to take the boat to that point without making a long journey, and in many cases it will arrive too late to rescue the lives imperilled. I suppose that the arrangements for the management of the stations have not been finally completed, and I would venture to suggest that the keepers should be trained men, capable of drilling the crew



thoroughly, and of seeing that something like efficiency is maintained during the first few years. If the keepers put in charge are not tried men the public will lose all spirit, and the whole service will fall into disrepute. It will be better if, in an organization of this sort, one or two stations are thoroughly equipped, possessing efficient men, not only volunteers, but, at certain seasons, trained men who will take charge of the boats. One such station would do more to ingratiate the service in the hearts of the people, and to save life, than would a half a dozen inefficient stations scattered along the coast. I should like to obtain some further information from the hon. Minister than he has yet given, but I take it for granted that the arrangements are not complete, and I hope that the suggestions thrown out will not be lost sight of by the hon. Minister when he comes to make these arrangements, with regard to the character of the crews. I would like to know if it is intended to have stated crews enlisted, or to depend entirely on any crew of fishermen who may be called on at a moment's notice. We know that, in emergencies, we have to take the best oarsmen we can get; but certainly we should have an enlisted crew, who should be trained at stated periods. I am sure that Wellington will be a very pleasant place indeed for a crew to live in; but I hope that the Government will not establish a mere resting-place for sailors, or give positions to persons who should not have them. If such is to be the case, it would be better to take the Bay of Quinté, and have one crew at Picton, and the other at Belleville, where they would be very comfortable. I hope that the crews will be stationed at the most dangerous points on the coast; and the men will be trained and enlisted, and that ere long we will have something worthy of the name of a life-saving service. If the hon. Minister is prepared to give explanations as to the character of the training, as to how the men will be enlisted, I will be most happy to hear it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member from St. John stated that he would be very much pleased, if the American system could be introduced on our coast; but the expense of the American system last year was about \$669,000, and I do not suppose that Canada would be prepared at the present moment to enter on a service of that kind, however desirable it might be; still I have no doubt that the country would sustain any expenditure necessary to protect life and property when vessels are wrecked; a question is put by the hon. gentleman, whether Canadian steamers are sent to the rescue, on the occasion of wrecks. I can tell him that this is done on all occasions, when there is a probability of the loss of property, and more particularly, of life. The hon. member for Prince Edward, I know, takes a very deep interest in this question, and most of his remarks were to the point and well timed, but he might just as well have omitted the attempt at the little political part in which he delights to indulge on most occasions. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the men who will be appointed to man the boats will be men physically strong, and quite capable of performing the duties allotted to them. I do not suppose, however, that men will accept these positions unless they want them. The hon. gentleman says he hopes that life-saving stations are not to be established for the purpose of finding places for men who want situations. My experience has been that whenever situations are to be filled there are generally to be found men who want them, and I have no doubt the Department will select men of whom my hon. friend, as far as physical ability is concerned, and capacity for performing their arduous duties which will devolve upon them, will approve. It is intended to drill these men and to have them thoroughly trained in their duties. The proposition is, that they shall be drilled twice a month, during the season, and paid during the time they are drilling; consequently they will be, to a certain extent, enlisted, or rather

—which is the more suitable word—employed to perform that service. They will come at stated times to practice and drill, for which they will receive pay. I can give the hon. gentleman no information beyond that given him by the hon. Minister when in his seat, as to location of stations on the southern coast of Prince Edward county. I am, however, informed that for ten years there has been a boat at and near Salmon Point, where the dangerous reef, to which he referred, lies, and in no case has the service of this boat been called into request. I am giving the Committee the information communicated to me by the Deputy Head of the Department. If, however, it be found in the future, that Salmon Point would be a better position for a station than Wellington, which is easy of access, as the hon. gentleman knows, and from which it will be very easy to go to any point east or south-east, west or south-west, towards Weller's Bay, or to the islands which lie to the west and as far as the point, and that it is necessary that the station should be changed, why, in the interest of life and humanity, the station will be changed at once. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no desire on the part of the Government to select any particular place, and certainly no position will be selected by them merely for the comfort of the men. It is not the intention to place them at Belleville or Picton, nor to furnish them with feather beds, on which to rest their weary limbs. The men will be placed at such stations along the coast as the Government believe, will be in the interest of the service which they will be appointed to perform. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that the desire of the Government is to have this service as far as our means allow, as effective as possible, and if it be found necessary to spend more money in the service in order to make it more effective in the future, the Department will not hesitate to ask for the money to put it on a sound footing.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is it the intention of the Department to establish life-saving stations anywhere on the route of the steamers between Collingwood and Parry Sound? It will be fresh in the memory of most members, that two very serious wrecks occurred there, one last year and one the year before, the *Asia* and the *Manitoulin*, and a life-saving station would afford relief.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Where?

Mr. ROSS. Somewhere about the north side of Manitoulin Island. I know that wrecks have taken place somewhere about there, where the navigation is very dangerous. As far as I am individually concerned, I would be most happy to support a very liberal expenditure for this service. I see in the report of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, during the last ten years, in Canadian waters, a greater number of tons of shipping than Canada owns have been lost. The loss, since 1873, has been 1,532,290 tons of shipping, and loss of life, 2,926 souls, while the damage inflicted has exceeded \$30,000,000, so that any provision which we make to protect life and property, even if it is very liberal, is one which I think that the House will very readily support. I merely throw out the suggestion that at some point on Lake Huron a life-saving station might be established.

Mr. DAWSON. Both on Lake Huron and Lake Superior there should be a great deal of life-saving apparatus, because in some parts of these lakes the shipping is very much exposed, and the wrecks which have occurred recently on Georgian Bay, and on the great lakes generally, show the necessity for some such arrangement.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I quite agree with the hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt), and I consider this a very important question. I have been a witness of several

very serious wrecks on the lake between Hamilton and Toronto, and I think that the sum appropriated is quite inadequate for the purpose. The object is not only a humane one, but it involves the lives of the people of this country. The appropriation is so small that it would be useless for me to ask the hon. Minister whether it was the intention to establish a life-saving station between Toronto and Hamilton.

Mr. PLATT. I did not intentionally allude to the suspicions which might be raised as to the intentions of the Government with the purpose of casting any aspersions upon them, but merely to caution them that public opinion sometimes blames the Government for the mistakes which they may fall into from mistaken advice. I was merely reflecting the opinion which I heard expressed in my own county, when it was heard that Wellington was selected as one of the stations. I wish to say also that in many cases, a mortar station is much more efficient than a life-boat station, especially at some points, and perhaps the Minister may feel disposed to give us a Lyle gun and proper appliances at Salmon Point if he cannot give us the other.

Mr. PAINT. I consider that the sum is entirely inadequate, when we remember that we have to protect a coast line of 9,000 miles, and that these coasts are visited every day during six months by shipping, and other portions every day during the twelve months. It should be at least \$50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the country at the present time would tolerate the spending of a large amount of money for this particular purpose. There is no more important route on the upper lakes, than that between Collingwood and Lake Superior, and as there is an increasing amount of navigation done in that part of the Dominion, I think the grant should be larger than it is. I am certain that in our part of the country at least, the people would be glad to see it increased; and they would also be pleased to see some scheme devised, if possible, to prevent the extensive loss of life which has been going on for years.

Mr. BOWELL. I have to express my gratification that notwithstanding the small vote it has been so well received, and that suggestions have been made with regard to the subject which will be of practical value to the Government. The question is a very important one, and these suggestions will not be forgotten. I may state that there is a life-boat at Nottawasaga Island, on Georgian Bay; but whether it is sufficient to accomplish the object which the House and the country have in view is a question which will be considered. There is no present intention of establishing a life-saving station between Hamilton and Toronto. I am not aware that that portion of the lake is considered very dangerous—at least, I have scarcely heard of any accidents which have occurred there. The establishment of a mortar station has not been considered. I have made a note of that matter and it will be considered by the Government. The object of the Government is to make the service as effective as possible, and the suggestions made by the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the Committee are not only worthy of note, but are such as to justify their serious attention at the hands of the Government.

157. Printing Triennial List of Shipping..... \$1,500.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think this should be printed as a supplement to the report of the Minister of Marine, as recommended by the Printing Committee some time ago, and that the item should not come up here as a special item.

Mr. PAINT. It is not sufficient, considering the fact that not less than 100 new vessels have been added to the list this year, that this list should be printed triennially instead of

Mr. McCraney.

annually. Is this great Dominion taking a step backward? Three years without a report and registry of new owners.

Mr. BOWELL. I can give no explanation of the matter except that it was considered needless to print the list oftener than once in three years. The work of printing the list is a special one once every three years, and, consequently, would not properly come from the annual vote. It is actually an extra expenditure for that purpose.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). My object is to keep the printing items under the one head as far as possible; for example, the Bank returns are published biennially, and they are published as part of the Departmental Printing, thereby keeping the Printing Accounts together.

160. Salaries and allowances, &c., of Lighthouse  
Keepers..... \$164,025.00

Mr. DODD. I would like to ask the hon. acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if it is the intention of the Government to increase the salary of the Superintendent of the Humane Station at Scattarie? He was appointed some years ago at a salary of \$500 a year; but since then there has been erected a fog-whistle, which is in operation nearly every day in the year, and he is obliged to do a great deal of extra work without any increased remuneration. He is an active, able seaman, a man who has risked his life more than once in life-saving, and I think he should receive the consideration of his Department.

Mr. BOWELL. The matter shall have the consideration of the Department, and if it is found that his pay is not sufficient for the services, he shall receive more.

Mr. KIRK. Is it the intention of the Department to increase the salary of the lighthouse-keeper at Tor Bay Point? He receives but \$200 a year, and he is not able to attend to any other business, so that he is entirely dependent on this small salary of \$200. He is a married man with a family, and it is impossible for him to live upon it. I hope the hon. Minister will see his way to increase his salary by at least \$200. I think no lighthouse-keeper receives so small a salary.

Mr. BOWELL. The Department will take the matter into consideration.

Mr. WELDON. How does the increase arise?

Mr. BOWELL. There are new lighthouses constantly being erected. This year some twenty-eight new lighthouses are proposed to be erected.

Mr. DAWSON. I think that the salaries of the lighthouse-keepers in the District of Algoma, that is, on Lake Huron and Lake Superior, should be revised. Some of them receive ample to live upon, but others are half-starved. This service up there, I am sorry to say, is in a mess at present.

166. Construction of lighthouse at Colchester Reef,  
Lake Erie..... \$5,000.00

Mr. DAWSON. This lighthouse was to be put there on the condition that the Americans should build a lighthouse at Passage Island, Lake Superior. They did so, and our Government was to erect this lighthouse. I believe the correspondence was carried on by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a gentleman of very refined taste and an elegant writer; and in carrying on the correspondence, instead of using the term, "steam fog-whistle," he used the more elegant one, "fog-alarm." In consequence we have, at Passage Island, a fog-alarm in the shape of a tinkling bell, instead of a steam fog-whistle, and when making this additional appropriation for Colchester Reef, it would be desirable the American Government should be communicated with and asked to put up a fog-whistle in place of the bell.

167. Signal Stations ..... \$7,500.00

Mr. KIRK. My predecessor (Mr. Ogden) had a list of the grants made out during the time he represented the county, showing an amount of \$7,000 voted for signals in that county. Is it the intention of the Government to spend that amount in that county this year?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think all the signal stations will be erected in Guysborough. They will be erected where they will do the most service along the shore, and after taking the reports of those best fitted to give the information to the Department. If Guysborough requires all the signal stations to protect her from any danger, no doubt they will be put there.

169. Observatories ..... \$7,750.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why is the observatory at Quebec struck off the list?

Mr. BOWELL. The service performed by that observatory has been transferred to the Meteorological Department, where it will be conducted with equal efficiency and more economy.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there anything allowed to Wiggins in that?

170. Grant for Meteorological Observations, including Instruments and cost of telegraphing Weather Warnings ..... \$48,000.00

Mr. BOWELL. The extra sum of \$8,000 asked for is because the service has been extended to the North-West Territory and to Manitoba, and because the service formerly performed at the Quebec Observatory is included under this head.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, having a new competitor we are obliged to make extra exertions.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:45 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 4th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### RATE OF INTEREST BILL.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved that Bill (No. 77) to fix the rate of interest in Canada be placed on the Orders of the Day for the second reading on Monday next.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. SPEAKER. Notice of motion for this step is not required.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lost.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the noes have it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the proper course to adopt has been already followed in this House. This is merely a motion for the second reading, in order to place the Bill on the Order Paper as a matter of form. The House has not yet disposed of this Bill, and I think that the motion must be granted. Of course, the House is all powerful; but if the Prime Minister, who guides the proceedings of the House, will refer to the proceedings of the 3rd of April, 1876, he will find that a similar motion was then made by

Mr. Caron, and granted. When the Bill comes up for the second reading the House may accept it, or not, as it pleases; but this motion is a mere matter of form.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think that the House has disposed of this Bill. I see, by the reports of the proceedings, that on motion of Mr. Auger, that the Bill be read the second time, that motion was rejected; so I think that we should not again allow the Bill to appear on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER. The proceedings the other day simply refused that the Bill should then be read the second time. The motion, was that the Bill be read the second time, and that motion was carried in the negative, not to fix the second reading for a future day, but simply stating that it should not then be read the second time. This being a motion with respect to a Bill now before the House, simply to place it on the Order Paper for a future day, it is quite in order, and it is for the House to say whether it will accept the motion or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that we ought to agree to the motion of the hon. gentleman. The House says that the Bill should not now be read the second time, and it did so because it did not record as a formal vote that it should be read this day six months. I think the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill should have accepted a decided expression of the opinion of the House on that occasion, and that decision really meant in fact that the Bill should not be read during the present Session. I think the hon. gentleman, out of regard to the opinion of the House, should have accepted this decision.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not take the decision of the House in that sense, for it is a very easy thing for hon. members to give a square vote that the Bill should receive the six months' hoist, but that was not done. The decision of the House was merely that the Bill should not be read at that time; and I think that it was a mere matter of procedure and order to put the Bill on the Order Paper so that the House may decide. Surely hon. members are not afraid to decide by vote whether the rate of interest should continue as it is—for my own part, I am not; and I think we should have a vote on that point, so that we may have a free discussion. There may be something new on the subject which might be brought by such a discussion.

Motion negatived.

### PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

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

Bill (No. 122) to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

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

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that, owing to a severe attack of inflammation of the throat, I was not able at the time proposed to make the annual statement in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I regret still more that I fear the present state of my health will not enable me to do adequate justice to the very important question that is submitted for the consideration of the House. But I must, as meeting all shortcomings on my part, refer to the celebrated motto: "Let the deed speak." I believe, Sir, that that great work now occupies a position in the estimation of this House that renders it less necessary that any very lengthened observations should be made in relation to it. It is not often that the promoters of a great and important measure are able, after an experience of two years, to say that all the most sanguine predictions that they ventured to offer in support of the

measure have been already more than realized. Yet, Sir, I am able to make that statement on the present occasion. The contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of that great work—a work so great that my hon. friend the leader of the late Government stated on an important occasion that all the resources of the British Empire were not sufficient to ensure its construction within ten years; a work so great as to have baffled the efforts that had been made by two Governments to give it any very great prominence—I say, Sir, that the contract for that work required that it should be completed by the first day of July, 1891. We are enabled now to say that if the progress in future is equal to the progress of the past, we may confidently accept the statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that by the end of December, 1886, that road will be completed from end to end. And Sir, with the organization they have effected, with the progress they have already made, with the preparation in hand for vigorously pushing that work to completion, they will not require to make any greater exertions to accomplish that pledge than they have required in the past, in order to push this great work to its present condition. That, Sir, will be four and a-half years before the time provided in the contract for the completion of the work. And those, Sir, who have witnessed the great progress given to this country, the enormous impetus given to the advancement of this country, by the vigorous and rapid prosecution of the work up to the present time, will agree with me in the sentiment that to anticipate the date of completion by no less than four years and a-half will be to confer upon Canada the greatest possible boon and benefit. Nor, Sir, can it be stated that the fullest anticipations of the Government, the strongest assurances given by us to this House in relation to the character of the work, have not been more than realized. I have laid upon the Table of the House such full and complete information with reference to the progress of this work up to the present time, or down to the very latest date, as will render it unnecessary for me to detain the House at such great length, as I would otherwise feel myself warranted in doing, in reference to the progress and character of the work. But I am sure the House will permit me to refer to the evidence of the progress of that work and the mode in which it has been pushed forward up to the present time. I read from the report of the General Manager, under date February 1st, 1883. In reference to the eastern section he says:

"On the eastern division, owing to the broken nature of the country, its difficulty of access, and the necessity of extensive surveys which consumed much time, very rapid progress with the work of construction has been impossible up to this time, but the track is now laid on the main line from Callander westward to the Sturgeon River, a distance of forty miles. The grading is nearly completed for an additional distance of twenty miles, and is well advanced on a further section of ten miles. Beyond this much work has been done in the way of clearing and road-making; 2,300 men and 173 teams are now employed on this work and it is expected that the grading will be completed and the track extended about 100 miles farther west during the present year.

"On the Algoma Branch, which diverges from the main line a short distance west of the Wahnapitae River, and thence follows a very direct line to Algoma Mills on Lake Huron, a distance of 100 miles, the track has been laid from Algoma eastward twenty-five miles; and the grading on the remainder of the line is so far advanced as to justify the belief that it will be completed and ready for operation by the end of the present season. This branch will afford a summer connection with the main line west from Thunder Bay, pending the completion of the Lake Superior section of the railway. 1,050 men and eighty teams are employed on this branch at the present time.

"During the past season active operations were commenced from Prince Arthur's Landing, on Thunder Bay eastward to the Nipigon River. The grading is already well advanced and several miles of track have been laid, and it is expected that by the end of the present year the track will have been laid to a point nearly, or quite 100 miles east from Prince Arthur's Landing. There are now employed on this section 1,150 men and 100 teams, and this force will be increased on the opening of navigation.

"The preliminary surveys of the remainder of the line north and east of Lake Superior have been completed, and prove, beyond a doubt, the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER:

feasibility of the line sought by the Company very near the north shore of the lake. The final location of this line is proceeding rapidly, and it is the intention of the Company to vigorously attack the work at all accessible points in the early spring.

"Much of the work on this section is very heavy, but keeping in view the competitive value of the shortest possible through line, as well as the capitalized value of the saving in the cost of operation, the Company have here, as on all other sections of their line, chosen the shortest possible route, notwithstanding a largely increased immediate outlay."

I may say, Sir, that the progress, as was stated before, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been entirely unprecedented. There has never, I think I am safe in saying, in the history of the world, been an instance in which the same amount of progress was made in the construction of any line of railway, from one end, as on the present occasion. The great rapidity of construction from Winnipeg westwards, as I have just said, more than exceeds, I believe, the construction of any line of railway in a prairie country or otherwise, in any part of the world. It will be observed that in fifty-three consecutive working days, from the 20th July to 20th September, 165  $\frac{13}{100}$  miles of main track, and 8  $\frac{9}{100}$  miles of side tracks, a total of 174  $\frac{63}{100}$  miles were laid on the main line, being an average of 3.13 miles of main track for each working day, and, including sidings, 3.29 miles per day. As I have said before, in the history of the railway construction of the world, there has been no evidence of the progress of the work being so rapid as in the present instance. Now, Sir, the next point that is of importance in relation to this matter, is the mode in which the road has been constructed; and I may say, Sir, that, on that point, I have evidence of a very high character, which, I think, will be accepted by the House. I have visited every portion of the line from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg; I have passed over the line from Winnipeg to a distance of 470 miles westward, which was constructed at the time I visited it last autumn. The Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway has from time to time visited the works, and has stated, on his own observation, and on that of competent engineers employed under him, that this work was being carried on in a very admirable manner. But Sir, I may venture to read to the House an unofficial letter, written while I was on the other side of the Atlantic by Mr. Sandford Fleming, late Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway—a gentleman whose unbiassed opinion and judgment, will, I believe, go very far in this House. Speaking of the mode in which the work is being constructed, Mr. Fleming says, under date of the 8th August, 1882:

"I was deeply interested in all that I saw, and the progress made in the Pacific Railway. I travelled twice over the whole line from Fort William to the western end, about the 104th meridian, which, with the Pembina branch, makes:—

West of Winnipeg .....	350
East of Selkirk .....	410
Pembina Branch .....	85
	845

Twice travelled over, making nearly 1,700 miles, on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

"No one could have been more deeply interested than myself, and I am bound to say the progress and character of the work is far better than expected.

"The men who compose the Syndicate are honestly carrying out their part of the contract; they have displayed wonderful energy and have been signally successful.

"I congratulate the Government on the present state of affairs, and especially on Pacific Railway progress.

"At Fort William I learned that the construction had practically commenced to Nipigon, and the shore of Lake Superior is covered with engineers to locate the line on the different sections to Pic River.

"On the prairie the road bed is being raised, as it should be, three, four and five feet above the prairie, with a view to working it in winter, and the present force is laying nearly 100 miles of track per month."

I will add on this point, in addition to the statement of the prosecution of the work which I have given by Mr. Sandford Fleming, the evidence of another gentleman whose name in connection with railway work will render him an authority which will be accepted in this House or out of it.

I refer to Mr. C. J. Brydges. As to the railway I cannot do better than produce the description of it given by Mr. Brydges to a reporter of the *Winnipeg Times* last August:—

"The grading is being very well done, the banks being wide and of good height, the track kept well above the level of the prairie, no cuttings anywhere, and good substantial pile openings to allow of the free passage of water where necessary. From Flat Creek to Moose Jaw Bone Creek, the grading will average about 17,000 yards to the mile. I do not believe that any prairie road has ever been built better or in a more perfect and substantial manner, and very few roads, indeed, that I have seen in a long experience have been so well constructed in the first instance. The rails are all of steel, with an excellent joint having four bolts and nuts in each, and the sleepers average 2,640 per mile, thus securing ample strength and solidity, and the whole is thoroughly well spiked throughout. There are now about 4,000 men employed in building the road, and 2,000 horses."

In addition, I may say that the number of sleepers—as any person familiar with railway construction will find—is far beyond the average, a fact which greatly increases the substantial character of the road; that the bridges are being constructed of iron with stone masonry, and that everything has been done from the commencement down to the present time to give the Canadian Pacific Railway the highest possible character as a first-class road in every respect. Although up to the time the contract was made with the Company we had been unable to find any line north of Lake Superior in which very severe grades were not encountered, although for a very considerable distance after leaving Black Rock, at the head of Lake Nipigon, these grades varied from 70 to upwards of 90 feet in the mile, the Company at a great cost had, as Mr. Fleming graphically stated, covered the country with engineers and surveyors, and notwithstanding the large amount of money which had previously been expended for surveys—they have been able to secure a line which will carry us from Montreal to the foot of the Rocky Mountains without encountering any grade over 52 feet to the mile. Too great importance cannot be attached, as the House will readily see, to the character of the grades on that portion of the road, because that is the portion of the road upon which it will be in the interests of the country that the largest possible amount of traffic should be moved at the minimum of cost. I may say, with reference to that portion of the work which is under the immediate charge of the Government, that the progress upon it has been very satisfactory. In making the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the Government undertook to hand over the works from Lake Superior to Red River at the time stated in the contract, which was July, 1883. They did not expect that probably it would be possible—as it has not often been possible—to complete works of such great magnitude and attended with such difficulties as were presented, especially by Section "B," within the time stated in the contract; but the rails were laid previous to the time stated in the contract, that was the 1st day of July, 1882, giving facilities for the transport of traffic over the road from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, and the road would have been in an advanced state of completion—but for the interruption of the progress of construction by giving facilities to the traffic which offered—by the 1st day of July, of this year. The great importance of opening the line for traffic from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg has induced the Government to make an arrangement with the contractors, who have been carrying on to completion the works in Section "B," and who were engaged in carrying the traffic under an arrangement—as it was impossible for one party to undertake to operate the road while it was being constructed by another—an arrangement was made for carrying that traffic during the past autumn by the contractors on the road. An arrangement is now being made for the contractors to surrender the work in its present condition—about \$300,000 of which contract remains to be done in order to complete it—to transfer that to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who will be enabled to

carry the work to completion under the terms of the contract, and at the same time carry on the great volume of traffic which did offer last autumn, and which we know will offer again with the opening of navigation, so as to give all the immediate facilities for that communication that are possible to be given. I may say, in relation to that matter, that I stated to the House, on a former occasion, that we expected to make a large saving, something like \$500,000, on Section "A," and something over \$1,000,000 on Section "B," and I am glad to be able to say that those contracts will be completed, and that the charge upon the country will not exceed the amounts which I have stated. They will be completed, with a very large margin, under the original amount which was contemplated on the extension of the prices when the contracts were let. I am satisfied that this arrangement will be one which will meet with the cordial approval of the House, because, without an increased cost to the country, we will be able to give the advantage to the people of Manitoba and the North-West of these increased facilities for communication with the older portions of Canada, at a much earlier period and under much more favorable circumstances than otherwise would have been possible. When I tell the House that, last autumn, with the road in an incomplete state, and with only very indifferent facilities for carrying traffic, Messrs. Manning, Macdonald & Co., the contractors for that portion of the road, were able to carry goods from Toronto to Winnipeg in six days, whereas it was not unusual to require six weeks with all the efforts that could be made over a continuous line of road from Toronto to Winnipeg, the importance and advantage to the country of having that line open, too, for traffic, will be so apparent as to require no further argument of mine to convince the House. Now, Sir, I may say here, that so far as the works under the charge of the Government in British Columbia are concerned, I am able to make an equally favorable statement. The contracts with the contractors of British Columbia require the completion of the works by the 1st of July, 1885, and I have every assurance from the engineers who are supervising those works, and from the Chief Engineer here, that there is no doubt that those contracts will be completed within the time stated. I am also able to say, with an additional year's experience, that my estimate as to the cost to the country of the completion of those works does not require to be modified or changed. I am at issue, Sir, to some extent with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, as to what that cost is; and I am not surprised that on a recent occasion he should have fortified his opinion by quoting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in his favor. The House will remember that when the contract was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I stated that the amount to be paid to the Company in cash was \$25,000,000, and the amount of land to be granted was 25,000,000 acres, and that I estimated that the 715 miles of road to be completed by the Government, and handed over to the Company, that portion between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg on the one side, and between Savona's Ferry and Port Moody on the other—would cost \$28,000,000. Some exception was taken to that statement, because I was told that I had not charged the Company with a sufficient amount for the surveys—that all the expenditure made between Callander and Port Moody, and from Victoria to Port Simpson, extending over a country nearly 3,000 miles in length, and some 500 miles, at least in some parts, in width, ought to be charged to that part of the work which we were handing over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Well, Sir, I dissent from that view of the case; but with that mode of charging all the past expenditures—the expenditure on the Georgian Bay Branch, the expenditures on large parties of explorers who were sent out by the Government to explore the character of the lands, quite irrespective of any line of railway, except in order to give

additional value to those lands with the view of our utilizing them for the purpose of securing its construction—all these expenditures are embraced, as my hon. friend knows, in the \$35,000,000. But as I have said, it is not wonderful that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when going into the market for money, should have been glad to take the highly colored statements of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in preference to mine. It was a better statement to show that they could quote that high authority as proof of the correctness of their statement that they were receiving \$35,000,000 of completed road, instead of \$28,000,000, as I stated. But when I state to the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have already paid on the Eastern Section \$94,178, and on the Central Section, \$471,798, or a total of \$565,976 for surveys in connection with the location of their line, and that they expect to pay \$300,000 in addition before they have completed the location of the whole line, or a total for surveys of \$865,976, I think it will be seen that I could hardly, with propriety, have charged those two portions of the road with all that \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 of expenditure which has been incurred during many years on surveys, and charged to the Canadian Pacific Railway account. That is the explanation I offer for the difference between the statement of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that the completed portions of the road should be valued at \$35,000,000, and my statement which I still adhere to, subject to the explanation I have offered to the House, that they should be valued at \$28,000,000. I may say, Sir, in addition to that, that the expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for steamers will be no less than \$850,000. They have already made contracts for the construction of three powerful steamers to run between Algoma Mills and Thunder Bay.

Mr. MACKENZIE. On the water-stretches?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the water-stretches; and I quite concur that it is almost impossible to overrate the importance to the country, during the three and a-half or four years that will be required to complete the road north of Lake Superior, of having the rapid, cheap and convenient line of communication which those steamers will afford. By the construction of those steamers it is expected that the voyage will be made from Algoma Mills to Prince Arthur's Landing within twenty-four hours, and immigrants, therefore, arriving at Quebec will be able to pass up to Thunder Bay at a comparatively small cost, and to be carried into the heart of our country without taking that long and circuitous, and, in more respects than one, hazardous journey through the United States, which they now have to make to reach the Territory. I mention that how in order to show the vigor that is being shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not only to push forward the work of the contract made with the Government, but to provide every possible means to develop the country, and to establish the cheapest and most convenient communication through it. The distance from Callander Station, the initial point of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, *via* Kicking Horse Pass to Port Moody, will be 2,528 miles, being a saving of 119 miles as compared with the route by the Yellow Head Pass, and of seventy-nine miles, as compared with that going through the Kicking Horse Pass, and round by the Big Bend of the Columbia River,—that is, piercing the Selkirk range, after passing through the Kicking Horse Pass, and getting direct across through to Kamloops, instead of taking the circuitous route by the Yellow Head Pass, or the less circuitous, but still very circuitous route, by the Big Bend of the Columbia. Now, Sir, I am aware that my hon. friend and predecessor will take great exception to the grades. I know the strong view he has held on former occasions, and the strong statements he made when the Bill passed through the House, with respect to giving power to the Government

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to change the route from the Yellow Head Pass to a more southerly one. I know that the hon. gentleman holds the strongest view with reference to the importance of grades; and I quite agree with him. There is no doubt that it would have been a very serious matter, had such a grade as is proposed to be adopted, 116 feet to the mile, been found necessary on the line between the Rocky Mountains and the city of Montreal; but my hon. friend will, I think, agree with me, that it is of vastly less consequence to encounter a severe grade west of the foot of the Rocky Mountains, where we cannot expect that the volume of traffic, at any rate, for many years, will be at all so great as that for the transport of the cereals of the great North-West to the tide water at Montreal. But the disadvantage of a grade of 116 feet to the mile will, I believe, be found to be more than counterbalanced by the shortened distance. I need not detain the House at very much length on that point, because the statement from the General Manager, which I have already laid upon the Table of the House, and which has been published, has dealt with it. I may be permitted, perhaps, briefly to refer to it:

"From the summit of the Rocky Mountains, descending westerly to the Columbia Valley, a maximum gradient of 90 feet to the mile can be secured, but it would involve excessive curvature, a large increase in distance and in cost, and twice the time in construction, and, inasmuch as helping engines will be required in any case, I have thought it best to adopt a heavier and shorter grade, and the shortest practicable line. This section of the line, as located, is very heavy work, which cannot be avoided; but it is very direct, and the heavy gradients (116 feet per mile) are confined within a comparatively short distance."

I may say, Sir, that the plan which I laid upon the Table of the House, indicating this grade, shows that, in going west, there is a distance of five miles, in which a grade of 75 feet to the mile is encountered, in reaching the summit of the Rocky Mountains, at Kicking Horse Pass. It is believed that grade can be avoided, and every effort will be made to avoid it. Then, in going west, there will be but one grade of 116 feet to the mile, and that for a distance of only twenty miles. In going east, which, as I have before stated, is of less importance, because the traffic will undoubtedly be very much more limited, there will be two grades of 116 feet to the mile for the distance of twenty miles each—a distance which, as every one familiar with railway management knows, is extremely convenient for the application of a pilot engine.

Mr. CHARLTON. Two distances of twenty miles east?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; two grades, but only one, I may say to my hon. friend, of 116 feet to the mile for twenty miles going west; but coming east there are two.

Mr. BLAKE. On the west side of the Rockies?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I may say that in this respect the Canadian Pacific will compare most favorably with any of the other Pacific Railways. On the Northern Pacific, gradients as high as 128 feet to 130 feet to the mile are used. It is well known that on that portion of the Union Pacific Railway Line, the extension of it over the Central Pacific Railway, gradients are frequently encountered of 116 feet to the mile; and yet, as is well known, very rapid time has been made when occasion required over the Union and Central Pacific Railways. I have evidence and information with reference to a number of roads in the United States performing an enormous amount of traffic in which the grades are as severe as, or more severe, than those to which I have alluded as likely to be encountered as the best we can do in passing through the Kicking Horse Pass over the Selkirk Range. But, Sir, there is not only the saving in distance that is important, the saving in time, the saving in the cost of transport of freight and passengers which will be very much less by the shorter line—79 miles shorter than by the Big Bend of the Columbia—it will not be only the saving in the cost of transport of

freight and passengers that will occur, but a most important advantage to be gained by the country is that, by the Yellow Head Pass, we come down through a very unattractive country, to say the least, all the way to Kamloops, and from the time you entered the Rocky Mountains at the Yellow Head Pass until you had gone down to Port Moody, there was comparatively little country that was available for any extensive settlement; whereas, as my hon. friends from British Columbia can point out much more fully and accurately than I can, the line now proposed by the Kicking Horse Pass and the Selkirk Range will carry us through the Kamloops country where there is the largest portion of British Columbia available for settlement. The value to the country, the value to the Government of the belt of land along that line will be incalculably greater than along the line which was previously projected, and I am satisfied that the more the question is examined, the more it will be found in the interests of Canada that this shorter line should be adopted. By the adoption of this shorter line, and by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the thorough and efficient manner in which it is being constructed, we believe we shall not only be able to offer the best and most available line of communication to the Pacific Ocean, the cheapest, best and shortest route for even the inhabitants of New-York, but quite possibly bring a large portion of the traffic between Chicago and San Francisco over the Canadian Pacific Railway. And, as a national line, it is impossible to overrate the importance of having the most direct and rapid line of communication, competing, as we are, as hon. gentlemen know, with the Northern Pacific Railway, some few hundred miles only to the south of us, and where—I should not be glad to say, but I am able to say—much more severe grades will be encountered than through the route to which I have alluded. Then the location has been approved except from the Wanapitae River to the Nepigon River on the Eastern Section, a distance of 483 miles. As I have already told the House, the Government have been extremely gratified to learn that the large expenditure and great efforts made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have enabled them to locate a line, so far as all the difficulties to be encountered are concerned, as they are now known, infinitely superior to any that the Government had been able to obtain through that district, and, as I have already stated, a line which will enable us to pass from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to Montreal without encountering any grade as high as 53 feet to the mile. Parties are now being engaged at both ends of this section of 483 miles, and that location will be completed during the ensuing season, and not only have very improved grades been obtained, but the character of the country has been found to surpass anything we had previously supposed. The region that is now pierced by the line already in operation to the Sturgeon River opens up one of the finest timber districts to be found in any part of Canada, and the mineral wealth that is now being developed on the line from the north of Lake Superior to Prince Arthur's Landing promises at an early day to be a source of enormous wealth to the country, and to furnish a very large amount of traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then from the crossing of the South Saskatchewan to Savona's Ferry, 660 miles yet remain to be located. I should not say remain to be located, because 300 miles of that, to the summit of Kicking Horse Pass is now located, all but the completion of the plans, and ready for the approval of the Government; and, as I stated before, if any unforeseen difficulty should arise when we come to have the line presented beyond the Kicking Horse Pass, up to the point where we do not encounter these heavy grades any more difficulty than is held out by Major Rogers to the Company in piercing the Selkirk Range, it will be quite practicable still to take the location round by the Big Bend of the Columbia, and shorten the line con-

siderably compared with what the line by the Yellow Head Pass would have been. Parties, to meet from the east and west, are already going to work on this remaining distance from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops, and it is expected that, during the present season, that location will not only be completed, but the facility that will shortly be afforded for proceeding with the work efficiently both east and west, will secure, as I have already stated, without greater effort on the part of the Company than they have already made, the entire completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end by the close of December, 1886. Of the entire line of 2,528 miles, the track is laid, and in good condition for passing trains, from Callander to Sturgeon River, forty miles; from east of Current River to Prince Arthur's Landing, six miles; from Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, 432 miles, from Red River to Colloy's Station, 626 miles, and twenty-eight miles in British Columbia, or 1,132 miles ready for the passage of trains, leaving on the main line 1,396 miles to be ironed. From Callander to Montreal is 347 miles, making the total distance from Montreal to Port Moody, 2,875 miles. I may, perhaps, be allowed, in referring to that, to draw the attention of the House for a moment to a passage in the prospectus of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as to the advantage of this line as a through line:

"It is worthy of note that the distance from New York to San Francisco by the shortest railway line through the United States is 3,331 miles, while, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal to Port Moody (its Pacific terminus), it will be 2,936 miles."

And more recent investigation and surveys since the publication of this report reduces that to 2,835 miles.

"And from New York *via* Brockville and the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will be 3,161 miles; and that the distance by the shortest line in the United States from Chicago to San Francisco is 2,408 miles, while from Chicago to Port Moody, by the way of St. Paul and Winnipeg and the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will be 2,342 miles. Considering the direction taken by the steamships on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the shortness of the Company's line across the continent, its completion will very materially shorten the time occupied in the journey between the ports of China and Japan and those of Europe; and with its advantages in distance, in light grades, and in the use of its own railway from seaboard to seaboard, the Canadian Pacific Railway will certainly be in a position to command its full share of the Trans-Pacific traffic as well as that of an extensive section of the Pacific coast."

I may say that, in addition to the main line constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, no less than 281 miles of branches will shortly be completed by the Company without any cost whatever to the Government, and, in addition to that, 110 miles of the extension of the south-western road, and 180 miles from the Pacific Railway to the Souris coalfields are already located, and I have no doubt whatever will be constructed within the ensuing two years, giving a very large additional amount of railway communication to the country, just as valuable so far as the development and opening up of the country is concerned, if not more so, than the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper. Subsidies paid by the Government, exclusive of the advances on rails, have been on the Eastern Section—forty miles—\$315,384, and the land grant, 384,600 acres. On the Central Section, 601 miles,—twenty miles have been added since the last return was laid upon the Table of the House within the last week, making 601 miles on that section—the subsidy was \$6,010,000, and the land grant 7,500,000 acres. Thus, the total cash payment has been \$6,625,384, and the land grant 7,879,100 acres. The payment by the Government, inclusive of \$1,248,627 advances on rails, makes a total of cash paid up to the present time of \$7,874,011. The outlay by the Government on the Lake Superior section, down to the latest date, last month, is \$13,373,500. On the Western Section, to January 31st, 1883, the outlay was \$5,412,500, making a total of cash paid of \$18,786,000. To that I must add the cost of the Pembina Branch, of \$1,480,883. The cost of these works to the country—and I am not including

in this statement the outlay for all the surveys over the whole territory for so many years, but only that portion which belongs to these particular works—up to the present date is \$20,266,883 for the two sections. The total outlay, including the cash subsidy paid by the Government to date is, therefore, \$28,140,894. I may now remark in passing, Sir, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have expended, down to the 31st March on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and branches west of Callander, without any reference to the sections in this part of the country, the sum of \$24,571,412. I got this information by telegraphic communication to-day from Mr. Drinkwater, the Secretary of the Company, and I give it to the House, because, as I have stated before, I endeavour, as fast as I obtain information in connection with this important work, to lay it as fully as is in my power before the House for consideration. The line in operation west of Winnipeg extends to Swift Current, a distance of 512 miles. Now, Sir, having given a general outline of the amount of work performed, and of the cost to the country of this work, so far as it has proceeded, I digress a little for the purpose of noting, more briefly than I would have otherwise done, in consequence of the condition of my health, some remarks that were made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I observe, Sir, that great anxiety has been exhibited by—I will not say the organ of the hon. gentleman, but leading organs of public opinion representing the views of hon. gentlemen opposite—lest I, or the Government, should allow the deeply interesting speeches of my hon. friend, on two occasions during the present Session, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, to pass unchallenged—great anxiety seems to be manifested lest these speeches, which were held to be overwhelming and unanswerable indictments of the Government, should pass unnoticed by this side of the House. But, Sir, I do not know that there is any particular necessity for answering those speeches at all. I mean no disrespect to my hon. friend in saying that, because everybody knows that the manner in which he devotes himself to this question, and the care with which he acquaints himself with everything connected with it, render the views he presents to the House upon it of very great importance. But there is a sufficient reason why no answer was required: his speeches have been answered already. The hon. gentleman, it is true, brought the prospectus of the Canadian Pacific Railway here, and painted the position and prospects of that great work before the House, and on the wings of the press, before the country, in a still more highly colored form than even the Company have ventured to present them. But I say I am not aware that any answer is required, for the simple reason that, glowing as was the picture which my hon. friend presented to the House as to the enormous bargain that had been obtained by this Company at the cost of the country; vivid as was the picture the hon. gentleman drew of the untold millions of profit this Company was going to make out of the country—vivid as his picture was, I say, it was pale in comparison with that which the hon. gentleman delivered a year before. It was, in no sense, as highly colored as the statement which the hon. gentleman made with equal ability, and equal earnestness, on the other side of the House last Session. When I call the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago, under the manipulation of my hon. friend, the land was worth from \$3 to \$4 an acre, and that now he calculated it to be worth only \$2.68 per acre, it will be seen that, instead of increasing the strength of his statement, he has greatly decreased it. But of this strong and highly colored statement, delivered by the hon. gentleman on the floor of Parliament, and distributed by the press all over the country, what was the result? Why, the hon. gentleman got his answer. He got his answer in the fact that in his own Province, in the centre of his influence, a large and overwhelming majority of the people sent gentle-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

men to this House to sustain the Government and its policy with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Down in the Province of Prince Edward Island the hon. gentleman was unable to obtain a majority.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, Sir, in Prince Edward Island, where the hon. leader of the Conservative party had been struck down, where the party had been left without a leader, notwithstanding every advantage, the hon. gentleman was unable to obtain a majority in that Province, and cannot count one here to-day. So in the Province of Nova Scotia, two-thirds of the representatives of the people in that Province have come back here to endorse the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, notwithstanding the statements the hon. gentlemen made were far stronger than those of the present Session. So in New Brunswick, which was considered to be the banner Province of hon. gentleman opposite, the people sent double the number of men to support my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, than he had previously. In Quebec, the hon. gentleman knows, the red disappeared. I will not say it disappeared entirely from the picture—but the red paled before the blue. And in the Province of Ontario with the great question of Provincial rights, the great Boundary question, to agitate, excite, and influence the people, even there the hon. gentleman was unable to get anything like an equal proportion of the representatives of that Province to condemn the contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway. So, Sir, I say if I had allowed his speech to pass unanswered by myself, it would still not have been unanswered, because he has had that best and most effective of all answers—the verdict of a free and intelligent people, upon a statement of the case far stronger than that which the hon. gentleman now, with the prospectus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in his hands, was able to make before this House. Sir, what is his statement? The hon. gentleman says the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made a profit, that it is now demonstrable from the prospectus they have published, and from the evidence he has, that that profit amounts to some \$37,000,000, which he makes up in this way. He says it is ascertained, by the land sales of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the present value of the land is \$2.68 per acre, and in consequence the Government, in the 25,000,000 acres of land, pay the Company \$67,000,000. He says the Company's receipts would, by their subsidy of \$25,000,000, Government Railways \$35,000,000, including the \$6,000,000 on surveys, which I have shown, have not been of much value to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, although they put them in their prospectus, and the proceeds of the lands already sold, \$17,300,000, or a total of \$77,300,000. The value of the unsold lands will be \$49,500,000, making the total receipts \$126,800,000. Now, Sir, when I was discussing the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in this House in the first instance, I made a calculation based upon \$1 per acre for the lands. What authority had I for considering that the lands might fairly be calculated at \$1 per acre? I had, in the first place, a very remarkable statement bearing upon that question, made by the late hon. Minister of Finance in his place in this House. Under the contract made with Mr. Foster for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch, he was to receive from the Government a certain amount of money, and 20,000 acres of land per mile for this road. As my hon. friend then leader of the Government stated, the Government had no lands except in the North-West, and the 20,000 acres per mile had therefore to be land in the North-West. Mr. Foster endeavored, after he made that contract with the Government, to carry it out. He went to New York, and tried to get money in England, but was unable to obtain the means of carrying out his contract. He came back to the Government, and, as was explained by the late Minister of Finance, he stated to them:



"If you will give me 20 cts. an acre, and give me the money, I will give you the land and carry out your contract;" but they refused to do it. The late Government, therefore, refused to consider the land in the North-West, when the whole country was open to choose and select from—to the extent of 1,500,000 acres—worth 20 cts. an acre, and my hon. friend the leader of the late Government gave a very sufficient reason for the course, which they then adopted—which was, that so remote was the country, and so difficult of access at that time, that it was not easy to obtain settlement, and that it would not pay persons to go there and settle. But I hold in my hand a return of all the land sold from 1872—the time the country came into our possession—down to 1880. What was the value of the land in the then condition of the country? This return shows that in the whole of that period, the Government had disposed of in preemptions and in sales, for scrip and cash, 1,929,619 acres of land. How much money did they receive? They received \$251,777.50, and there was owing to them \$356,761.23, or, in all, cash to the amount of \$608,538.73—if they had obtained it. How much was that equal to per acre? It was equal to 31½ cts. per acre.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is embracing the preemption?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, embracing the preemption. The gross amount received, or to be received—for a great deal of it was on credit, as I have explained—for the preempted lands, and for the lands sold for scrip and cash, was only 31½ cts. per acre; and when the expenses were taken off, it would be brought down to 20 cts. per acre.

Mr. CHARLTON. You treat the scrip as cash.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I treat the scrip as cash. The scrip and cash, in all, amounted to less than \$1,000,000. Under these circumstances, it did not appear very much out of the way, with the evidence we had, to value the lands at \$1 per acre. But supposing these lands have become more valuable since, what has made them so? I appeal to my hon. friends from the North-West, and am quite indifferent to which side of the House they belong. I do not mean to say that I would not like to see them all seated on this side, for I would like to very much; and I do not believe there are any representatives in this Parliament on whom the Government have such claims as on the representatives of that country—but I appeal to those hon. gentlemen to say what the effect has been on the value of lands in the North-West, of the vigorous prosecution of this great national work by the present Government. If my hon. friend is able now to charge me \$2.68 an acre for the land, he is able to do so only in consequence of the vigorous policy we pursued in reference to that work—to the very contract that was made with, and the manner in which it is being carried out by the Canadian Pacific Railway. According to my estimate, if the hon. gentleman puts as cash the subsidy at \$25,000,000, and the lands at \$2.68 an acre—I shall have something to say about that by-and-bye—that will give him, for the lands, \$67,000,000. The road built by the Government I put still at \$28,000,000. That makes a total of \$120,000,000. But suppose the hon. gentleman could induce anybody to believe that it would be right to charge that contract with \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 expended in surveys away to Port Simpson and Bute Inlet, and from James to Hudson Bays, all over the country in every direction, it would only make \$126,000,000. Now that, according to the hon. gentleman's own showing, is the outside amount that he considers he can charge the Government for the construction of that work. It is the hon. gentleman's own estimate of the cost. Supposing we paid the \$127,000,000, supposing we accept his statement of the value of the land—I shall show by-and-bye what an extraordinary statement it is—what would it

amount to? It would only furnish the money that the hon. gentleman himself, after years of examination, declared this country would have to pay for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman would now make us believe that we had made an extravagant bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that we had made them a present of \$37,000,000. If that was the case no one is so much to blame as the hon. gentleman himself. If we did not make a better bargain, it was because the Government of which he was long a member, decried the possibility of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway at all within any reasonable period, because the hon. gentleman could not be made to believe in the value of the lands of that country. If we did not make a better bargain, none are more responsible than those gentlemen, who, when the Government asked their support to enable them to use 100,000,000 acres of land in the North-West to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, obstructed them at every possible turn. We hoped, when we made this contract, that we were going to lift the Canadian Pacific Railway question out of the arena of party politics altogether. We believed that one of the great difficulties we would have, as a Government, in going on with the work, was the importance to hon. gentlemen in Opposition of obstructing us at every turn, and preventing our being able to proceed with the work as vigorously as necessary; and we hoped, when making a contract with a Company, composed especially of the hon. gentleman's own friends, that we should have reached that point in the consideration of the question that would have taken it out of the arena of party politics. We were unfortunately not able to do that. When I was here asking the House to assist me, as Minister of Railways, in going on with the construction of that work; when I stated, with the view of appeasing all hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite to the construction of that great work at all, that I proposed, in the first instance, to open up the prairie district of the country, which the hon. gentleman now says should have been opened up vigorously by the Government in the first instance, did my hon. friend support me? No; he treated the road I was proposing to build as unworthy the name of a railway. I was compelled to admit, and did admit, that I was proposing to construct the cheapest possible railroad in the first instance, in order to open up the country for settlement—in order to get people into it who would be able to sustain a railway. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said:

"Again, of course, the through traffic depends on the road being first-class, and we must remember that, after we have spent all the hon. Minister proposes, we shall have, not a Pacific, but a colonization road."

He condemned my plan to build a prairie road for the purpose of getting in settlers. What did he further say? He told the House, and he told the country, through the medium of the press, of the danger that was being incurred through the enormous character of the work that this Government was entering upon, and having had the advantage of the calculations made by his colleague the hon. Minister of Public Works, my predecessor, he gave to this House a careful and accurate calculation of what—not a colonization railway, but a Canadian Pacific Railway worthy of the name, would cost the people of this country. He said:

"According to the old system of construction that Central Section would cost, including the other item I have mentioned, altogether over \$42,500,000, leaving out entirely both ends."

So that the hon. gentleman himself has declared, in the most formal manner, after years of consideration, after ten years of examination of this question with all that astuteness which the hon. gentleman brings to bear upon every question that comes before this House, that the prairie section of the line would cost \$42,500,000, charging it with

the \$6,000,000 previously spent on the surveys. What more did he say? Why, Sir, he says:

"What are the ends to cost? \$45,000,000 is, as I have stated, the cost from Edmonton to Burrard Inlet on the west; and from Fort William to Nipissing on the east, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at a length of about 650 miles."

And we still find it to be 650 miles.

"and a cost of \$32,500,000. Thus the ends make up together \$77,000,000, the centre and the past expenditure \$42,500,000, making a total of \$120,000,000."

So I say, assuming the hon. gentleman to be able to charge us with \$2.68 an acre for the land, the payment for the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway to these gentlemen would be \$127,000,000; and the hon. gentleman here has a charge as the lowest cost at which the Canadian Pacific Railway can be constructed of \$120,000,000. The hon. member for Lambton added \$1,500,000, I suppose for contingencies to that, and put it at \$121,500,000. And yet the hon. gentleman, now that he knows that it is being constructed as a first-class road, now that he knows there is no road on this continent that will be a better road than the Canadian Pacific Railway when it is completed as it is now being constructed, must admit that instead of their being any such margin of profit as he has intimated, and taking it by his own estimates, the amount at which Government has secured the construction of the road is a fair and reasonable one. Because it must not be forgotten that many of the other calculations of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House always admitted that for many years to come it would be impossible to operate a through line when constructed without doing it at a considerable cost. Let me say a word here as to this \$35,000,000 that the hon. gentleman says the Government gave the Company for the construction of that road. I say there is not an intelligent man in this House, there is not an hon. gentleman on either side of this House, that will not say that it would have been doing a wise thing in the interests of this country when we had completed that 715 miles of railway if we could have induced parties with ample resources, to stock and operate the road without making any charge upon us for doing so; so that the \$35,000,000 was wisely expended so far as the interests of the public and the country were concerned, because the hon. gentleman knows that the companies and the parties with whom he was co-operating shrink from the contemplation of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the foot of the Rocky Mountains down to the shores of Port Moody on the Pacific Ocean. Well, Sir, let me take the hon. gentleman in another way. As I have said, we have the advantage, and we had the great advantage, in making this contract, of having the views of hon. gentlemen opposite as to what it would be wise and judicious for us to offer to any person to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway; we had the fact that they had invited tenders all over the world, in Great Britain, in the United States, wherever there was the slightest chance of getting a tender accepted—they had made an absolute offer of \$10,000 cash per mile and 20,000 acres of land per mile. They said to the parties, not how much less land will you do it for, but how much money must we pay you 4 per cent. on in order to induce you to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway along with the \$10,000 cash and the 20,000 acres of land per mile? Now, Sir, the length of road at that time consisted of 2,627 miles of the main line; the Pembina Branch, eighty-five miles, the Georgian Bay Branch, eighty-five miles, making altogether 2,797 miles of road as projected by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The cash subsidy of \$10,000 per mile that they offered, and offered without being able to get a bid from any person, was equal to \$27,970,000 in cash. The land grant of 20,000 acres per mile, at \$2.68 an acre, the price that the hon. gentleman declares this land was worth \$149,919,200. Now, as to the additional amount, I think I am safe in taking

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the hon. gentleman's own estimate of the Foster contract. In the Foster contract the hon. gentleman bound himself to pay 4 per cent. on \$7,400 per mile for twenty-five years; that applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway would have given a further sum in cash to be paid by Canada of \$20,977,500, or, in all, \$48,947,500 in cash, \$149,919,200 in land, at \$2.68 an acre, making a grand total of \$198,866,700. Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman whether we are not in a position to congratulate the people of this country for having deprived him and his friends of an opportunity of securing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway at a cost to this country of \$198,866,700? I defy the hon. gentleman to escape from this conclusion in any possible manner. Either the land has a right to be charged at that, or it has not, and as the hon. gentleman charges the same price for lands 250 miles from any railway to-day—and 250 miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway—he puts it down at \$2.68 an acre, the same as that alongside the track—I say I am warranted in applying the same rule to the hon. gentleman on this question. The hon. gentleman knows that in that land arrangement he has the benefit of the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of all the lands in Manitoba,—the odd-numbered sections in Manitoba that were available for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that he has the advantage of all the lands available along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Moose Jaw Creek, and that the balance of the lands remaining, to be obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway, are to be taken mainly out of a belt fixed upon by agreement with the Company, between the 52nd and 54th parallels of north latitude, from 100 to 250 miles away from any railway whatever, and that the only means by which that land can be made worth \$2.68 an acre are the same means by which they made the land worth \$2.63 an acre that they have sold. And what were they? Why, not only by building the Canadian Pacific Railway, but by building, as I have shown, 281 miles of branches, at their own cost, and thus opening up and rendering that land in Southern Manitoba valuable. But the hon. gentleman wants to go back to his old policy of dropping off both ends and building the prairie section. The hon. gentleman's policy was contained in what may be called the Sir William P. Howland's syndicate's offer. And what was that offer? Let me consider it for a single moment in relation to this work. Was it a better offer for the purpose of securing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on more favorable terms, even taking the lands at the exaggerated value placed upon them by the hon. gentleman? Let me invite the attention of the House to it. The hon. gentleman knew, and every man who placed his name to that offer knew, it never could have any practical value or effect until there was a change of Administration; and unless this House could be induced to refuse to ratify the contract made by this Government, and to which the faith of Canada had been pledged as well as that of our own, as far as a Government is able to pledge the faith of the country, the hon. gentleman knew that no man sitting on the Treasury benches under those circumstances, the Government having made a bargain in good faith and submitted it to this House for ratification, would be worthy of his position if he had listened to any proposal coming from any other quarter, and especially from a quarter which would not touch the Canadian Pacific Railway until the Government were bound hard and fast by a contract. What did their proposal amount to? It contained the very curious provision—one that ran on all fours with the hon. gentleman's policy, propounded then and advocated now—namely, to build the prairie section and leave the two ends of the line to take care of themselves. The hon. gentleman knew that the offer could not be accepted by us, and that if the House did not ratify the contract we placed before it, we would have to go to the other side of the House, and the hon. gentle

man and his supporters would take our places. And then what would have been the position? The position would have been that the leader of the Government, the present leader of the Opposition, stood pledged before the world to abandon the two ends and build the prairie section, for in the proposal of Sir Wm. Howland and his associates, it was stated that the Company would be willing to drop the two ends if the Government wished them to do so. Very well, we will see what their proposal really was. It was, that for the prairie section, 900 miles, they should receive a cash subsidy of \$7,333.33 per mile, equal to \$6,600,000; also 10,000 acres of land per mile, which, at \$2.68 per acre, would be equal to \$24,120,000, or a total amount of \$30,720,000. That was not all. They were to have the road, from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay, built by the Government, and also the Pembina Branch, and that would have added \$16,261,900, making the gross value, \$46,981,900, or \$52,202 per mile for the prairie section. That was the policy to which the hon. leader of the Opposition stood committed, the only policy which could have been carried out if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's contract could have been defeated; and I leave the hon. gentleman to say whether, in the light of those facts, he thinks it would have been better for Canada if the Howland Syndicate scheme of construction—admitting that the hon. gentleman's valuation of the land be correct—had been accepted, instead of the policy adopted by the Government, by which a magnificent backbone is given to this country by the construction of a through line of railway, to be completed within some four years, from end to end of this Dominion, so that passengers will be able to travel in the same car from the city of Halifax until they reach Port Moody, on the shores of the Pacific, running through our own territory, instead of by a circuitous route through the United States. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is able to day to stand up in the presence of this House and the country, and to affirm that it would have been a better policy to have abandoned all the great national features of this project, and to have abandoned the construction of this railway that is indispensable to the security of the North-West, independent of every other consideration? The hon. gentleman knows that, cut off during six months of the year from the rest of the Dominion by the United States, the very existence of the North-West might at any moment have been imperilled, if we did not possess a through line of communication within our own country by which we could pass rapidly from one section to another. I ask whether, in view of that fact, the hon. gentleman would have taken the responsibility of committing the Government of which he was a member, or the Parliament of which he was an honored member, to breaking faith with British Columbia and violating the agreement entered into between the Provincial Government, the Imperial Government, and the Canadian Government, and cutting off from the Dominion that valuable Province on the Pacific Coast? I ask the hon. gentleman whether he would have handed over, at those enormous figures which he has mentioned, the construction of the prairie section, and have left poor Canada to have constructed such sections of the line as would be unprofitable, and to have left us for an indefinite period to carry our traffic over American lines to Chicago, and find a seaport at New York, instead of by the great national line of inter-communication, by which passengers and freight would be carried from one end of the Dominion to the other through our own country, over our own road, and independent of foreign lines? I have told the House what the effect would be even of opening the line from Lake Superior to Winnipeg on the means of transportation, and the progress and development of the great North-West. The hon. gentleman must see that at this hour of the day to come back with this feeble, impotent and miserable policy, as I think I may fairly term it, of abandoning the great national line of communication

that is to give us intercourse rapidly and cheaply between the different portions of the Dominion, and hand over the work to a company to build at enormous figures nothing more than the prairie section, is trifling with the intelligence of this House and with the intelligence of the people of this country. But I will take the hon. gentleman for a moment in another way. He says it is not certain but that the construction of branches will be attended with danger. Danger to whom? Is it dangerous to Canada to have opened up at a large expenditure various lines of communication through the North-West and other sections of the Dominion? Is it dangerous to Canada to have the Algoma Branch constructed, which is going to give us within a year from to-day, a line by which traffic can pass very cheaply through the heart of the country instead of by a circuitous route, 600 or 700 miles longer, through the United States? It is impossible for any one to over-rate the value to the North-West of the construction of the Algoma Branch during the short period of three or four years before the line along the north shore of Lake Superior will be completed. Not only so, but it is important to look at the position of the older portions of Canada. Look at the position of this portion of the country engaged in manufacturing products, many of which find a market in the North-West, and the advantage to the people in the older portions of the country of having this cheap and rapid inter-communication between that great North-West country which is being so rapidly developed and their own manufacturing industries. Anything in a contrary direction will not, in my judgment, bear a moment's consideration. But suppose these branches are carried out, and there is no question that the expenditure involved in carrying to completion the roads now rapidly to be proceeded with in the shape of branches, will cost the Canadian Pacific Railway \$20,000 per mile—

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And with what result Sir? Why, Sir, can they give the value of \$2.68 an acre to every acre of land of their own without giving us the same value for our land? If, Sir, we have given them \$67,000,000 in 25,000,000 acres of land, they have given us \$67,000,000 by the construction of the road, making our land worth \$2.68 alongside of their own; and there is nothing but cause for the most profound gratification on the part of the House, on account of the position in which we stand in relation to this question. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman makes up his \$127,000,000 by \$25,000,000 in cash, \$35,000,000 in road completed, and \$67,000,000 for land, which makes \$127,000,000. "Well," he says, "I have figured it out completely. I have made a close calculation. I know to the hundredth part of a cent what the construction of this work is going to cost the Company; and I find—"

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, when I say that, I am speaking advisedly. I am showing that the hon. gentleman makes a close and elaborate calculation, and I think that he would take into consideration the hundredth part of a cent if that hundredth part of a cent would make a little larger his amount as paid by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Well, Sir, take it in that way, and he says he has discovered that this road, for which they are receiving \$127,000,000, will only cost \$90,000,000 to construct it; the Company have only got to pay \$90,000,000, and he has taken note of the price at which they are selling their stock, and gone minutely into all their monetary calculations, and come to the conclusion that the road will cost them, as I have said, \$90,000,000. Well, Sir, that just gives him exactly a profit of \$37,000,000; but, Sir, there is another side to the story. How much does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company up to to-day

have paid for rolling stock? How much does the hon. gentleman suppose has been paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of this money which they have received? I stated to the House, that the amount which they have been paid by the the Government, was \$6,625,384; and of that, Sir, they have paid for rolling stock, including duty, \$4,351,374.84; for rolling stock on the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, \$450,800; and the Canada Central Railway, \$432,500; and for tools and machinery in their shops, including duty, \$244,651; while for steamers, their payments have been already \$160,000. Now, Sir, that makes a total of \$5,647,325.90 paid for these objects. The hon. gentleman may ask me, what have we to do with the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway and the Canada Central? I tell him this—and I was astonished that the hon. gentleman should have endeavored to make a point against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for acquiring the Canada Central, and the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railways—why, Sir, it is impossible for any person to over-rate the value to Canada, it is impossible to over-rate the value to the country, of having that great national line of railway start from the great commercial centre of this country and go to the Pacific Ocean. Why, Sir, it would have taken twenty years for the people outside of very limited districts to get an idea where Callander was; and when you talked about the Canadian Pacific Railway going from Callander to Port Moody, you were simply talking Greek to very illiterate people. The fact is, Sir, taking it as regards traffic and as regards travel, it is impossible to over-estimate the value to every man who has to do business between these two termini, the Pacific coast and Montreal, of having one Company and one railway to deal with instead of two or three. I say, Sir, that no step could have been taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which was more eminently in the interest of this country, in the interest of Canada, than the acquisition of these two roads, for it gave a truly national and complete character to this national work; but, Sir, it was at no cost to the Government. Every person knows that the Canada Central and the line between Ottawa and Montreal, not only pay all the working expenses of these lines, but also the interest on every dollar which they have cost; and they have done this for years; so that instead of being any charge, instead of being any burthen to the resources of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, this was an absolute advantage from a pecuniary point of view, and I am including the branches as well as the direct lines. I may here say, Sir, that there is under contract and subject to early delivery, \$753,670 worth more of rolling stock, making, with the Customs duty added \$350,462.50; and this is exclusive of the balance of the \$850,000 required for steamers, which make no less than \$6,497,788 in cash, which has been paid out by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, almost the entire amount of money which they have received from the Government of Canada for all they have done down to the present hour, paid for rolling stock and equipments for the purpose of carrying on the works upon this road. Now, there is another point—and I may here mention that I am satisfied that the return which has been laid by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell) on the Table of the House, has some mistake in it—I have got the figures from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's office, where they charge, as hon. gentlemen know, every item, and where a very minute account is kept of every class of expenditure; and they state to me, that they have paid in duty, in hard cash, in duties from the Montreal office, \$216,774, and from the Winnipeg office, \$618,747, or, in all, \$35,502.81, which have been paid in duties into the Treasury of this country by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that if we had been carrying on this work, not \$1 of that money

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

would have been paid into our Treasury, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not only given an enormous impetus to our country by the rapid development and construction of the road, but they have also put nearly \$1,000,000 in cash into the Treasury of the country—not \$1 of which would have been placed there if the Government had been constructing this road, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, we were able to bring into the country free of duty, and without contributing to the revenue, anything imported by the Government and for the Government. I give that to the hon. gentleman as another evidence of the position of this Company in relation to this question. Now, Sir, I have no hesitation in venturing the statement that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proceed as they have proceeded in the North-West, if they go on with the construction of branches as they have gone on, and as they must go on if they are going to make all their land worth \$2.68 an acre—land which is now from 100 to 250 miles away from the railway and their road—if they do this, then I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will have paid on that road from end to end and on the branches, which give the land that value, every dollar of the \$25,000,000 for the equipment of the line—for the rolling stock, shops, tools, permanent stations, elevators, harbors and wharves, and the various things with which they are obliged to furnish themselves—and so that \$25,000,000 of the hon. gentleman's calculation will disappear, and of his \$37,000,000 of profit, I thus knock off \$25,000,000 without the slightest hesitation for the rolling stock and equipment they will be obliged to provide. Now, the hon. gentleman may say: "You must not charge this twice: you must not first charge the road with the amount to build and equip it, and then charge the equipment besides." I do not intend to do so; but—and I will draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this—what are the two ends to cost? He himself answered that very pertinent question. He put the first cost of the two ends of the Canadian Pacific Railway at \$77,000,000, so that the hon. gentleman will see that it will take \$10,000,000 more than all they get for the land to build the two ends, according to his own calculations; and I think, Sir, under these circumstances, that the hon. gentleman's calculations of profit will be found very much at fault. But suppose we put the construction of the Lake Superior section at \$30,000 per mile without equipment; that would be \$20,000,000, and 450 miles of the mountain section at \$70,000 per mile, without equipment, would be \$31,500,000, or without equipment, a total of \$51,500,000, that they would have to pay. An equipment, as I have stated, costing \$25,000,000, would bring it up to \$76,500,000 that they must pay, and deduct that from the \$90,000,000 and you have just \$13,500,000, or \$15,000 per mile left to apply to the prairie section, and I think, Sir, that after the hon. gentleman's own estimate of \$42,000,000 for the prairie section, he will not consider that a very extravagant estimate. Now, Sir, I will take the hon. gentleman in another way. I have shown the absurdity—and he must excuse me for using so strong a term—I have shown the absurdity of the calculation of \$2.68 per acre, because I have shown that the mode in which we arrive at it is by taking the total amount that they have received, irrespective of the expenditure that they will have to make for surveying—and they have that country covered with explorers and surveyors in connection with the work—I say irrespective of the cost of the Company, the hon. gentleman is only able to put the amount of land that they have sold at \$2.68, by taking in all that land made valuable by the construction of the branches in Southern Manitoba, by taking all the land that is valuable running out from Winnipeg to Moose Jaw Creek; and, Sir, in passing I wish to correct an error into which hon.

gentlemen opposite fell as to the necessity of going into Southern Manitoba to get land, because it could not be obtained in the twenty-four mile belt—I may be mistaken—it may be that it was that great organ of public opinion the *Globe* newspaper, but it was stated that they are rejecting a great part of these lands along the line of the railway. Why, Sir, they have not rejected an acre. I do not mean to say that there may not be some spots found unfit for settlement, or about which question might arise, but they have calculated all that was valuable of the odd sections which were not already alienated, or against which some claim against the Crown had not been established. I am happy to say that it is the settlers who pour into that country, and get land and acquire rights in connection with these lands, that has created any difficulty with reference to their obtaining their quota of lands within the twenty-four mile belt. But if they can only obtain \$2.68 within the twenty-four miles of the railways in Southern Manitoba how can they hope to obtain for 17,000,000 of acres, a large portion of which must be found between the parallel of the fifty-second and fifty-fourth north latitude. Why, I say there is no railway to-day—neither the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other—from within 100 to 250 miles of these lands. There is but one way, and the hon. gentleman knows therefore, that to-day it would pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, looking to the long period that must elapse before it is possible to obtain the cash and utilize it for the sale of these lands—it would pay them, if they hoped to secure the lands for immediate or early settlement to take, \$1 an acre for the remaining lands. And what would that make? It would make, with the amount they have received, and the amount they would receive, \$35,000,000 instead of \$67,000,000, or knock off \$31,000,000 of the profits of the hon. gentleman, which he is able on paper to place in the pockets of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I believe, Sir, that the hon. gentleman's services have been of very great value to that Company. The discussion which took place between the hon. gentleman and myself gave a very valuable impulse to the stocks of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on a former occasion, and I am sorry to say that it gave a corresponding drop to the Grand Trunk stocks in the London money market; because when it was found that the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House joined in treating as enemies of Canada anybody who would seek to injure the prosperity of our great national work, it would be seen that the sudden tumble which had taken place in certain stocks was caused by parties who, I believe, were standing behind the hon. gentleman and furnished him with the calculations which he made. Now, Sir, I do not intend to say much more in relation to that; but I will turn my attention for a single moment to another very important point which the hon. gentleman raised in connection with this discussion. He said that these branches are going to be fraught with danger to this country, and why? He said they would go on and acquire these branches at their own cost, and when it came to the question of having their tolls reduced because of their profits being 10 per cent. of the capital they have expended, we will not be able to reduce their rates for the simple reason that the expenditure of operating these branches will be a burthen upon the main line, and they will require to take all the profits of the main line to make up the profits of the branches. Does not the hon. gentleman see that he is making the strongest case possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They cannot construct a mile of any branch—and they are doing it at their own cost, without every mile that they construct being of great money value to the Dominion of Canada, because it is opening settlement and doubling and trebling the value of lands that would otherwise remain unsettled and unsold on the part of the Government; and the hon. gentleman must see, therefore, that it is a perfectly legitimate operation. He objects again to

their selling their bonds for 60, and he asks with well-feigned innocence—for I cannot believe for a single moment that the hon. gentleman was serious when he was propounding such an extraordinary proposition to the House—he asks whether we are to be charged par for these bonds when they sell at 60. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of any portion of a railway being built by bonds that the discount on the bonds of the company actually used for the construction of the railway was not charged to the capital.

Mr. BLAKE. But they are not bonds. It is stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are not bonds, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that he and every Canadian may thank God that they are not. I will tell him why. If they were bonds, when this great national work was completed, it would be in the position that the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific and the Northern Pacific, and those inter-oceanic lines of railway were in. That having a bonded debt of an enormous amount hanging upon it upon which interest must be paid, the interest must be found by obtaining it from the traffic of the road, because it is a mandatory claim which must be met, or the road will pass out of the hands of its possessors, whereas, if the money is raised by the sale of stock, as it is in the present instance, the hon. gentleman will see that although they pay—and justly pay—interest on the stock during the process of construction, the moment the construction is completed there is no mandatory debt upon the property—the property is not compelled to raise a single dollar of interest, because all the interest that has to be paid is going into the pockets of the owners of the work itself—there is no mortgage of any kind. And what is the result? The result is that in Canada we shall be able to point to a great inter-oceanic line of Canadian Pacific Railway that can compete, as I said before, even between San Francisco and Chicago for the transport of the traffic of the Pacific coast down through a large portion of country, for the reason that having issued no bonds, having only issued stock, the road is entirely in an independent position—in a position to deal by competition with other roads in a manner that no road could deal if it had a heavy bonded debt upon it—if it had a mortgage upon it and had to raise the interest under any circumstances. The hon. gentleman says that he deprecates the fact. He says we led the people to expect that capital was going to be brought into this country, and he says there has been no capital brought in. Who prevented it coming in? The enemies of Canada, the enemies of the Canadian Pacific Railway prevented it, and what is the fact? The fact is that if we had not had the good fortune to have made this contract with men of enormous personal wealth the scheme would have broken down, and would have gone to ruin under the hostility it had to encounter in Canada and out of Canada. We had the advantage of the fact that the contract was made with men who were prepared to do not what hon. gentlemen opposite told us would be done when the contract was made. They said a gigantic stock-jobbing operation will be performed; bonds and shares will be floated and these men will disappear without incurring the slightest responsibility or having the slightest trouble in connection with that work. But where are we to-day? We are within a short period of the completion of the work. They are pledged that the work shall be finished from end to end by December, 1886. It is nearly half completed now, and we stand in this position: That there is not a man who went into the contract who does not stand there to-day—not a man who went into the contract who did not dip his hands deep into his own pockets to furnish the means to carry on this national enterprise to its present position. I do not understand the hon. gentleman when he says, on the one hand, that he thinks it would be desirable to bring foreign capital into the country,

and yet the moment the attempt is made and stock is put on the money market of the world the hon. gentleman complains, and he would have the Government interpose to forbid them to sell at less than par because he fears it is going to be treated as capital, when we come to consider the question of tolls on this road. I need not tell the hon. gentleman that it would be better to build the road if they only got 50 cts. on the dollar for the stock, in the mode in which it is proposed to build it, than to mortgage this great railway, and put it in a much less favorable position to compete with the other lines of inter-oceanic communication. I do not think I need elaborate that subject. I only wanted to draw attention to the incongruous character of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and of the analysis of this question which he gave to the House. I do not blame the hon. gentleman, standing as he did face to face with the fact that at the end of two years we stood on the great vantage ground of being able to claim before the House and the country, that there was not a single point upon which we had urged the adoption of the contract as to which our predictions have not been realized. I am not surprised that he found it difficult to keep within the limit of fair and legitimate discussion of this question, when even, with his microscopic inspection he could not find a spot or a speck on which he could found a just complaint. Now, Sir, I need not discuss very fully the question of tariffs, although the hon. gentleman attached, as I attach, very great importance to that point. But I might say at the outset that it would be utterly impossible—it could not be expected—no such thing has ever occurred anywhere as a great line of railway rapidly constructed through an unpeopled country being operated except upon a relatively high tariff. Every person knows that you cannot carry freight at a similar rate in proportion to the increased volume you have to carry up to the carrying capacity, and that where you have to carry it long distances through a sparsely settled country you must necessarily have a tariff which is tolerably high. But hon. gentlemen will observe that this tariff is constructed as all such tariffs must be constructed, upon what is called the parabolic curve, that is, it moves up rapidly at first and then more slowly in the longer distances. You must have high charges for short distances in order to recoup yourself for the small charges that must apply to the long distances. I might mention in this connection that I have received a severe criticism of this tariff—and it is the only severe criticism which I have received—from Mr. Brydges, as President of the Winnipeg Board of Trade. But I notice that his complaint is confined to the first, second, third and fourth classes of goods—that is, shelf goods, groceries, dry-goods, and things of that kind. But he is singularly silent as regards the great features of a tariff of this kind—constructed in the interests of the country—and that is the cost of carrying settlers' effects, agricultural implements, fuel, lumber, grain, and those other things upon which you must make an exceptionally low tariff, or it would be utterly impossible to people the remote sections of the North-West. I do not hesitate to say that the tariff which is now on the Table of the House cannot pay the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will not pay them for a considerable number of years. It would be impossible, until a large number of people go into that country, to construct a Tariff which would pay them. Because the climatic difficulties of the country are such that I have no hesitation in saying that the cost of hauling per ton per mile would be four or five times as great in the North-West in the present sparsely settled condition of the country and the small amount of traffic, as it would be on the Grand Trunk Railway with the enormous amount of traffic which I am glad to say it is carrying, and the milder climate in which it operates. The House will excuse me if, instead of reading a comparison of the tariff, I save myself and the time of the House by handing it to the reporter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

COMPARATIVE LOCAL FREIGHT RATES.

Classification.	Comparative Local Freight Rates.												Remarks.						
	Canadian Pacific Railway.			Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway.			Northern Pacific Railway.			Union Pacific Railway.				St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway.					
	Miles.			Miles.			Miles.			Miles.				Miles.					
Merchandise—Class 1.....	200	400	600	200	400	600	200	400	600	200	400	600	200	400	600	200	400	600	Per 100 lbs.
do do 2.....	123	162	197	155	240	296	165	249	296	247	300	300	247	300	300	73	130	130	do
do do 3.....	103	135	164	130	200	264	157	220	264	213	250	250	213	250	250	65	121	121	do
do do 4.....	82	108	131	115	175	225	133	191	225	191	191	191	191	191	191	54	111	111	do
do do 5.....	62	81	99	92	130	183	103	153	183	159	159	159	159	159	159	42	91	91	do
Grain, &c.—Special Class 1.....	34	42	49	47	75	88	44	76	88	46	76	76	46	76	76	30	30	30	do
do do 2.....	68	84	98	94	150	176	86	152	176	92	152	152	92	152	152	60	60	60	do
do do 3.....	99	129	159	125	185	245	116	166	245	116	166	166	116	166	166	50	50	50	do
Salt, lime, stucco, &c.—Special Class 3.....	3700	5500	7300	8200	10000	13000	7300	10700	13000	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	3600	8000	8000	8000	do
Lumber, shingle, lath, &c. do 4.....	6000	8400	12400	23000	35000	42000	11500	17200	20600	11800	11800	11800	11800	11800	11800	27600	27600	27600	do
Live stock do 5.....	6000	9400	12400	14400	20000	20000	8300	12500	18500	21700	21700	21700	21700	21700	21700	11600	11600	11600	do
Household goods, farming implements, packed meats, &c.—Special Class 6.....	6000	9400	12400	14400	20000	20000	8300	12500	18500	21700	21700	21700	21700	21700	21700	11600	11600	11600	do
Coke, pig iron, railway iron, pressed hay, charcoal, &c.—Special Class 7.....	4600	6800	8600	8600	10800	12600	4600	9800	14900	17400	17400	17400	17400	17400	17400	8200	8200	8200	do
Coal.....	310	470	630	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	do

Note.—By the Canadian Pacific Railway, Emigrants and Settlers' effects coming into Manitoba and the North-West are carried at half special 6th class rates. Coal is carried from Prince Arthur's Landing in quantities at a reduced rate.

Hon. gentlemen will see by comparing the traffic tariff of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe, the Northern Pacific Railway, the one which runs through the same description of country, but at some distance from it, the Union Pacific Railway, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Manitoba Railway, that the tariff of the Canadian Pacific Railway is greatly lower than that of any of these other roads. It is said that they have raised the tariff beyond what the Government were charging, and beyond the previous tariff in operation in Winnipeg. It is quite true they have. But it is a mistake to say that that tariff was higher than the tariff of the Grand Trunk Railway, or than the tariffs of the railways in the Central or Middle States. That tariff was an extremely low tariff, while the distance between St. Vincent and Winnipeg is a comparatively short distance, with a large volume of business. But, as I was saying, the objection that Mr. Brydges, or the Board of Trade of which he is the President, raised, is this: He says that the tariff operates against Winnipeg, that the charge for carrying to Portage la Prairie, sixty-four miles beyond Winnipeg, is not double what it is for carrying sixty-four miles to Winnipeg, and he seems to think that that is an injustice to Winnipeg. Well, I may say at once that the Government are anxious to do everything in their power to promote the prosperity of that great and rapidly increasing commercial centre; but they are not prepared to sacrifice the whole of the North-West to secure that end. If you made a double charge for taking the same amount of goods to Portage la Prairie as to Winnipeg, you would not be acting on the principle of lessening the charge per ton per mile in proportion to the distance it is carried west. I say that to adopt a tariff that would sustain a railway at all on a principle such as that urged by Mr. Brydges, would be utterly destructive of the settlement of those remote portions of the country, to which the tariff as to those great leading articles of grain, fuel, lumber, agricultural implements, settlers' effects, and things of that kind must be a low one. In that respect, I have no hesitation in saying that the tariff will be found to be an exceedingly moderate one, comparing favorably with those of railways similarly situated; and the only objection raised against it, is that it is not so constructed as to make Winnipeg the distributing point for the whole of the North-West. Why should you do that? Winnipeg has many advantages; it is destined to be a very large place; it is the golden gate through which everything for the North-West has to go, whether from the United States, or from Thunder Bay. It has the advantage of possessing a great number of wealthy and enterprising men who are able to import in such large quantities as necessarily to obtain reduced rates for the business brought into that city. But, as I have shown before, it would be impossible to make those rates of the same character as the rates must be made for traffic to a point four or five hundred miles west, at the base of the Rocky Mountains, without adopting a tariff which would be either, on the one hand, utterly destructive of the successful operation of the road, or, on the other hand, utterly destructive of the settlement of the country. I will not elaborate that point further, because I believe that it would be found, on careful examination, that there is no great ground for complaint. I may say that the Government, in order to do justice to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on the one hand, and to hold themselves free to act from day to day in the interest of the settlers and the people who have to travel, on the other, have fixed the tariff for one year only, so that, as the country settles up and a greater volume of trade offers for the railway, we shall be able to deal with it as circumstances arise, and with the view to promote, to the utmost of our power, the interests of the people who settle in the North-West. Now, Sir, I was a little surprised to find that

my hon. friend, with that—shall I say party—blindness, which occasionally affects him, I believe, in common with other people who are subject to partisan influences, actually ventured the astounding proposition that the advantages of the contract were all on one side. He was referring to the statesmanlike expression of my hon. friend the member for Westmoreland, who stated, and in terms that, I think, carried conviction to the mind of every hon. gentleman who heard him, that he was glad that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had a good contract; that he was glad that it was going to be advantageous to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. And why, Sir? A more fatal mistake could not have been made by any Government than to have made a hard contract, under which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have come to grief—a hard contract, which would compel them, when shut out of the English money market by the influences to which I have referred, to turn back upon themselves to furnish the means to carry on this enterprise until at some remote period they could obtain some return from the lands that were placed at their disposal. I say, no greater mistake could have been made in the interests of Canada, than to have made a contract, the success of which would have been imperilled, or upon which a doubt could have been thrown. But if any person wishes to know whether or not this contract was all on one side, let him consider the single fact that I have alluded to before, that is, that with all the influences the Company could bring to bear, with the glowing prospectuses they could publish, with everything set forth in the most highly colored terms, down to this hour they have been unable, in London, the place where, above all others, if you can show that money is to be made in any undertaking, any amount of money will be at your command—there they have been unable, with all these advantages, and with the millions of profits which the hon. gentleman's lively imagination conjured up, to sell the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at more than 60 cts. on the dollar. And what more? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman has called attention to the fact—I believe he has rather suggested to the Government that there has been a violation of the law—that we should endeavor to prevent the Company from obtaining this 60 cts. on the dollar, for he has a doubt that under the law of this country they can pay  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of interest on the money they have obtained, and pay it out of capital. But did it not suggest itself to my hon. friend, when he was making a calculation of the interest they have to pay—for they have to pay 5 per cent. on par for every dollar they get during construction—did it not occur to the hon. gentleman what that would mean at 60 cts. in the dollar for four or five years? And yet that hon. gentleman did not hesitate to say to this House that the Company were going to have a profit of \$37,000,000, regardless of those considerations which are of primary importance in a calculation with reference to monetary transactions. I think, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I will ask the permission of the House to pause here before I enter upon another branch of the question, as I see that it is impossible for me to close my remarks before six o'clock.

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

#### After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker: Before resuming the discussion of this question at the point at which I left off, I want to call the attention of the House for a single moment to an omission I made in quoting from the speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition when discussing the policy of the Government propounded to the House on this important question on the 15th April, 1880. I have shown that the hon. gentleman, after a careful calculation and

estimate of the amount it would cost to make a first-class Canadian Pacific Railway, declared that it could not be placed at a smaller amount than \$120,000,000; but I find that I did some injustice to the hon. gentleman in leaving it at that point, because by reference to that speech, which I now hold in my hand, I find the hon. gentleman added \$24,500,000 to that sum as the cost to the country on the interest that would require to be paid during the construction of the work. I will read his words. He said:

"According to the old system of construction that Central Section would cost, including the other items I have mentioned, altogether over \$42,500,000, leaving out entirely both ends. What are the ends to cost? \$45,070,000 is, as I have stated, the cost from Edmonton to Burrard Inlet on the west, and from Fort William to Nipissing on the east, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at a length of about 650 miles and a cost of \$32,500,000. Thus the ends make up together \$77,000,000, the centre and the past expenditure \$42,500,000, making a total of \$120,000,000, and that wholly exclusive of the legitimate and necessary charge, which must be added in all cases, the charge for interest during construction. In all enterprises of this description every estimate with reference to expenditure includes a provision for interest on capital provided during construction, before the enterprise becomes productive, and this item is to be considered in the reckoning. The House will be surprised to learn that on our expenditure up to this time, and rating the interest at 4 per cent. only, as the money was raised partly on a guarantee, that interest up to 30th June next will exceed \$1,250,000. Taking the estimate of ten days ago if \$60,000,000 are expended in the next ten years, there will be a total of over \$34,500,000 for interest, calculating interest on future loans at 5 per cent., the lowest rate, as I believe, at which the money can be raised."

Now, my hon. friend will admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway Committee cannot raise money at 5 per cent. interest, and consequently he will require to add to his \$120,000,000 \$24,500,000, as the cost of the road, plus the increased interest which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will have to pay over and above the rate of 5 per cent. which my hon. friend has fixed. I am glad that the opportunity has occurred of drawing attention to that, because I think the hon. gentleman's statement would not be quite complete without it. And I may say, Sir, in speaking of capital on which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to obtain 10 per cent., under the law on our Statute-book, and under the contract we have made with them—because the hon. gentleman will remember that the Consolidated Railway Act was amended, and the contract made to embrace the amendment—there is a provision which declared that the capital of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be held to be the amount of money which the Company was obliged to put into the work, plus the subsidies received from the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Less the subsidies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Less the subsidies received from the Government. So that the moment that the Company obtain 10 per cent. on their capital, on the amount they had put into the work, less the subsidies they had received from the Government, these tolls are subject to revision. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, as I stated before, that whatever money the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are obliged to raise upon the sale of bonds, in order to honestly implement the amount received from the Government of Canada for the construction of the work, whatever discount there is on that amount will fairly be chargeable under the head of capital. It is not to be supposed that any railway company will sell their bonds for any smaller amount, at any lower rate than the very highest rate they can obtain in the market, and having obtained on the best terms possible the amount of money absolutely necessary to implement, whatever that may be, the subsidies furnished by the Government, that will be the capital on which they will be entitled to receive 10 per cent. profit before the Government can interpose and forcibly reduce or require a reduction of the tolls on the road. Now, Sir, I have referred to a good many of the objections which the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hon. gentleman made in the course of the two speeches which he delivered and the criticisms that he offered upon this subject. The hon. gentleman, as I said before, objected to their eastern engagements, and thought it was quite possible they had gone too far, and the hon. gentleman seemed to think that they had behaved somewhat imprudently. Well, Sir, from my knowledge of those gentlemen up to the present time, I had supposed they were tolerably well qualified to take care of their own interests. During my acquaintance with them, I have found them not at all wanting in a knowledge of what the interests of the Company required, or in any amount of vigor in pressing those interests; and I think he will find that, in the eastern engagements they have made, they have consulted the interests of Canada as well as their own by having an extension of their line from Callander to Montreal. I have already stated that not a dollar of the money of the country has been required to be used in connection with these engagements, because those sections of the line yielded a profit over and above the interest required to meet the entire expenditure which the Company had to make. The hon. gentleman's mind may, therefore, be relieved upon that point. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the subject of monopolies. He says "we declared the provisions as to monopoly were unnecessary in order to procure the construction of the work, and were calculated to retard the settlement and impair the prosperity of that country, and to create great dissatisfaction and discontent within its bounds." I want to know where the hon. gentleman gets the impression that this road could have been constructed at all without the monopoly to which he refers. I want to know where the hon. gentleman obtains the information that it would be possible for any person or any body of capitalists, on the security offered, to obtain the means that are required to construct this road unless this Parliament had given them all the advantages that that contract provides. The hon. gentleman has the fact before him of the difficulty of floating the stock of the Company, notwithstanding all the advantages which the contract provided. I deny altogether, Sir, that if the terms given by the Government of Canada to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been impaired in the slightest degree, there would have been the least chance of the successful carrying out of that great project. The hon. gentleman says it has been held that the Company was not merely entitled to, but could compel the Government of the day to exercise its power of disallowance. He says: "I myself have never been able to understand it being held that the Company was not merely entitled to, but could compel the Government of the day to exercise its power of disallowance, to veto charters for local railways within the borders of the Province of Manitoba, contrary to the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I say that that construction of the bargain is not merely contrary to what we were told the terms were to be, but contrary certainly to what we were told its terms were when the bargain was laid before us by the Minister of Railways." Now, Sir, I ask my hon. friend to produce the statement made by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. I said we were told that when the bargain was before us, but I did not say by the Minister of Railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the Minister of Railways did not tell it?

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. First Minister did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can say is that as the humble mouthpiece of the Government, I undertook to state the terms of the contract, and the position under which the Government and the country under that contract stood



in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the hon. gentleman knows that no man in the House can charge me with ever having receded in the slightest degree from the position I have ever taken upon that subject. Sir, I may recall to the hon. gentleman the fact that this has not been the policy of one Government, but the policy of all Governments. The policy of the Government of which he was a member was just as strongly pronounced upon that question of the disallowance of local charters which were calculated to interfere with the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the policy of the present Government has been. The hon. gentleman knows that during the term of office of the late Government, a charter was given, subject to its being brought into operation by proclamation, for the construction of a line of railway from Winnipeg, on the west side of the Red River, to the United States boundary. The hon. gentleman knows, too, that my hon. predecessor, then Premier of the country, was applied to by Mr. George Stephen, to issue a proclamation making that charter law. What did he say? He refused to issue the proclamation. He vetoed the Bill. That is the position the hon. gentleman took. And why did he take it? He took it upon the plain and palpable ground that the Government of the country had undertaken the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they would not permit competing lines from the United States of America, or anywhere else, to come into competition with that undertaking. That is the position the hon. gentleman took. I say he took a sound and statesmanlike position, a position which—vigorously as he was pressed by his then opponents in Parliament, vigorously as the hon. gentleman's policy was being criticised by the Opposition of the day—no man in this House would have been so recreant to what we all knew to be the true interests of this country as to assent. But what more? Applications were made by companies who came down to the Government and Parliament for the passage of Bills that would secure competition between the Canadian Pacific Railway and those companies. What did we do, Sir? I went down, as Minister of Railways, to the Railway Committee, composed of 100 of the leading members on both sides of the House, and declared in most positive terms that the policy of this Government was to steadily refuse any company permission to build a line of railway in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway or its branches. That was the position we took, and I say it unhesitatingly, and in the presence of hon. gentlemen opposite, that that policy met with the universal assent of the Railway Committee, of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as ourselves. I say that the policy, neither in the Railway Committee room, nor in this House, was challenged; it was accepted as a sound unquestionable policy in the interest of the country. Then parties came down in the following Session, and appealed to the Government to allow rival lines to be built in the Province of Manitoba, running to the American boundary, and they were again refused. So I say there was no person in this House, or out of it, that did not know that the policy of the Government was never more pronounced or declared than it was upon that question of the prevention of the construction of any railway in Manitoba that was going to interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, what was the Canadian Pacific Railway in those days? The Government had not undertaken to carry a trunk line of railway through Canada, nearly 650 miles along the north shore of Lake Superior, where not a single inhabitant was to be found from the time you left Red Rock at Nipigon, until you came down to Callander. No Government was prepared to undertake the construction of the work. No Government—this Government had not proposed at that day to do it. And notwithstanding that was the state of things, we refused to allow competition with the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway run-

ning to the boundary of the United States. Now, there is not a fair-minded man in Canada, a man who is not blinded by party feeling, who will say that—when the Company are bound not only to do all we were doing, when we refused competition, but to supplement that by building 650 miles through the desert between Callander and Thunder Bay—we were not *a fortiori* bound to carry out the same policy regarding the Company that we adopted for the protection of the Government irrespective of any contract at all. It is only necessary to apply the commonest principles of justice to this question to be convinced of that, and that is what I have invariably done in this House and out of it in discussing this question. I say the interests of this country demand that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be made a success, and the man who does any act by which that success is imperilled takes a course which is hostile to the interests of Canada. But somebody may ask what about the interests of Manitoba? Are the interests of Manitoba and the North-West to be sacrificed to the policy of Canada? I say, if it is necessary—yes. I met a deputation when visiting that country three years ago at Emerson, who put this subject before me, and I told them then and there that the Government of Canada made it its first consideration to do everything it could do to develop the great North-West Territory; that we were asking the people of the older Provinces to take hold of this gigantic work to push it forward and to develop and build up that country. And I said, under these circumstances, anxious as we are to do everything that will promote your interests, we would feel that we were traitors to the North-West, to Manitoba and the rest of Canada, if we were to allow ourselves to be swerved from that policy which we have declared hitherto honestly and plainly to be absolutely vital to the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On this ground I ask the approval of this policy, not only by all parts of the Dominion, but I ask Manitoba and the North-West to concur in it as a part of that railway policy which has vitalized and developed that country with such wonderful rapidity and energy. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman in relation to that. He says there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in this country on that subject. Who stirred it up, Sir? Who are the men, where is the press, where are the people that hounded the Government of this country, and assailed it day by day, and tried to influence the people of the North-West to believe that they were being prejudiced and injured by the policy of this Government? The same who when on this side of the House had propounded and acted upon the same policy as the only just and reasonable policy they could offer in relation to the interests of the whole of this country. So much, Sir, for disallowance. I think I have noticed and done justice to all the leading positions taken by the hon. gentleman in the speeches which he delivered. I now will refer, for a few moments, to the last and most important statement that he made, and that was the point at which I had arrived when the House rose before Recess. I said that when the hon. member for Westmoreland propounded the broad, statesmanlike policy that it was in the interests of Canada that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have a good bargain, he propounded a sentiment that will be echoed and reechoed from one end of this country to the other as a sound and judicious sentiment. I believe they have a good bargain. I do not hesitate to say so, and I trust they will make great fortunes out of their venture in undertaking the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway—an enterprise beset with difficulties as it is; a gigantic enterprise, from undertaking which both Governments in this country shrank; a work so gigantic that alarm was created in the minds of both the great parties in this country at the idea of taking it up as a Government work, with all the resources of the Government of the country, with the means of bringing everything free

into the country, with every facility and advantage, with the means of getting any amount of money we wanted at 4 per cent. Notwithstanding all these advantages, both the great parties shrank from the contemplation of the Government of Canada constructing this gigantic road for 3,000 miles through a comparatively unpeopled country. It was a source of great relief to the people of this country when the Government were able to come down and lay upon the Table of the House a contract which provided for the construction of that work upon terms more unfavorable than had ever been propounded by any member of this House on either side, and which were eminently advantageous to the people of this country. I say that at this moment, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are successful, they owe it to the undivided energy with which, heart and soul, all the leading members of that corporation have thrown themselves into this work and made it the business of their lives. If this enterprise is made a success, and it has been trembling in the balance more than once, notwithstanding all their resources, it is because the Government were fortunate enough, not only to get men of vast experience and great resources, practically acquainted with all the work they had to do, but men who themselves possessed great fortunes upon which they could fall back, to implement any want of funds, while they were endeavoring to obtain the necessary means from that which had been an unpeopled desert—the North-West. Under these circumstances, I rejoice to believe that they have met, and will meet, with great success, and ultimately obtain a valuable property which can be worked, not only in their interests, but in the interests of the people of this country. Having said that much, I say that I believe my hon. friend never made a greater mistake as a statesman, and I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite never in the course of their lives committed themselves to an unsound policy, looking at the interests of their party, than their hostility to this great work. They could not afford to take the position they have taken. Their past record year after year; their long struggles in connection with this question; their statements again and again to which they were committed in this House in relation to the enterprise, in relation to the value of the land, the character of the territory that had to be pierced, and the enormous responsibility that was going to be thrown upon whoever constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway, by its operation—I say that in view of these public statements and their past record—a record they will find to be an indelible record—they could not afford to take the position of hostility they have taken in relation to this great work. I say if they were capable of learning anything, if anything could make an impression on them, if hon. gentlemen could be taught anything by experience, the experience of the past two years ought to have convinced them of the fatal mistake they had made, and induced them to abandon that line as soon as possible. Looking to the interests of the great Conservative party in this country, I want to see them pursue to the bitter end the policy they are now pursuing. Looking I say, to the interests of the great Conservative party, I want these hon. gentlemen on this question, just as they are on the National Policy, to remain in clear and well defined antagonism with the great mass of public sentiment in this country. Sir, I speak of what I know when I say—for I have not spent twenty-eight years of continuous public life, and in the study of public questions, and the public mind, without being able to form some judgment of the public sentiment of this country—I say there never was any question before the people of Canada upon which the overwhelming masses of the people of all parties and of all classes had their minds more completely and thoroughly made up than on the question of this Canadian Pacific Railway contract. In the debate on the Address my hon. friend declared,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

in reviewing the statesmanlike utterances of my hon. friend from Westmoreland, that the advantages were all on one side. Why, Sir, is it possible that the hon. gentleman was candid? Is it possible that anything can so blind his eyes, so deafen his ears, so obtund every sense by which a gentleman learns what is transpiring around him, as to induce the hon. gentleman to venture such a statement? Let me ask him what has been the effect of this measure upon the great vital question of population for Canada? The hon. gentleman knows that there is no question upon which our rapid progress and continued prosperity so entirely depend as the means by which we shall be able rapidly to fill up that great North-West and bring population into all sections of this country. When my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture brought down his estimate for immigration, the hon. gentleman said: "Why, what does this mean? We thought we were to be relieved of all this; we thought the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were going to spend all the money and bring the immigration into the country, and that we were going to fold our arms." Sir, nobody ever thought anything of the kind. I admit that my hon. friend behind me has exhibited wonderful industry, wonderful energy and wonderful skill in attracting immigration to Canada, and I say that all his efforts would have been comparatively futile but for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that no one factor has produced the influence upon our country in that great, that vital, question of immigration that the construction of this Canadian Pacific Railway has produced. I say the very fact that you have capitalists everywhere, capitalists in London, capitalists in France, capitalists in Germany, capitalists in New York, capitalists in Amsterdam, all interested in this great national work of Canada, and the fact that through every avenue that will reach the public mind of Europe from end to end, hundreds of thousands of documents are sent out that no Minister of Agriculture could ever have sent out without the aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—I say that all these facts are entirely ignored by the hon. gentleman. And what do these documents show? They have shown the world, they have shown the people of the overpopulated portions of Europe the fact that they will not have to remain pent up in Winnipeg, unable to get land for settlement, but that a rapidly constructed railway will carry them the day after they reach Winnipeg, 500 or 600 miles out through the prairie country where they can choose land to the right and to the left upon which to locate and build up their own fortunes. Now, Sir, what do our statistics show? The hon. gentleman has only to look at the report of my hon. friend to find that the immigration went up from 40,000, in 1878, to 193,000 in 1882. Of these there came by the St. Lawrence, in 1878, 10,295, and, in 1882, 44,850 settlers. In 1878, 29,808 settlers came to the country, and in 1882, no less than 112,458. In 1882 no less than 70,532 settlers went to Manitoba and the North West, and no less than 13,325 were from the United States. Now, what do these figures show? Why, Sir, every person knows that the great disadvantage under which Canada has labored in times gone by was that the United States of America had a North-West to attract immigration, while Canada had none. Every person who has studied this question knows that there is nothing more true than that "Westward the star of Empire wends its way." Every person knows that the tendency is to go West. Look at the Eastern States of the United States, and what do you find? Look at their population to day compared with what it was long ago, and you find it comparatively stationary because of that constant drifting to the west that takes place on this American continent. The same took place in Canada. The tendency was to go West and as Canada had no West they went to the United States. How is it now? Why, Sir, not only is the current westward to the United States

stopped, but it is reversed and now flowing back over the 49th parallel of latitude are the people that went out of our country into the West, and those who have always lived in the United States until some 13,000 of them during last year came over. And I say that if the railway has done nothing else, if this development of our North-West had done nothing else than to turn this current of immigration into our own country, and invite people from across the boundary into our North-West, if it had done nothing else it would have accomplished all that would be necessary to commend it to the judgment and the regard of any patriotic Canadian. Deduct the floating population out of the whole and you have of remaining settlers in the North-West, 58,751. But, Sir, that is not all. I will read, as the authority is better than any statement I can make—and I am sure the House will permit me to do so—I will read one of the most interesting extracts that ever graced the report of any hon. Minister of Agriculture since Canada was a country:

"It thus appears that the value in money and property ascertained as brought by the immigrants into the country in 1882 was \$3,171,501.59, besides a very large amount unascertained taken into Manitoba, and which it is impossible to approximate. In addition, there were the very considerable values in tools, implements and effects.

"The amount of money taken to Manitoba by intending settlers during 1882 was very considerable, and as will be seen by a note at the bottom of this page, it was stated by a banker that \$8,000,000 were on deposit in Winnipeg, which sum had been taken in for investment before the middle of the year. Still further capital no doubt, was brought in after that date, of which no record is available. Part of this was from the older Provinces, but having in view the fact the capitalists from the Eastern Provinces, intending to invest in Manitoba, or the North-West Territory, would probably leave their deposits in their own banks, for draft upon them as required, a proportion of three-fourths of the above amount of \$8,000,000, may be placed to the credit of newly arrived immigrants; and this cash capital without taking into account the monies deposited after the date above referred to, would make a total value of cash, goods and effects brought in by immigrants \$10,000,000 in round numbers, in 1882.

Now, Sir, I have given you the figures in relation to the past year, and I draw attention to the fact that a cablegram appeared in the *Globe* newspaper from its London correspondent announcing that three steamships sailing that day conveyed 3,000 persons from Liverpool to the Dominion of Canada, and declaring that that number was double that which ever embarked on any previous day in the history of the country. I need not add a word to a statement of that kind to show the enormous value to this country of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, as I have said, has been one of the chief factors in changing the position of our country and ensuring that we may rely on a steadily increasing tide of immigration, because the initial difficulty in immigration is the great difficulty; provided you have, as I am proud to say we have, the most inviting country for settlers in the world. All you want is the means of getting people into the country, from which they can communicate to their friends the prosperity that has attended them, and you will draw ultimately thousands, tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands after them. Our advance will thus be in a progressive ratio, and we will have the proud satisfaction of knowing that this garden of the world will be at no distant day filled with energetic and enterprising settlers who will make that hitherto neglected wilderness blossom as the rose. Now I may, perhaps, be permitted, with a little personal pride, to allude to the resolutions which I had the honor to submit, as representing the views of the Government in 1879. I do not intend to read the whole of them, but I will read three, as follows:—

"3. Resolved, That reports from the Mother Country set forth an unprecedented state of enforced idleness of the working classes, and the possibility of a scheme of relief on a large scale being found indispensable to alleviate destitution.

"4. Resolved, That the construction of the Pacific Railway would afford immediate employment to numbers of workmen, and would open up vast tracts of fertile land for occupation, and thus would form a

ready outlet for the over-populated districts of Great Britain and other European countries.

"5. Resolved, That it is obvious that it would be of general advantage to find an outlet for the abundant population of the Mother Country within the Empire, and thus build up flourishing Colonies on British soil, instead of directing a stream of immigration from England to foreign countries."

I need not remind the House that the great difficulty under which Canada labored was that the United States presented such overwhelming attractions, previous to our having a North-West of our own, that we were unable to compete with them in relation to immigration. But I will draw attention to the fact that while hon. gentlemen opposite told the people it would be an idle dream for the Government to suppose they could enlist the Government of England in support of our policy, I have the proud satisfaction of knowing that to-day one of the questions uppermost in the minds of British statesmen and British Ministers who to-day control the destinies of the empire, is this question, and it is held that a sounder policy could not be adopted to meet the difficulties of the over-populated districts of the Mother Country, whether in England, Ireland or Scotland, and there are largely over-populated districts in all of them, than that of immigration. Lord Derby, the able Minister who now presides over our colonial destinies, publicly declared that England could not appropriate millions of its treasure to better use than to send to Canada assisted emigrants from the over-populated districts of Great Britain; and at last, through the various channels and means, means which never could have been adopted but for the attractions we are able to offer in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people of England and the press are being brought to understand that there is no source to which they can look with more confidence as a relief from their difficulty of over population, than the means of using the money at the disposal of the Imperial Government to place those who are now struggling with poverty and wretchedness in the heart of the empire, in the great Canadian North-West where, by industry and energy and by a tithe of the labor which now refuses to give them the common necessaries of life, they may rapidly become not only successful settlers, not only men who are going to add to the wealth of the country, but a source of strength to the empire instead of a source of the greatest possible weakness. And yet with all those facts before him the hon. leader of the Opposition ventured the statement that all the advantages of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract are on one side. Let him turn to Winnipeg for a few moments. Let him look at Winnipeg as it was, and as it is—before it was vitalized by the vigorous manner in which this Government undertook the work of pushing forward the railway. The hon. gentleman has only to turn to the figures to find the most astounding facts that are presented in any part of this continent. Where, I ask, even in the Western States of the Union, can the hon. gentleman show me a single spot, notwithstanding all the advantages they possess, and all the connections they have made by means of immigrants in the United States and their friends in the old countries, which presents the evidences of rapid progress and prosperity that Winnipeg presents to-day? Where is there a spot on this continent that has surged ahead with the rapidity, strength and energy seen in that city which is soon to become, which has already become, one of the great commercial centres of this country? The population in 1871 was 500, in 1881 it had risen to 9,000, and that was largely after 1878, as the hon. gentleman knows. But from 1881, the first year of the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the population went up from 9,000 to no less than 25,000 in a single year. The value of assessed property increased from \$9,000,000 in 1881, to \$30,000,000 in 1882. What evidence can be more conclusive of the influence and success of that

policy than is to be found in the figures to which I have directed attention. The imports from Great Britain and foreign countries in 1881 were \$2,837,431; in 1882 they had risen to \$3,222,923, being an increase of \$5,395,497. But the amount of increase with our own country is a question in which the people of the older Provinces have a lively interest. In addition to the \$5,000,000 increase of imports from Great Britain and foreign countries, the imports from the older Provinces of Canada reached \$12,000,000, making the imports for the little town of Winnipeg, as it was but yesterday, no less than \$20,000,000 in a single year. Let us now turn to Customs duty, and what do we find? I need not tell the House the material value of every immigrant; that all Canada requires in order to secure material progress, and to rapidly wipe out the debt of the country and have a degree of prosperity which will compare with that of any country in the world, is that people shall be brought into the country and furnished with the means of obtaining profitable employment. The taxes paid into the revenue of the country by every immigrant who comes in, makes them an absolute and certain source of wealth. What do the Customs returns show. The duties collected in 1879 were \$279,255; in 1881, \$651,892; in 1882, \$1,587,327, or an increase for 1882 over 1881 of \$935,435, showing nearly \$1,000,000 of an increase; and yet my hon. friend hesitates to accept \$1,500,000 of Credit Valley Railway bonds as security for \$1,000,000 to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to prosecute more vigorously the great work in which they are engaged. Not only have we an increase of about \$1,000,000 here in consequence of that contract, but we have at the same time nearly \$1,000,000 absolutely paid into the Treasury of this country by themselves, or as nearly so as possible, in connection with their own works, \$5,000,000 were expended in building in 1882. The deposits in the Government Savings Banks increased \$707,922 in 1882 over 1881, and yet the hon. gentleman can find no evidence of any benefit accruing to Canada from the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Does he believe, does any hon. gentleman in the House believe that the history of our country would furnish figures like these to evidence to the world the gigantic strides which we are making in progress and prosperity, if it had not been for the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I say, Sir, under these circumstances, that we may point to that country, that we may point to the development of Winnipeg in this relation. Here, Sir, I want to ask the permission of the House to read an extract from a speech made the other day by Mr. Duncan McArthur. Mr. Duncan McArthur is a gentleman, a practical, clear-headed, able man, who has been engaged for ten years in the city of Winnipeg as manager of the Merchants Bank, a position from which he has recently retired. On a recent occasion that gentleman used the following language:

"When I came to Winnipeg upwards of ten years ago, it was a remote and insignificant village 500 miles north of any considerable town in the United States, and containing a population of about 800 souls. It was regarded both by Americans and Canadians as the ultima thule of settlement and of civilization."

He then went on to describe what he had seen during those ten years, but I will not detain the House, except to read what he says with reference to the future; and I read it, Sir, not as the language of a heated partisan, not as the language of any person who has anything to gain by advancing the political interests of one party or another, but as the clear deductions of a logical and able mind, in a better position carefully to study the past, and to estimate the future progress of that country, than perhaps almost any gentleman who is to be found in its borders. What does he say:

"And now, gentlemen, a few words about the future of Manitoba and the North-West. It is difficult to believe that the North-West Territory

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

should have remained, so far as people generally were concerned, a terra incognita until the last twelve or fifteen years. Yet such is actually the case, and had it not been for the consolidated impulse that accompanied and followed the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, it might have remained a terra incognita to this day. Our statesmen never dreamt, during the earlier stages of their efforts, to bring about Confederation, that there was an unborn and greater Dominion in the North-West, stretching from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains on the one hand and from the international boundary to the Arctic Sea on the other, containing agricultural, manufacturing and mining resources sufficient to supply the wants of one hundred millions of human beings—a territory worth more in point of material value than all the other Provinces put together. Gentlemen, our country is so vast and its resources are so rich and varied, that it is impossible to mark the extent of the former or to estimate the value of the latter; and very few even of those who have lived longest and who have travelled most in the interior of the country possess an adequate idea of the value of Canada's heritage in the North-West. Confining one view of it to that portion that is suitable for agricultural purposes, we can see, standing as we do on the eastern confines of the fertile belt, an immense tract of country extending from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains on the one hand, and from Winnipeg to the fertile valleys of the Peace River country on the other hand, a tract of country which contains hundreds of millions of acres suitable for farming and grazing purposes, and which is sufficient to afford homes, an independence and comfort to the surplus population of Europe for centuries to come; and owing to the exigencies arising from too large populations in many European countries, our North-West is destined to be speedily peopled. Our soil, which is easy of cultivation, and is of unsurpassed fertility, is obtained free by actual settlers, and owing to its level surface, machinery, which so largely aids the efforts of the farmer in a prairie country, can be employed with advantage in every agricultural operation. The country is, moreover, accessible to Europe, and apart altogether from the special immigration which has been induced of late years to come here from the other Provinces and from Great Britain, we may expect that the great wave of immigration from Northern Europe, which during the last twenty years has been slowly but surely filling up Minnesota, Dakota and other United States Territories, will reach us and conduce greatly to the rapid settlement of the country. Moreover, our climate is healthy and bracing and is peculiarly well adapted to inspire mental and physical vigor into our people. (Applause.) It requires no ardent imagination to picture the change which awaits the North-West during the next twenty years. Long before that time the face of the country will be covered with a network of railways. Our prairies that now appear so bleak and boundless, will be cultivated and planted, and dotted over with the comfortable homes of an intelligent, prosperous and a contented people. We shall be able to grow and export a sufficient quantity of grain to justify us in calling our country the granary of the world. Many cities and towns of great importance will spring up, and Winnipeg will not only retain its present position and prestige, but will in all probability be the largest and most important city in Canada. Those who know little or nothing about the North-West and its resources may think these statements are either gross exaggerations or the utterance of a sanguine and partial individual, but the time is not far distant when this great country will be sufficiently well known to receive the recognition to which it is entitled. With such a future before us we may well work and hope and wait. Unlike many of the older nations of the world, who are limited by space, fettered by poverty, and crushed by the exactions of injustice and tyranny (whose greatness and opportunities are in the past), we stand on the threshold of a new land of promise—a land which constitutes one of the fairest portions of the new world—a land on which millions of our race are yet destined to act out the great drama of life, and which is to witness new and triumphal marches in literature, science and art, and in many other forms of national progress and development."

I may say, Sir, that no gentleman can read that statement, that clear, calm, dispassionate statement, which in every line of it carries conviction to the mind of every intelligent man, without coming to the conclusion, that the fears and anxieties of hon. gentlemen opposite had been in the past totally without foundation, and that all that is required in order to develop a greater Britain in this continent with a rapidity that the people of the Old World have never been able to understand or appreciate, is to energetically go forward in the future as we have done in the past; and by the policy which we have entered upon in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, give that scope and verge for the development of that country that it would be impossible to give to it in any other way. I referred a little while ago, Sir, to the value of branches that were being constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I alluded to the fact that, with the exception of the land along their lines from Moose Jaw to the Rocky Mountains, they would be obliged to get the balance of their land in the North-West, between the fifty-second and fifty-fourth parallels of north latitude, and that these lands were

from 100 to 250 miles distant from the railway. Now, Sir, let me just draw attention to this fact—that while the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been constructing 281 miles of branches out of their own resources, and while they are engaged in constructing another branch of 110 miles, and another of 180 miles in addition, to be built within the next two years, all that we have been able, all that this Government has been able to do in constructing branches through that great and priceless heritage of the North-West, by private enterprise, has been one branch of fifty-one miles—the South-Western—and another of thirty, soon to be fifty miles on the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western. I need not say, Sir, that this is the total amount accomplished, notwithstanding that this Government gave to these Companies 6,400 acres of land per mile at \$1 an acre along these lines of railway, to aid and assist them in the construction of these private branches; and here, Sir, I may say, that on the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western line, as everybody knows, not a blow would have been struck if it had not been for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Portage la Prairie—and I give that, Sir, as evidence to the House of the enormous value of the development of this country in the North West. Not only, Sir, have we this record of Winnipeg, but going further West, we find Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Broadview, Regina, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat and Calgary, and we find in all these points the nucleus already of thriving, energetic, populous towns rapidly to become large centres of population throughout that district, and giving the nucleus and starting-points for the development of the population and extension of branches north and South, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the development of that country to an extent which could not be accomplished in any other way. In the cattle ranches at the foot of the Rocky Mountains we have been enabled to illustrate and demonstrate to the world the fact that there is no part of the continent of America better adapted to that class of business than our Canadian North-West, into which great herds of cattle are pouring, and supplying, as they will continue to supply, the most important elements in connection with the development of that country. Now, Sir, I would like to ask my hon. friend, with these facts before him, whether he is still prepared to reiterate the statement that the advantages in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway contract are all to be found on the one side. I do not believe he will. Sir, we are developing not only the agricultural resources of that country, but capitalists are pouring in to develop its mineral resources. There is one respect in which we have at a great advantage over any portion of the prairies of the Western States—one respect in which they cannot at all compare with us. It has already been stated on the highest testimony that the fertility of the soil of our portion of the North-West is unequalled; and we have coal, one of the most vital elements in building up a great and prosperous people with rapidity, in the Canadian North-West—a great advantage over the prairies of the Western States where the absence of this element was found to be a material drawback. I have in my hand the report made by an able, and one who is rapidly becoming a very eminent, man—I refer to Mr. George M. Dawson, who is connected with the Department of the Interior. He says, after describing at length the value of the seams and the admirable character of the coal in the North-West:

“The occurrence of workable coal seams at several different horizons, and the proved continuity of some of them over great areas, guarantees an abundant supply of fuel in this district, a matter of great importance in a country which over great areas is almost entirely destitute of wood. The quality of some of the fuel is such as to render them suitable for transport to a distance, and it is doubtless on this belt of coal-bearing rocks in the vicinity of the mountains that the

railways of the North-West will depend chiefly for their supply. The quantity of coal already proved to exist is very great. The distance for which the outcrops of certain seams have been traced have been mentioned. Approximate estimates of the quantity of coal underlying a square mile of country in several localities have been made with the following results:—

“Main seam in vicinity of coal banks, Belly River, coal underlying one square mile, 5,500,000 tons.

“Grassy Island, Bow River, (continuation of Belly River main seam) coal underlying one square mile, over 5,000,000 tons.

“Horse-shoe Bend, Bow River, coal underlying one square mile 4,900,000 tons.

“Blackfoot Crossing, workable coal in seam as exposed on Bow River. Underlying one square mile, 9,000,000.”

I refer to this, in passing, to show that in that most important element in the development of a prairie country Canada possesses great superiority over any portion of the Western States, and it is an element which will have a great deal to do with the future of our country. We have gold, we have copper, we have iron mines which are attracting immense attention at the present moment, at the head of Lake Superior, to furnish a profitable industry for great numbers of people. And in that rougher country from Prince Arthur's Landing all through to the head of Lake Neppigon and Red River the hum of mining industries is now to be heard, while large amounts of capital are going in to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the country. I now turn the attention of the House for a single moment to another point in this connection, and that is the position in which the country stands in relation to the sales of land. I will read a short note which was addressed by Mr. Burgess, the able Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to my friend the Speaker of the Senate, who has been giving this subject his constant and careful attention for a length of time. It was not given me for publication, but it expresses the facts of the case so tersely and so much to the point that I venture to give to the House.

“OTTAWA, 4th May, 1883.

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

This note is signed by Mr. Burgess, under whose personal observation and information all these various points come. I give it to the House as an evidence of the soundness of the statement made by my right hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, when he told the House three years ago that he confidently relied upon the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway being accomplished without its costing one dollar to the people of Canada, as the entire amount required to recoup the Government and the country for their expenditure in connection with it would, at no distant date, be returned by the sale of land and the revenues derived from lands in the North-West. I say that the evidence on that point is very conclusive. I hold in my hands a statement of the Department as to what has taken place. I have already given the total sales of 1872 to 1880 inclusive, and I have shown the utterly insignificant quantity of lands that the Government was able to dispose of, and the small amount of money they received for them—namely, something like 31½ cts. per acre. I now give from the Department the following: Approximate estimate of the amount due for lands—time sales and pre-emption sales, computed from 1st January, 1880, to 31st December, 1882, and maturing before 31st December, 1885, \$4,930,000. Instalments owing by colonization companies to mature within four years and assuming that the companies earn the full amount of rebate, \$927,150. Companies who have till 30th of June, 1883, to complete agreements and to mature within four years: Land and Colonization Company of Canada, \$537,600; Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company, \$322,560; Temperance

Colonization Company, \$835,656, or a total for these companies of \$1,698,816. Estimated to be received from colonization companies who have till 28th February, 1883, to pay instalments, \$150,000; ground rents on timber leases, \$4,163; owing at Winnipeg Timber Office, \$25,600; estimated amount owing by Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Winnipeg Office, \$20,000, or a total of \$7,755,731, and adding to this cash received during the calendar year 1883, \$2,256,850, or a total of \$10,012,381. It will be remembered that my right hon. friend made a computation of what would be received in connection with the sale of lands in the North-West; and it will also be recollected that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, not only took great exception to the statement, but he pronounced it so absolutely beyond any possible conception, as to entirely discredit, so far as that hon. gentleman was able to discredit, the prediction and the computation which the right hon. gentleman made. We estimated that by the time the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was to be completed, under the terms of the contract, we would receive not merely the \$53,000,000 we were going to pay in connection with the construction of that work, but that we would receive about \$60,000,000, or a considerable amount over and above the entire expenditure we were called upon to make in connection with the construction of that road. In order to show the House how thoroughly reliable and within the mark that calculation is, I will give the calculation made by my right hon. friend, and communicated to the House as our estimate two years ago, when it was very much discredited by hon. gentlemen opposite; and I will also give the result. The Minister of the Interior estimated that in 1882 there would be an incoming population of 35,000; the actual immigration of settlers into the North-West was 58,751. I am almost afraid, Sir, of discrediting my right hon. friend by reading these figures, because you will find how incapable he is of making an accurate calculation. He estimated that the revenue to be derived from Dominion Lands for the year 1882 would be \$781,000; the actual revenue for the calendar year was \$2,256,000. My right hon. friend estimated, for the year 1883, 40,000 as the increase of population; and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture estimates the increase of population at 75,000, and I think that will be below the mark, as previous estimates have been. My right hon. friend estimated the revenue to be derived from the lands in 1883 at \$1,820,000; the present estimate is \$2,750,000, with every evidence that that will be under the mark. My right hon. friend estimated the increased population of 1884 at 45,000, a much smaller estimate, it will be seen, than the actual increase of 1882; my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture estimates it at 100,000. My right hon. friend estimates the receipts at \$2,622,000, and I have no doubt that we shall receive in that year \$4,250,000. I give these figures as the evidence upon which I think we may confidently ask the House to accept our estimates as being altogether below instead of above the mark; and I ask my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, again whether, with these figures, I am not warranted in the statement I make in relation to everything connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, that down to the present hour the most sanguine calculations that any gentleman on this side has ventured to offer to the House or the country have been more than realized; and I ask my hon. friend whether he will reiterate the statement to this House—if he does I am sure it will be to incredulous ears on both sides of the House—that all the advantages of this contract are to be found on one side. Now, Sir, I will say a single word, before I sit down, with reference to the net debt of the country. Every person knows that when this Government came down to the House and asked it to sustain them in the policy of vigorously grappling with the construction of a Canadian

Sir CHARLES TUPPER

Pacific Railway from end to end, a wail of dismay was set up on the other side of the House, and every one remembers the utter ruin and destruction that was going to result to Canada from the attempt on the part of the Government, within any reasonable period, to construct that great railway. Everybody remembers the warning, the solemn warning, that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition gave to the House, that in that ruin we were going to destroy the very foundation of our country's prosperity. He admitted with us that the greatest thing for Canada was to bring people into the country; but he said, "You will load this country down with a debt so gigantic in proportion to its population that everybody will avoid Canada as they would a pestilence, and our immigration will cease." I am glad, Sir, to be able under these circumstances to draw the attention of the House for a single moment to a calculation made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance—and we all know how far below the mark all his calculations have been, how careful he has been not to overstate anything—as to the condition which this country will be in with respect to its debt, when the time comes under the contract for the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may state, and I do so with great pleasure, the result of one year's experience, which we have had already, of the Pacific Railway contract. We have had one year in which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have gone too fast; we have had one year of unprecedented rapidity of construction and of draft on the treasury of the country for public money under the contract; and what has that year disclosed? Why, Sir, at the close of that year after we had paid them every dollar that they were entitled to, with all that rapidity of construction, we actually owed \$1,734,129 less than we did at the beginning of the year. The net debt of the Dominion—the net debt on the 30th of June, 1881, at the beginning of the contract, was \$155,395,780.40; on 30th of June, 1882, it was \$153,661,650.78, or, as I said before, a decrease of \$1,734,129.62. So much for the ruin that was to overtake this country by the rapid construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has given me this memorandum:—

Surplus Consolidated Revenue, 1879-80 .....	\$4,132,743
do do do 1880-81 .....	6,316,052
Proceeds of lands, 1880-81 .....	1,744,456
Estimated surplus this year .....	6,000,000
Proceeds of lands this year .....	1,760,000
Estimated surplus next year .....	3,000,000
Estimated proceeds from lands .....	2,250,000
Estimated saving of interest after January 1885, 1 per cent. on \$30,000,000. \$300,000 per annum or equal to a reduction of debt of .....	7,500,000
If we have a surplus of about \$1,000,000 a year from June, 1884, to 1891 say seven years .....	7,000,000
Proceeds of lands, seven years at \$2,000,000 would be .....	14,000,000
	\$53,693,251

This is the amount that we expect to receive from surplus revenue and the sales of land from the commencement of this contract down to the time the contract provides for the completion of the work. With that calculation before us—and I think all will admit that it is a safe calculation—I think we may come to the conclusion, not only that our country will not be overwhelmed in debt, but that we shall be in the position that the Imperial Government are in to-day. Mr. Childers has brought forward his budget, and in it he has very much astonished hon. gentlemen opposite, by a proposal to reduce the National Debt by £3,000,000, a year. It was reduced last year by £8,000,000, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to reduce it this year by £8,000,000. So my hon. friend the Minister of Finance proposes to reduce our debt; so we propose to use these surpluses, not for the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway, mark you, but for the reduction of the public debt, that when this work is

constructed from end to end there will not only be no increased indebtedness upon Canada, but at an early day the sales of the lands alone will recoup back to the treasury of the country every dollar that has been expended. But what will be the difference? Why the difference will be that instead of being overwhelmed with debt, instead of immigrants who are looking to our shores as a future home being driven to seek other lands, because we are borne down by a monstrous debt that we are unable to control or provide for, the hon. gentleman will find that we shall have in this country reduced the debt, and at the same time a little over 4,000,000 of people will have accomplished one of the most gigantic feats in the record of any country in the world, the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean. I feel that we are in a position to congratulate ourselves upon the condition of our country, of which every Canadian may be justly proud. I say, Sir, that in contemplation of these facts, I trust my hon. friend will reconsider the statement which he made, and will come to the conclusion that the statement that all the advantages were to be found on one side, requires some little modification at his hands. I may say, Sir, that it would be impossible, in my judgment, to find any country in the world that has exhibited greater evidences of progress and prosperity, during the time that we have been engaged in actively grappling with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, than Canada presents, take it from what point you may. I spoke a little while ago of the great advantages the United States of America had in regard to attracting population to their country; but what is the fact? Here in this Canada of ours, we have been able, in connection with the construction of this great national work, and with the efforts that have been made through that Company and the Government of the country, to increase the immigration from Europe 50 per cent. while our neighbors (the United States) have been only able to increase their immigrant population  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The tables are turned. Every person knows that the eyes of the civilized world have, for many long years, been turned to the wonderful development of the great country south of us. Every person knows that there never was a country that has made such progress as Canada has made in regard to the sentiment of the people, the press and the Government of England. The position Canada occupied yesterday has been entirely changed, and to-day the statesmen, the press and the most intelligent minds of that country are drawing the attention of the people to the fact that the wide world presents no more inviting or attractive field for those who wish to seek homes in the New World than is to be found within the Dominion of Canada. We have every reason to feel proud of our position, when we look at the rapidity of the increase of our population, at the imports of the country, at the exports of the country, and at the increasing and developing industries of the country. We are prepared to-day to meet our great American neighbors to the south of us in friendly rivalry, and to show that in neither one nor the other of these great factors of the development, and of the progress of the country are we behind. Now, Sir, I have trespassed upon the attention of the House much longer than I intended to, and if I were to judge by the futility of my efforts in the past, I would sit down without saying any more to my friends on the other side of the House. I have already stated, Sir, that looking at it from a party point of view, nothing could be more conducive to the continued rule of the Conservative party of this country than that hon. gentlemen opposite should continue to maintain the attitude that they have maintained in the past in relation to this great work. I have said, Sir, what I sincerely believe, that there is no question that is so rooted in the public mind of the great body of the intelligent men of all parties and all classes in this country, as the conviction that the Government of Canada deserves

well at the hands of the people for having put their hands to this great work, and for having achieved the contract under which our country is surging ahead with such gigantic strides. But, Sir, there is a greater, there is a higher, there is a more important standpoint from which to view this question than one of party. Even at this late hour I would ask our friends on the opposite side of the House—notwithstanding the great advantage it will give them, and the great advantage it will take from us—I ask them to bury the dead past and to unite with us on the greatest national question that is now engaging the attention of the people of Canada, unite with us in a hearty endeavor to elevate, to raise and to advance the prosperity of our country together, as it can be only elevated, and only advanced, and only raised by the united sympathy and hearty action and co-operation of both parties. I feel that it is more in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite than in the interest of my friends that I make this proposition. But, Sir, I believe that the time is coming, when, with the evidence before the world, that we have achieved a position of which no Canadian, however sanguine, dared two or three years ago to dream we could attain in so short a period.—I believe, Sir, that the time is coming when every patriotic Canadian will feel bound to unite, heart and soul, with all the energy that he possesses, in a common effort, to sustain this gigantic enterprise which has already accomplished so much, and is calculated to accomplish still more to make us a great and prosperous country.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not the first time that the hon. gentleman has appealed to hon. members on this side of the House not to treat questions in which he conceives himself and his party deeply interested, in what he calls a party spirit. This is not the first time on which he has appealed to us to act with a different view from what he believes the doctrines of the party demands. I have answered him before—as I shall answer him to-night—that if I understood the obligations of party and the machinery of party, as the hon. gentleman does, I would abandon all party alliances, and eschew all party views from this hour forward. I know of no obligation of party which prevents me from taking, supporting and sustaining what I believe to be the best course in the interests of my country. I know of no obligation upon me, as a party man, or upon those with whom I have the honor to co-operate, to oppose the hon. gentlemen opposite in any one measure—upon any one question—in which they believe that opposition is not justified in the interests of their country. But it is now as it has been heretofore; because we differ from the hon. gentleman in his views of what is to the public interest, of what was to the public interest; because we differ from the hon. gentleman in his estimate of past, present and future, and still more vitally in the causes which he assigns to results which, so far as they are prosperous results, we heartily join in rejoicing over—I say it is because we differ cardinally from him upon those subjects that we are constrained, not by any party obligation, but by our views of what is our duty to our country, still to criticize the hon. gentleman's policy, still to point out where he is wrong, still to point out what the results would have been of a wiser, a better, a more prudent policy than that which he has adopted. The hon. gentleman has said, in the earlier part of his speech, that he believes that no lengthened explanation was necessary upon the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because he was satisfied that that Company occupied so strong a position in this House, as to render a long explanation needless. I dare say he is right. But after the hon. gentleman had made that statement, his performance did not exactly correspond with his promise, for I am sure we have not to complain of the brevity any more than we have to complain of any other feature of that statement, except that I think

I shall be able to point out some slight inaccuracies of fact and lapses of reasoning which the hon. gentleman was guilty of during the course of his oration. He said that I painted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's prospects the other day in colors altogether too bright, and that he thought my speech did not need an answer, because the country had answered it. He declared that in the Province of Ontario, an overwhelming majority of the population had negated the proposals which I made to them on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was mistaken. By the means which hon. gentlemen opposite chose to use, of manipulating the constituencies, they obtained a majority of supporters in this House; but I stated on the Address, and the statement was based upon a fair, careful and impartial estimate of the figures of the population who voted—and these figures have not been, and they cannot be, successfully contradicted by anyone who will go into the details—that the voting population of Ontario was practically equally divided in the month of June last. I admit that hon. gentlemen opposite obtained a majority of the voting population—I have always admitted it—but instead of that majority being an overwhelming one, it was inappreciable if you regard the number of votes cast, about 270,000. The hon. gentleman said, going from Ontario to Prince Edward Island, that I was defeated in Prince Edward Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and that a majority was returned to this House by the people of that Province.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You will not allow me to explain?

Mr. BLAKE. I will not, because I know what you said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said you had failed to get a majority.

Mr. BLAKE. We did not fail to get a majority. Prince Edward Island sent a majority of men to this House to support us, but this House chose to return to Parliament, and give a seat here to a man who was rejected by the vote of the free electors of that Province. By the vote of the majority of this House, the hon. gentleman acquired that seat which the people refused to give him. The hon. gentleman said that in Nova Scotia there was a two-thirds majority for the Government. I have not counted up the figures lately, but if I rightly remember the returns from Nova Scotia, they are about equal in point of strength, to what they were on the one side and the other previous to the Elections. In New Brunswick, the hon. gentleman no doubt succeeded in altering the political complexion of the representation in this House; but I understand another change, on a revision, has taken place at a very recent moment, which you will, Mr. Speaker, be called on to announce to us in a day or two, in the delivery of your duty; and I say that some of the changes which took place before, may have been produced by means into the full discussion of which it would take to long to enter to-night. In Quebec he would not say that my hon. friends were annihilated, but that the red paled before the blue. We returned, it is true, a small number, but we returned the same number that were sitting in this House from the Province of Quebec prior to the Elections; and if that line of red be thin and narrow it is a gallant line of red, that, I tell the hon. gentleman, neither quails nor blanches before the overwhelming forces of the blue. The hon. gentleman said that he would make a further allusion to my speech in which I referred to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I will defer a reference to the question until I reach that portion

Mr. BLAKE.

of his speech. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of the monopoly. He said the road could not have been built without a monopoly, and he declared, with reference to the disallowance, that that was a policy settled on and agreed on and applicable to this contract and this Company. I deny both the propositions of the hon. gentleman. I shall not enter into any lengthy details on this or any other topic of the hon. gentleman's speech which have been before discussed very fully in this House, professing to deal more at length with those topics which possess somewhat more the merit of freshness and novelty; but I will say there is no proof whatever, but proof to the contrary, that the road could not have been built without the odious monopoly clause, and I will add that the hon. gentleman's statement as to the power of disallowance, as applicable to this contract, is not in accordance with what I understand to be the facts. In the first place, he referred to it as a question of policy, and he said that the former Governments had acted upon the view that lines competing with the Government Pacific Railway should not be chartered. While yet it was uncertain how the road should be built; while yet all that was being done in the way of construction was being done by the Government itself; while yet, so far as was known, it was to be a Government road; while yet the arrangements for the contract were uncertain,—it was thought improper, at that time, and under those circumstances, to charter railways which might conflict with the great railway. That is true, but if the hon. gentleman infers from that that a policy was laid down with reference to this Company and to this contract, which was to guide us in the future, I deny his proposition altogether. I say that the people of this country, if they build this Pacific Railway through the prairies that would be an excellent security against the rates being high. The Government has built other railways. They have built the Intercolonial, and they run it—with what results as to profit we know. They have built the Prince Edward Island Railway, and they run it—with what results we know as to profit. There can be no doubt that the pressure would have been altogether in favor of low rates, and that the public interest alone being to be consulted, there would in that regard be little danger from the existence of a monopoly. A monopoly? Why, it would be the public that would own the railway, and the public could not have a monopoly in its own property: But a policy changing from year to year, from Session to Session, as the circumstances of the country and the condition of the enterprise might change, is one theory; a policy which involves an obligation, as it is now said, to a railway company, an obligation or contract that we will have to disallow local Acts of Parliament, is quite a different thing. The hon. gentleman challenged me to produce proofs of the assertion that during the debate on the contract allusion was made to this subject. We know it was. I have more than once quoted the passages which I shall quote in answer to the hon. gentleman's challenge. Late in the course of the debate the First Minister, dealing with this subject of monopoly, which he knew pressed the House very much, which he knew was one of the greatest difficulties in the way even of friends of his agreeing to the ratification of the contract, used this language:

"We know perfectly well it will take many years before that country is filled up with a large population, and the first ten years will be most unprofitable; we know perfectly well that it will require all the exertion, and all the skill, and all the management of the Company to make the eastern and western sections of this road fully compensate them, and fairly compensate them for their responsibility and for their expenditure during those ten years. In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament—we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall for the first ten years after the construction of the road give their own road, in which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

Now, Sir, if it was not a bargain between the Government of the day and the Pacific Railway Syndicate that they



would use that power for which they are responsible to, and in the exercise of which they are responsible for, the control of this Parliament, that they would use that power during these twenty years to disallow Local Acts of the Province of Manitoba and Local Acts of the Province of Ontario, then, Sir, what is the meaning of the phrases I have just read? What is their sense? What is their application? What did they mean, Sir? If the hon. gentleman says: "We cannot check the Ontario Parliament, we cannot check Manitoba," when he had bargained, or understood himself to have bargained, as a consequence of this contract, that he would check Ontario, that he would check Manitoba, by the exercise of the power of disallowance and prevent the construction of these railways; while this phrase clearly indicates that he intended Parliament to understand they would have power to charter and to construct if they should so determine. The hon. gentleman says that no fair-minded man could take any other view than that which he has proclaimed. I defy any fair-minded man to take any other view than that which I have stated, from the statement of the hon. gentleman made at a critical period of the debate on the question of this Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and which had a very serious effect. I will call a witness upon this subject. Although I would be glad to pay any hon. gentleman a compliment, I will not say that the witness I am about to call thoroughly answers the hon. gentleman's description, because I am afraid that, like most of us, he is sometimes a little biased, prejudiced, no doubt unconsciously, in favor of the side he espouses, and in that particular he cannot be that fair-minded man. I do not impute to him any undue share of bias or partiality. We are all human, and I suppose he may be—I see he recognizes the allusion; my witness is ready to rise. Now, he heard the speech of the First Minister, and it was his duty a little later on, after having heard the explanation, to give his views on this matter. I refer to the hon. member for Cardwell, and he must be a fair-minded man in the view which the hon. gentleman would desire. He is, if my hon. friend will allow me to say it, like the Irishman's wall—a little more than plumb, and he leans slightly to the other side. As the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) once said with reference to the widower who was about to be buried between his wives—he said that he wanted to be laid right betwixt them, but if there was any inclination at all there should be a slight cant towards Biddy. Now, I do not suppose it will be said of the hon. gentleman that he has not a slight cant towards Biddy. Well, with that slight cant towards Biddy, and with that desire to state the case as Biddy would desire to have it stated, the hon. Minister after having heard the explanation of the First Minister, used this language:

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railways in that country. To what does that apply? Simply to the territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organization to build a railway from Winnipeg to West Lynne, on the boundary. And after this agreement is ratified, this provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right to possess. In fact, this Parliament cannot take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this Company has under the contract is that their traffic shall not be tapped far west in the prairie section, thus directing the traffic away from their line to a foreign line, but there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side."

What does my fair-minded man say to that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. He agrees in that view! Then the hon. gentleman, I suppose, must think that it is an admirable

amusement for a Legislature to say: "Oh! yes, you have a perfect right to charter a railway, to be built to the boundary of the Province, so that no other railway may connect. The fifteen-mile clause does not in the slightest degree affect Manitoba. It does not affect the monopoly. It prevents the railway from being tapped far west from Manitoba by southern lines." I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks it a good joke—because it is no argument—to say that when the contract was going through, and afterwards to say "Oh! yes, that was all right, the contract did not do it, but then, we understood that we would exercise the power of disallowance. They may charter from now till doomsday, if it amuses them, but then they must understand that these charters would never be allowed to remain law; they must understand that they are going to be disallowed." And this is the way in which Manitoba could not be checked; this is the way in which railways could be built to the boundary line in Manitoba, and connect with southern lines; and this is the way in which the monopoly was not to affect the Province of Manitoba, and this is the way in which it was only to protect the Company from its traffic being tapped far west of Manitoba. Well, if that be so, I must withdraw the character I have given to the hon. gentleman, of being a fair-minded man. Now, this hon. gentleman has declared that it was the interest of the country that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have a good bargain, and that they had one. I agree, I have always agreed, that it was to the interest of the country, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have a fair bargain. What I have objected to, is the peculiar character of this bargain, to which I gave a descriptive form, and which I do not in the slightest degree withdraw. The hon. gentleman has said, that if they have so far succeeded, it has been by devoting themselves with undying energy and determination, heart and soul, one and all, to the single prosecution of the work. But we have heard within a few days that the chief officer, the president of the Company, had a large interest in another railway, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway had to purchase that railway for fear it should be alienated to a rival corporation. That is the extent of his devotion to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was explained to us with perfect good sense that his interest was larger in the Credit Valley than in the Canadian Pacific Railway; and was it to be expected that he should sacrifice his private interests in the Credit Valley for the sake of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Of course, not. But when you talk of undying devotion, of a single eye to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it seems to me those phrases are a little high-flown applied as to the circumstances which the officer of the Company has just disclosed. Then the hon. gentleman says that we ought to change our tone; that for party purposes he would like us to maintain in our present line of conduct, and none other; but that really we ought to change our tone, and that if we reflected upon what have been the consequences of the construction of this railway, if we reflected upon the immigration that is to be sent into the country, if we reflected upon the progress of the Syndicate, if we reflected upon the progress of the other parts of the North-West, if we reflected upon the statistics with which he deluged us—why, Sir, that we ought certainly to change our tactics and join in lauding and magnifying and falling down and worshipping the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. I do not agree in that point of view. I have said before, and I say to-day, that in so far as action in Canada, with respect to railway construction, has forwarded, and it has forwarded, the position of things in the North-West, it has been such action as we recommended to the hon. gentleman in 1880, and not such action as he took in 1881. I say that railway construction in British Columbia is not that which has produced appreciably good results in the direction to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. He has

referred to immigration into the North-West; and that is not dependent on railway construction in British Columbia. I say construction,—I cannot say construction, for there has not been very much construction,—but the preparation for construction and such construction as has taken place to the north of Lake Huron, and that commencing from Thunder Bay, has not done much to create settlement in the North-West. What, in so far as railway construction is concerned, has forwarded settlement in the North-West? Why, it has been the building of railways in the North-West. That is what has done it, and that is what we suggested to the hon. gentleman he should do in 1880. The hon. Minister has said that the Pacific Railway Company is building great branches. I will advert, at another portion of my remarks, to the promises of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with respect to branches; but I was a little amused when I heard the hon. gentleman claim that the Canadian Pacific Railway has built some miles of branches in the North-West, but that the Government had been entirely unable, notwithstanding all their efforts, to get more than a few miles built—not more than eighty I think, by the Manitoba and South-Western, and a few miles by the Portage and Westbourne. To say that the Government had been exerting itself to forward the construction of the Manitoba and South-Western, and to say that the construction of that railway had failed, notwithstanding all the best efforts of the Government, is to say something which I did not believe could fall even from the lips of the hon. gentleman. We believe that road has failed to be constructed, to a large extent, because of the apathy of the Government to deal with that railway as it should have been dealt with. The difficulties in the way of obtaining a land grant and of locating the line, have been the main causes which have impeded the construction of the road, and that they have been due largely to the attitude of the Government; and I believe that those difficulties are in a fair way of solution, because the Company has got into hands which are deemed by the Government not hostile to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman has said that the position of things with respect to the construction of this work, so far as the country's expenditure is concerned, is excellent, and he read a brief statement from the Secretary of the Department of the First Minister, giving the gross and estimated receipts from the sales of land in the North-West, placing them at \$58,000,000. That must be taken for what it is worth. We do not know what the details are; we do not know on what principles the calculations are made. It is impossible to discuss the details, because we have only the gross sum; but I will deal with the estimates which the hon. gentleman has given in detail. He has alluded to the very large revenue which he expects will accrue, within four years, from the sales to colonization companies; but that class of revenue is not indicative of a continuous income, because that source of supply has, to a large extent, dried up, and we are not likely to hear of many more colonization companies acquiring territory. The hon. gentleman has referred to the computations of the hon. First Minister. I rejoice, I am sure, quite as sincerely as does the hon. gentleman, at the influx of population into the North-West. But it was an unexpected influx; it was an influx which even hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1880, did not expect, and to a very much larger extent than ever could have been calculated at that time, it has come from the older Provinces. Up to this time the bulk of the immigration has been from the older Provinces, with consequences of not all unmixed good and advantage to them, though I have more than once said that I am quite willing that my Province should bear such ill consequences as have flowed from that immigration up to this time, in order that the higher interests of the country might be subserved by a large population from the older Provinces, taking part in the early settlement of the country. Still it is so; you cannot deny

Mr. BLAKE.

it, that the bulk of the immigration into the North-West has been from the older Provinces, a source of supply which must necessarily fail to continue unless consequences wholly disastrous ensue, or the void is filled by a very large foreign immigration. Then the hon. gentleman referred to his own resolutions, and to the resolutions of 1882, and the consequences which are now said to have fallen. I do not know whether it was the hon. gentleman's view which attracted the attention of the British Government and the world at large, but they have marched with rapidity in the Old Land, particularly in one of the countries, and a set of circumstances and feeling on the part of public men wholly different from that which existed, or was likely to exist, have now arisen. I rejoice at it; I rejoice, that driven by the necessities of the case, there is now a concurrent sentiment in favor of forwarding emigration from the Old Country. I hope and trust no check will occur to that new impulse, but that it will go on and develop. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in his calculations of emigration from Great Britain, took no account of the large Irish immigration which is likely to come here by the efforts of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman said he had not included that in his estimates. I need hardly say that we know, from the hon. members who come from the North-West, and from what we read and hear, that unless some money is supplied, it is impossible to place in the North-West country, as farmers, any very large body of those so wholly pauperized as are those classes from the most distressed parts of Ireland, who are likely to be sent out. A scheme that must involve the removal of a large number of those persons with their families to the North-West, to become farmers, must involve the proposition that there should be a very considerable advance of money to start them in the world. They must have means to build houses, or have houses built for them; must have implements, and supplies, and cattle, for one year at least. I would heartily rejoice if, under those circumstances, they could be sent to the North-West and enabled to start with supplies for one year. Short of that I think any large immigration of this class would be an injury to the North-West, unless they secured those means which are essential to their making a fair start in their new homes. But those are circumstances wholly unexpected at that time, and they favor the hon. Minister of Railways; and as they favor the country, too, we rejoice that they favor the hon. gentleman and the country together. The condition of the country at large is wholly different from what it was in those days. The hon. gentleman says that is due to his policy; he says that the large revenue is due to his policy, and so far I agree. He says, further, that the capacity to pay the imports is due to that policy, and there I differ with him; but we have enough to discuss this night without entering into the grounds of opinion in this regard, and I do no more than record my opinion on this subject. He declared he would get a statement from the hon. Finance Minister as to what was to be the result in, I think, nine years, with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway expenditure. He took that expenditure of \$53,000,000, omitting altogether the surveys to which reference was made several times by the hon. gentleman, and other incidental expenses. Well, the hon. gentleman may leave this out of his speech, but that will not prevent it being taken out of our pockets. We paid it. It is part of the expenditure incurred in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It belongs to the enterprise. It is here in the Public Accounts. We borrowed the original money, \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000, \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, and we are paying their debt, so that I maintain, that \$60,000,000 is the sum which we have to consider in this regard, and not \$53,000,000. The hon. gentleman does not dispute that \$5,000,000, \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 were spent on that account; but he says: "Let us put that aside. I do not see the use of it; and let us state

the account fairly, and then it is \$60,000,000 with which we have to deal;" \$28,000,000, he says, are for works completed; \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000, or whatever it may be, for surveys; Canada Central subsidy, \$1,500,000 for telegraphic and other expenses connected with the work, making up \$35,000,000; and \$25,000,000 subsidy; and thus you get \$60,000,000. The hon. gentleman begins by saying: "Let us take the account of \$53,000,000 only;" and he leaves out the \$7,000,000, or whatever it may be, but still we have to pay it all the same. How does he state the account? I was amused at his statement of the account. He pointed out, that there was a surplus in the Consolidated Fund for 1879-80, of \$4,132,000; for 1880-81, \$6,300,000; and for 1881-82, \$6,823,000, while a surplus of \$3,000,000 is estimated for next year, making a total surplus of \$19,448,000, all paid except that of this year; and he pointed out that he expected a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year for the next seven years, making \$7,000,000 more, and an aggregate of \$26,000,000, all surpluses, which he applies to the wiping out of the \$53,000,000; but where does that come from? Why, the hon. gentleman raised the taxes on us! He collected taxes far in excess of what was necessary for the public demands, exaggerated as he has made those demands! He has collected out of our pockets surpluses amounting to \$19,448,000, including the surplus of the current year, and he expects to take \$7,000,000 more in the next seven years, making \$26,000,000, which he says will wipe out half of these \$53,000,000. He has put aside the fact, that we paid this out of our taxes; although the plan on which the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be built, involved no increase in taxation; and yet the hon. gentleman now declares, that half of the whole \$53,000,000 to which he reduces these demands, is to be met out of increased taxation. It is quite true, that the hon. gentleman, a little later on, said: Now mark you, we do not apply that towards paying for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but to reduce the debt." But he is not applying it towards reducing the debt, but towards preventing the debt getting higher, because the interest of the money borrowed to build the Canadian Pacific is paid off out of the taxes, and, therefore, no financial juggle of that kind will avail in the slightest degree. Now, it is plainly declared this night by the hon. Minister of Railways, on the authority of the hon. Minister of Finance, that out of the \$53,000,000 to which he has reduced the public charges, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, no less a sum than \$26,448,000 is to be paid out of the taxes, of which, including the surplus of the current year, \$19,500,000 have been paid out of the taxes. Then the hon. gentleman says: "I see another financial feature. I venture next year, or a couple of years hence, to borrow \$30,000,000 to redeem a debt contracted a long time ago at a high rate of interest. We have been reducing the rate of interest gradually, owing to the ease in the money markets generally and to the higher credit of this country in particular, and I will reduce the rate of interest. I expect to have to borrow \$30,000,000 and to save 1 per cent. interest on the loan, which will be equivalent to \$7,500,000, and thus," he says, "I will relieve you of \$1,500,000 merely on account of the Canadian Pacific, and this don't cost you anything." But if we did not have to pay these \$7,500,000 for the Canadian Pacific we would have it in our pockets for something else. It is not due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that we make this saving. It has nothing to do with the North-West, that we make this saving, but it is our general gain by virtue of the improved condition of the money market, and of our increased credit, through which we make this saving, though, according to my calculations, it is not a saving of \$7,500,000. However, he simply says he will thus wipe off another \$7,500,000 of the \$53,000,000. I would like to know what this has to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and how far it will ease any burthen respecting those \$53,000,000.

We now come to the proceeds of the lands, and he pointed out, that these proceeds for 1880-81 were \$1,744,000, for 1881-82, \$1,750,000; and for 1882-83, \$2,250,000, making a total of \$5,744,000 thus far received. Well, the Finance Minister already estimates the receipt of \$2,000,000 a year for the next seven years, or \$14,000,000; but the Secretary to the Minister of the Interior estimates \$58,000,000 for nine years. I do not know whether or not the odd \$44,000,000 are to come in the last two of the nine years, but this is the difference between these two authorities; and I do not know whether to give the preference to the hon. gentleman who stands in the higher official position, or to the Secretary. The Minister of Railways, who knows more about the subject than anybody else, estimates \$2,000,000 a year, making in all for lands from 1880, for nine or ten years, \$19,744,000, and he puts that all to credit!—the net proceeds of the lands! He places that against the \$53,000,000; but have we got it yet. Why, Sir, up to to-day—no, but up to the 30th of June last, on surveys and the management of lands, we actually paid \$2,480,000. We have still a large sum to pay, and will have a further large sum to pay. We have paid, with reference to the North-West for Indians, \$3,993,000, of which during the last four years we paid \$2,844,000; last year we paid \$1,100,000. We have paid for Police, \$2,976,000, of which during the last four years we paid \$1,335,000, with other vast expenditures, with which it is not necessary now to deal. And yet the hon. gentleman says: "I will take every shilling that comes into the Public Treasury from lands, and I will deal with it as applicable to the reduction of the \$53,000,000." Now, we suspected some time ago that the hon. gentleman would make an attack of that kind. A good while ago he proposed to alter the plan of dealing with the account with reference to surveys; and he proposed for the future to charge surveys to capital account. The First Minister proposed that the cost of surveys, which up to that time had gone against income, should go to capital. In doing so, on the 28th of April, 1880, he said:

"As to the charge to capital, it is simply owing to this that we hope to realise capital out of the land, and this charge is to be taken out of capital."

"Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not fair having regard to other years."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It only requires an explanation. It is satisfactory to know that up to yesterday at Emerson, 7,000 emigrants came in, 3,500 of whom went into Winnipeg. There is a great claim for land both by settlers and purchasers."

"Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to press discussion. The sums received heretofore for Dominion lands have been credited as an ordinary income. This is manifestly correct, and I do not think it is right to have this survey charged to Capital. It should be charged to Income, and any proceeds also should be charged to Income; therefore, in the Public Accounts for the future, if this is persisted in, you must charge the other side."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, a special land account can be kept for this for which credit will be given for all moneys received, and in which all charges for surveys, etc., will be charged."

"Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Without pledging myself as to taking a vote, I may say that that will to a considerable extent obviate the objection which lies to charging to Capital. Some distinct assurance had better be given on that head."

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the terms of the Resolutions of last Session, there would have been a general arrangement made between Her Majesty and Canada. There would have been Commissioners to hold these lands in trust. As there are no Commissioners, the Government must act as Commissioners, and keep the accounts which the Commissioners, if appointed under the Resolutions, would have kept."

But all that has been forgotten, and the hon. gentleman, although \$2,480,000 had been spent up in that country, irrespective of the enormous sums which, due to the Dominion Lands, we are spending at headquarters, and which are equally justly a charge upon those lands, the increased expenditure of the Department—I say that the \$2,480,000 spent on survey is put to one side, and we are asked to-night to understand that the \$53,000,000 were liquidated by the gross proceeds of the lands instead of the net proceeds. Well, Sir, it is an easy way to liquidate, but the people of this country know, as the hon. First Minister said in April, 1880—they

know perfectly well that it has cost that money to sell the lands. They know perfectly well that not only has \$2,500,000 been spent for surveys, but that enormous votes are being asked from year to year, and they know that it is an unfair mode of stating the account to assume that the gross proceeds of the land, rather than the net proceeds, are applicable to the payment. These are all charges against the land for getting them into the market; and as I said before, so I say now, it is absurd to discuss these lands as producing even the price, less the cost of survey and other expenditures of a very large character, which are incurred in the North-West, and are properly chargeable on the proceeds of the sale of the land of that country. The hon. gentleman has said that the financial terms of this contract, as evidenced by events, do not justify my criticisms the other day. I believe they do. That criticism was based, so far as information was afforded by a public document—upon the official memorandum of the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. There were some points upon which I stated the Company's memorandum did not afford information, and upon those I was obliged to act conjecturally; but the main and a leading feature of that statement, which the hon. gentleman criticised, was founded on the official memorandum of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, dated, I think, on the 2nd of December last. The Company, as I then said, calculated its expenditure for the completion of the road to be the amount of its subsidy, \$25,000,000; the amount it had realized from land grant bonds, \$20,000,000; and \$90,000,000 which it had sold at 60, making \$54,000,000, or a total of \$99,000,000, for which the Company, on the 12th of December last, said it would complete and fully equip the whole of the railway for 684 miles, with branches and extensions, including the eastern extension, to which I have referred, the Callander Branch, and the western extensions so far as under construction—some 200 or 300 miles. I excluded, with the view of ascertaining what the cost, according to the Company's estimate, would be of the contracted line, my view of what the cost to the Company was of the eastern lines which were outside of the contract altogether, and of the branches—\$8,000,000, subject, of course, to the mortgages upon it; and that reduced the cost, according to the Company's estimate of the contracted line to \$91,000,000, towards which it was receiving \$25,000,000 of subsidy, and about \$17,500,000 for lands already sold, making \$42,000,000 of cash which we could see. This would leave about \$40,000,000 to be provided for, and there are the town lots and the mile belt, which has not been sold; there are the speculations which were made in Brandon and other places upon other lots, from which the Company realized large sums; and there are those bonuses which would add considerably to the sum of \$49,500,000. Now, you have to add to that only the cost of the land, taking the same average price to which I referred, of \$2.68, in order to ascertain, as I have said, that there is a considerable margin over the cost of the railway as estimated by the Company, which is given to the Company in money and in land, without counting the cost of the Government works. The hon. gentleman criticized my statement of \$35,000,000 as the cost of the works, and he says that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company borrowed that of me. I do not know from whom they borrowed. I did not know that I was upon such terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway, that they would borrow anything from me, but I find that in their prospectus, and I think they took a very fair and reasonable view of it. I do not understand that in the construction of a great work like this you are to assume that the exploratory surveys which have taken place, are not a part of the cost. These surveys were required to find the best route, they cost a large sum of money—they have to be paid for. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had entered upon their enterprise without any of these surveys, they would

Mr. BLAKE.

have had to enter into much more extensive surveys, and the cost of these surveys would have been part of the cost of the road. So these surveys, in so far as they acted affirmatively or negatively—affirmatively by proving certain lines to be the best, negatively as showing that certain lines were not available—were so much expended as part of the work. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and myself are right, and I think, when two agree, as we do, that the fact may be regarded as a good proof that we are right, and that it is fair and reasonable to call the cost of the surveys \$7,000,000. But the \$7,000,000 will not balance the account, because the cost of the contracted line would be \$91,000,000, which would more than balance up the money and the land. There would still be a margin of \$28,000,000, after the hon. gentleman shall have pitilessly knocked off the \$7,000,000 for surveys and other items. The hon. gentleman says this will not do at all. He says these calculations will not answer; he says it will cost a great deal more money; he says that the estimated cost of the land is all wrong, and he makes various statements of that kind. Before I touch upon them, I wish to read a further piece of evidence which has come out lately, in a letter from Mr. Stephen, the President of the Company, dated the 5th of April last, and addressed to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk. In this letter he states briefly the financial position of the Company, and the results of the enterprise, as he calculates them:

"In conclusion let me say that the Canadian Pacific Company is officially committed to the statement, that the whole of the main line, from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, 2,904 miles, plus some 450 miles of branches—complete and fully equipped—with the addition of about 17,000,000 acres of perhaps the finest wheat lands on the continent, will be represented by \$90,000,000 of share capital, without preferences of any kind. The proprietors of this capital will own the whole of this property, free from all incumbrances, except about \$5,500,000 of mortgage bonds previously charged on the purchased lines. In other words, taking the \$90,000,000 of share capital at the issue price of sixty, the actual cash cost of 3,354 miles of railway, and some 17,000,000 acres of land, will be \$54,000,000—say, \$16,300, or £3,260 per mile of railway, with the valuable land asset in addition."

This is Mr. Stephens statement. He points out that the stock capital of \$90,000,000 is \$54,000,000 cash, and he says that when the enterprise will be completed the road from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean will be in existence, fully equipped in the best style, with 450 miles of branches, with this result: that it will cost \$54,000,000 of paid-up capital, against which we have to set 17,000,000 acres of perhaps the finest wheat lands on the continent. Now, what do you value 17,000,000 acres of the finest wheat land on the continent at? Whatever you value them at, strike a balance between that value and the \$54,000,000, and you will find what the road will cost the Company; and after that the Company get these \$28,000,000 of Government works, irrespective of the surveys. Now, Sir, that statement is perfectly plain and clear. If that statement is reliable—and I do not understand the hon. gentleman to dispute it, for it represents the views of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after all the information they have received as to what this road is going to cost—the result will be that the view I have stated, which was based on that prospectus, the inferences I drew, which were drawn from that prospectus, are wholly borne out in this regard. But the hon. gentleman says that we ought to make the calculation on the valuation of \$1 an acre for the lands; he says that a contract was made for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch in the year 1875, that 20,000 acres a mile was to be granted as part of the price, and that it was talked of as being worth \$1 an acre; he says that was the general estimate, although the late Finance Minister declared that Mr. Foster had offered that land for 20 cents an acre; and so he says: "That proves to you that I was quite right, this having happened in 1875, in valuing this land at \$1 an acre in 1881." Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman

made a valuation of that land in that year, 1875, and he declared that it was worth \$5 an acre then. He did not accept Sir Richard Cartwright's valuation of \$1 an acre; but even then, without a mile of railway in the country, without any access to the country at all, without any Pembina Branch built, or any connection on the other side if it had been built, with the Thunder Bay section untouched, with no immigration as yet in the country, the hon. gentleman, sitting where my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) sits, and speaking from that place, declared that he estimated the land as worth \$5 an acre. But so diffident is he of his own judgment, and so inclined to learn from his adversary, that it turns out that he was convinced by my hon. friend's speech at that time, and that in secret—he did not make any public declaration—he recanted, and came to the conclusion that the land was worth only \$1 an acre. But, then, the hon. gentleman says: "In 1880 this land was valued by you at advanced rates." Well, I am a little surprised at this. The hon. gentleman made his valuation in 1880 too. The hon. First Minister brought down a scheme in the spring of 1880, in connection with which he declared that the average value of the land would be \$3 an acre for one hundred miles on each side of the railway; and yet the hon. gentleman, sitting beside him and not dissenting from his view, but affirming and reiterating it, in the following year declares that the land is worth only \$1 an acre—and that a different kind of land; for the lands then spoken of as worth \$3 an acre were in alternate lots, the other alternate lots being held for free grants and pre-emptions—100,000,000 acres reserved for sale, and valued at \$3 an acre, good, bad and indifferent. But when the hon. gentleman was dealing, in the following year with selected lands—lands from which the bad and indifferent were to be deducted, and only those fairly fit for settlement to be granted, he suddenly reminds himself of the fact that five or six years before his valuation of \$5 an acre had been disputed on the other side, and he says: "Now, I will go down to the bottom dollar." Well, I do not understand that kind of argument. I accept the hon. gentleman's figures as good for himself; I accept his statement as indicating his own opinion; I accept his calculations as indicating what he thought was right as to the bargain; and we find that, in 1881, he thought \$1 an acre was enough for selected lands, although in 1880 he thought \$5 an acre could be got for the good, bad and indifferent. What had happened between 1880 and 1881 to decrease the value of the land? The hon. gentleman pointed out that the exertions which had taken place between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay ought to be extended to British Columbia. He said that what was necessary was to connect that country with our seaboard, and what was done in getting a line from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg had changed and improved the condition of affairs enormously. So the opening of the Pembina Branch had opened the country to railways; and so the hon. gentleman's own railway works in the Province, although he is not to be congratulated on his success, were being carried forward. Then the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, but you did not help me; if you thought that the proper course was to build the railway through the prairie, why did you oppose me in my plan in 1880 of building a prairie road." If I thought as I did then, and had opposed the hon. gentleman, I would have done something of which I would be ashamed. But the hon. gentleman's memory is at fault. I did not oppose him. On the contrary, I declared that I favored the building of the railway over the prairie, that it was a course which ought to be pursued, and I used this language:

"I agree also that we ought to proceed with the road through the western prairies as rapidly as we find the settlement and development of that country requires us to advance. I believe that just as fast as we see that the plan of settlement presses for it and will be promoted by it,

we ought to get on with the prairie road; and, therefore, to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that he has contracted for 100 miles and that he is about to contract for another hundred, I offer no dissent but my hearty approbation. I believe that the true course is that which the hon. gentleman has adopted—that is to proceed with the construction of these sections. He has told us in what time he expects to have them finished; but long before they are finished we may know at what time and what rate it is necessary for us to proceed further in order to develop that country. We can be guided by circumstances and construct the road if necessary, even slightly in advance of the actual tide of settlement, but not so far in advance as to be expending our money before it can be of use."

Yet the hon. gentleman ventures to charge me this night, in the face of this House with having opposed his policy in 1880, of building the railway over the prairie when he proposed it to the House. What I opposed was something else. It was his going on, at that time, and under those circumstances with the construction of the road through British Columbia; but feeling that it was the duty of every hon. member on what ever side of this House he might be seated, to give his cordial support to any proposal which might be in the interest of the country, I did not hesitate, not merely not to oppose, but to affirm positively my approbation and give my encouragement to the hon. gentleman in prosecuting the road over the prairies. Now, I say that it is the road over the prairie that has done the business. So far as railway construction has helped the North-West the benefit has come from that road, and therefore I say now, as I said in 1880, that the true and sensible course was to build the road over the prairie, develop the country, bring in settlement, get in that backbone of which the hon. gentleman spoke and to which I referred before, but not to contract in advance—but not to contract in advance with a company to build the road when we have to deal with most unfavorable circumstances as to the land and the work to be done at both ends of the line. You told us, that the land was worth but little, \$1 an acre at the most; that nothing would be made out of it because there was no railway through it. Then I said: Get the railway through, but do not sell the lands first and build the railway afterwards. Since you are provided with ample means, build the railway, give value to the lands and sell them after they have achieved value instead of selling them when they are worth but little. The hon. gentleman says he looked to the lands sold from 1872 to 1880, and found they only realized 31½ cts. an acre. Did he look to that in 1880 when the hon. Minister of Interior made the statement that he would sell the lands at \$3 an acre, nearly ten times that amount? Then the hon. gentleman says that I estimated the cost of the railway in 1880, and that if the bargain is a bad one it was due to the conduct of the late Government and of myself, who embarrassed the present Government by our opposition. After stating that I did not support him in opening up the prairie section, he says that I estimated the entire construction of the road at that time at certain values amounting in the aggregate to \$120,000,000. I have repeatedly explained what those estimates were based on. They have never been refuted or contradicted. The materials upon which they were based were open to all the world. They were the estimates of the hon. gentleman's own engineers and the engineers of the preceding Government, Mr. Fleming and his officers. There was no mystery about them. These gentlemen had estimated these prices for these different parts of the works, and the calculations made by my hon. friend from East York were undoubtedly correct, as based on the estimates of these gentlemen of what the cost of a first-class road would be. We did not say that was the road the hon. gentleman was going to build, because that was not the road. We did not form any estimate of what such a road as the hon. gentleman talked of would cost, but I adopted his estimates for the sake of argument as to the road he was going to build. I demonstrated, however, that a first-class road would cost \$120,000,000 according to the estimates of the engineers at that time. Subsequent statements I believe have shown these estimates in some

instances to have been somewhat excessive, but they come wonderfully close to the cost of the road as estimated now by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If you take the \$91,000,000 I have given you as our estimated cost of their portion of the road, and add to that the \$28,000,000 or \$30,000,000 of Government work, you get about \$120,000,000, so that the present estimate given for the construction of a first-class road is about what the engineers formerly estimated would be the cost—an estimate which did not exclude but included equipment and interest on cost of construction. These monies to which I have referred, and which made the aggregate the Company expect to pay, include the cost of equipment and interest during the period of construction, in so far as that may have to be provided out of capital. They expect to provide for it largely out of the profits of the enterprise, and I believe they will according to present tariff results. But what is the deficiency they expect to provide for out of that capital? The hon. gentleman says that assuming the cost at \$120,000,000 there is not so much of a margin of profit in that. Well, no, there is not a very large margin of profit in that, if the Company were building the road for the Government; but you must remember the Company is to own the road they build, and after all, if they get the road for nothing, I do not know but that leaves a pretty fair margin of profit—\$120,000,000, when you own the property after you construct it. The hon. gentleman says there will be a great loss in operating it. I do not know that at all, but I could read to the hon. gentleman paragraphs from that official memorandum which I think would indicate very clearly that there will not be much loss in operating the road. Of course we know that things have greatly changed, that prospects have improved, and we know above all that with the provision for a monopoly, with the provision that rates must produce at least 10 per cent. on the capital, the Company can put on the screws on such traffic as is going into the North-West and prevent any loss by making the centre support the ends. Our calculations were made in reference to a Government enterprise, and the Government could not put up or keep up rates in the North-West in such a way as to prevent loss at the ends. But the Canadian Pacific Railway is entitled by this contract to have the rates put up so high as to make, not only to pay the loss on the operation, but to make 10 per cent. profit on their expenditure. Therefore, an arrangement has been devised which renders this loss a serious thing for the country, but not for the Company, which, out of the profitable portions of the road, has got to pay that loss in operating, and 10 per cent. profit on the capital. But the hon. gentleman says there was an invitation for tenders at \$10,000 a mile and 20,000 acres a mile, and a guarantee at 4 per cent., and he proceeds to make adverse calculations. First of all, he says that this proposal was for 52,000,000 acres of land in round numbers; that you are to value the land at \$2.68 an acre. Now, this is an old business that I have already treated fully, and I will only give a slight sketch of it now. In the first place the hon. gentleman takes no note of time. He thinks there is no difference between 1874, 1875 and 1881, when this contract was sanctioned. He thinks the prospects of the North-West were the same in those earlier years as in the later ones. But I could read from the hon. gentleman's speech in 1880 that he said everything had changed, that his own views had altogether changed, that circumstances had entirely changed. But for the purposes of his discussion the hon. gentleman insists on putting on his blue spectacles, and looks back again at circumstances as they were in the old days; to day, however, he puts on his railway spectacles, and he says, in the case of this contract: "Oh! I value the land at \$2.68 an acre." Now, Sir, money itself varies little in value, less than anything else, but land varies much, particularly in a new country and land in the North-West has varied greatly in value. I think, therefore, it is ridiculous—the hon. gentleman

Mr. BLAKE.

man will pardon me for saying so—I think it is ridiculous seriously to argue that you are to take the value of the lands in 1877-78 as an estimate for the value of lands when the contract was let in 1881. There is no use arguing about it, because the subject-matter is wholly different. There was a value to the land in later years; there was no value to the land in former years. But more: what was the nature of the land? In the former it was the land of the odd sections, as they come, which comprised the 52,000,000 acres, rough or smooth, as they came, along the line from Manitoba to the Pacific Ocean. The land was to be taken along the line of the railway deep enough to make this 52,000,000 acres, and if it could not be found there the Government was to assign them in other spots. If there was a bad lot, and it fell upon the Company's share, they were to take it; if it was a water-stretch, they were to take it. They had, it is true, the advantage of the fertile plains, but they had to take their land through British Columbia as well; and would the hon. gentleman compare in price, as of an equal price, acre for acre, even in the same year, land which they were to take as it happened, rough and smooth, good and bad, heavy and light, fertile and desert, swamp and hollow, water-stretch and sandy plain? Take it in that way and take land in which you can reject all that is not found fit for settlement—it is absurd, the things are totally different in their nature. There is no means of comparing the two things together. Yet the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, I have got you there. I insist that of the land I sold in 1881, the selected land, the lands from which were to be eliminated all that were not found fit for settlement, is worth \$2.68 an acre, why, of course, the other land should also be rated at \$2.68 an acre." The hon. gentleman goes a little further. He says the Government gave a guarantee of 4 per cent. on an additional sum, a guarantee for twenty-five years. "Why," he says, "I have made an estimate;" and I assumed he was going to give 4 per cent., on \$7,500 per mile. What rate he did assume I do not know, but I will request him not to make estimates for us. It is hard enough for us to have facts inverted for us without having estimates inverted for us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I gave the hon. gentleman my basis.

Mr. BLAKE. I know he gave a basis, but his basis was baseless. His basis was the Foster contract, given in 1875, and I have explained what the condition of the country was in 1875, relative even to its condition in 1878, and it is absurd to suppose that was a true basis. But assume it for a moment, and what does the hon. gentleman say?—and here we get down, not to estimates, but to actual monetary calculations. He has told us that we will have to pay interest at 4 per cent. on \$7,500 a mile for twenty-five years, and that, he says, is equal to \$20,979,500. Now, Sir, I have run the figures out and I find that the hon. gentleman has taken \$7,500 a mile on every one of these miles, and that is how he makes up his \$20,979,500; he has actually assumed that an annuity of 4 per cent. is equal to the capital sum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To \$300 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well; what is the value of an annuity of \$300 a mile for twenty-five years? Is it this \$20,979,500? Let the hon. gentleman look at the figures. What rate will he take interest at? If he takes interest at 5 per cent. the value of such an annuity is \$11,826,225.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What is the value of that \$25,000,000 on the same calculation? The hon. gentleman will see at once that I had a right to charge, just as he has given the right to charge, \$25,000,000, which is only to be paid as the work proceeds, *pro rata*, and that is the entire process of the hon. gentleman's calculation. If I have a right

to charge \$300 per mile, he would have to pay 4 per cent. on \$7,500 a mile, but he charges me with \$25,000,000. If he capitalizes one, he must capitalize the other.

Mr. BLAKE. In the first place, the hon. gentleman finds himself caught. This \$25,000,000 is to be paid inside four years. There will be an average of two years' interest upon that, speaking roughly. And I say again that the hon. gentleman's calculation was \$7,500 a mile in clean cash paid over, and the value of such annuity, according to the tables, calculating interest at 5 per cent. is about \$11,826,000, so that, one way or the other, about one-half what the hon. gentleman has estimated his annuity at its real value, according to the tables. Why, Sir, if it had been for fifty years, according to these tables, the hon. gentleman would have owed nearly \$20,000,000 to-day. As long as you are paying it, he says, I have counted it. Now, the truth is, he charged us as if we were going to give \$7,500 a mile in cash.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I charged you with paying interest on \$7,500 a mile per annum, as it became due, for twenty-five years; that made \$20,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. If it had been for fifty years, the hon. gentleman would have made it out \$40,000,000, and he would not have allowed for a delay in payment. He would have placed us in the same position as if he had agreed to pay \$10,000,000 in four years, or \$10,000,000 in forty years; and that is what the hon. gentleman calls a fair, just, candid, reasonable calculation, fit to be submitted to reasonable men. Then the hon. gentleman says: "Oh! I am looking at the offer of the second syndicate." Now, that offer, he says, was an offer for the prairie section, and he charged us with an intention, a design, if they turned out and we came in, to accept that offer for the prairie section. Sir, we recorded our dissent for the prairie section; we not merely expressed our dissent in debate, but we recorded it also in the resolution which stands upon the Journals of Parliament, and which indicates the opinion that this alternative proposal could not be accepted; and therefore, there was not the slightest doubt or difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to what our policy was on that subject. It was not obscure, it did not stand only upon word of mouth, we wrote it down, and we voted for a resolution expressly declaring that the alternative proposition could not be accepted. But because you have an alternative proposition capable of being adopted, that is no reason why it is impossible to act on any part of it, and why it was impossible to act upon the suggestion of the second syndicate with respect to the prairie section. I will now deal with the hon. gentleman's statement as regards the prairie section. He says that the cost, according to the offer of the second syndicate, would be \$9,720,000. It is true; it is a great deal too much; I always thought so, I said so, and I voted so. But if it is too much, what do you think of something very much more, of something like \$42,000,000 for the prairie section? What do you think of paying, instead of \$7,333 per mile, \$10,000 per mile; instead of 10,000 acres of land per mile, 12,500 acres per mile for the prairie section? If one was bad, the other was worse.

An hon. MEMBER. That is special pleading.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it is special pleading. It may be special pleading; there is about \$10,000 a mile of special pleading in it. I, therefore, maintain that nothing which the hon. Minister of Railways has said to-night, has tended in the least degree, to alter the opinion that the true, the statesman like, the business like course, was to have proceeded rapidly with the construction of the railway in the North-West, and have held our hands as regards the ends of the line, rather than have made a bargain which in its pecuniary conditions has proved so onerous, and which in its other conditions has proved already

onerous, and will, in the future, prove still more onerous to the country at large, and to the North-West particularly. I have pointed out that we had given too liberal terms for the prairie section, and that these funds should have been reserved to provide for the more difficult work. I have shown that up to the 30th June, the Company have actually received from the Government, in the way of land subsidy: in cash on account of land subsidy, in cash subsidy, in advance on rails, in the way of rails sold and not paid for, and in interest on deposits, \$13,588,000, to which are to be added \$664,000 for the twenty miles more which have been constructed according to the statement of the hon. Minister, making a total amount of \$14,000,000 up to date. To that you add the Company's capital, \$5,000,000 in cash; and yet the Company was pressed to the uttermost. That is proved very clearly by the papers before us, which show most urgent demands for advances, which show proposals that the contract should be violated by money being paid in advance of construction, which show pressure in various ways, indicating almost impecuniosity on the part of the Company. What has been done with this money? The hon. gentleman has said he has received a telegram from the Secretary of the Company to-day, to the effect that they have expended west of Callander, up to date 31st March, \$24,471,000. We have the Company's accounts up to 30th June last, and they show a total expenditure west of Callander of \$6,290,000 only. Yet the hon. gentleman states that they have spent \$24,471,000 up to the 31st March. I think there is an error in that telegram. I do not think that amount in cash has been, or can have been spent. It may have been spent in arrangements for paid-up stock in connection with some hocus-pocus business to which I shall refer presently, that stands to the debit of the Company; but as for that amount of cash, I cannot see what we have got for it. Up to 30th June the amount expended on rolling stock was \$2,423,000. The hon. gentleman says \$4,351,000 have been expended.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to read the telegram, because I desire the hon. gentleman to know the information I have in my hands. It runs as follows:—

"May 4th.

"Have just ascertained the total expenditure to March 31st, including construction, material in hand and paid for, \$24,571,412. This does not include anything on account of purchase of lines east of Callander."

Mr. BLAKE. That is just what the hon. gentleman said before. I say the hon. gentleman has stated that this sum includes \$4,351,000 for rolling stock, that the accounts up to the 30th of June last show a total expenditure of \$6,290,000, of which \$2,423,000 was for rolling stock, and, therefore, the additional sum for rolling stock is about \$2,000,000. On looking at the length of line constructed I find it very difficult to find how any such sum can have been expended in that interval. I applied to the Government for information on this subject. The Minister agreed to give it, the House awarded it, the Minister said the Company were anxious to furnish it; but I have not got it, and not until this evening has the hon. Minister given us any information and that which he has given is partial and unsatisfactory. We do not know the details, the points where the money has been spent, what was expended on the Callander Branch, how much was due to other branches and how much to the main line. But if it was so, it is all the more important that the Company should have reserved resources for the western work. The hon. gentleman has adverted to my remarks on another occasion. I had special reference on that occasion to the eastern extensions and acquisitions. I pointed out one reason why I thought it improper that the Company should be launching out into different undertakings from their main work, and were evoking hostility which it was important they should not evoke; and I said we

should not permit the resources which were intended to be, and which should be, devoted to the construction of the contract line, to be used in buying branches and extensions which might not be essential to the contract line, and which might prove unfavorable to this country, because of the clause respecting 10 per cent., which, if applied to the extensions from the main line, and which was said to be applicable thereto, might have to be paid out of the profits obtained from working other portions of the line. Some further information has been obtained in respect to those branches and acquisitions since I spoke, and I wish to give a statement of the result of that further information. The Canada Central has been acquired, and the financial condition, as appears from the papers, of that enterprise as acquired by the Company is this: first mortgage bonds, £500,000 sterling, or \$2,500,000; second mortgage bonds overdue, £200,000 sterling, or \$1,000,000; first, preference stock, \$1,400,000, assumed at par; ordinary stock outstanding, \$1,200,300; to be issued \$28,000; or a total of \$2,850,000, assumed at 50 cents on the dollar, making \$934,000. And then there is the agreement to pay certain other obligations outstanding for stock or otherwise, that when I make only a conjectural estimate, because no clue is given to the amount, but from the character of the statement I assume that they are not far from a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and giving \$186,100 for them. This makes the price to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of the Canada Central, \$6,000,000. Of these \$6,000,000, \$2,500,000 stand on mortgage, and the remainder is provided for the present by the Company, making the sum to be provided for in this purchase, some \$3,500,000. Now, of that line 120 miles were built almost entirely by the Government subsidy of \$12,000 a mile, and the price seems to me, having regard to the fact, that a considerable portion of the whole mileage is in branches, to be a price greater, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said, than will be paid for with the interest of dividends, or profit, at the rate which this Company is entitled to exact. Besides this liability of \$6,000,000 the Montreal and Ottawa line has also been acquired, including the Aylmer Branch and the St. Jerome Branch; and if we include the rolling stock, as was included in the Canada Central case, we have \$4,000,000 paid; \$400,000 practically in cash, and \$600,000 in yearly payments, and the balance of \$3,000,000 is left on mortgage; and these \$3,000,000, with \$2,500,000, make the \$5,000,000, which, in their prospectus, the Company declare will be mortgaged on the extension which they have purchased. It thus appears that these two purchases, these two main purchases in the east, come to \$10,000,000, of which \$6,500,000 have to be presently provided for, or have been provided for by the Company. Then I see that they have made another little purchase. They have bought the Laurentian Railway, together with the St. Lin Branch; and there again you find a purchase which I cannot connect with the true interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but for which, notwithstanding, we will have to pay. This small road running from Ste. Thérèse to St. Lin, somewhere about fourteen miles, they made a bargain for apparently about the same time at which they bargained for the large road. They bargained for the large road, through the then First Minister of Quebec, the present Secretary of State; and they bargained for the small road through L. A. Senecal, the President and practical proprietor of the road. Now, that little branch was built on a financial scheme; and it received about \$60,000 in aid from the Quebec Government. It was to have got some \$50,000 from municipalities, and there were shares to the amount of \$45,000 subscribed for, making a total of over \$160,000. Still the road only cost about \$140,000, and the contract was made on terms for the bonds, stock, &c.; but unfortunately things took such a shape, that the contractor handed over the bonds to Col. King and Mr. Hurteau, at two different

Mr. BLAKE.

times, and apparently all that was advanced by those unto whom the bonds ultimately fell, was a sum of about \$60,000. Mr. Senecal became the proprietor of all of them I believe, or of all but a fraction of them, for somewhere about \$60,000 or \$70,000. In that position, at the same time when the large sale is made, the small is made; and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acquires the Laurentian Railway, as it is called—a fine title, by the way, for a branch fourteen miles long—and agrees to pay these bonds in full with interest upon them calculated at 7 per cent., which, as far as I can see, has not been paid for a long number of years; so that the price to be received would be nearly \$400,000 for the St. Lin branch, and representing an investment to the fortunate proprietor and vendor of \$60,000 or \$70,000—for which he receives nearly \$400,000 for a road costing perhaps \$140,000 to construct, and being worth no more. Well, there you find an investment for which the country has to pay, because, as I have said, the country has to pay out of the North-West, the interest upon the investments of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in other lines; and if this is to be treated as part of the main line, it has to pay 10 per cent. profit on it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the statement which I have just read to the House, declares that not a single dollar of the money to which reference is made, has been expended in relation to any of the works east of Callander. As I have already stated to the House, all further purchase by the Company, not only pay their working expenses, but the entire interest on the cost of the works; so I do not see how the hon. gentleman can charge against the funds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as derived from the Government of Canada, anything in relation to anything east of Callander.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, Sir, the Parliament of Canada has agreed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall have the tolls kept up to such a point, that it shall reap enough to pay the working expenses, the interest on its debt, and 10 per cent. on capital, and, therefore, we are deeply, vitally interested in what that capital account is, and what the acquisitions of the Company are. It is not with its own money that it is speculating, it is not with its own prospects that it is speculating, it is speculating with the prospects of the North-West, for if that country can be made to pay toll and tribute enough to pay the interest on whatever it acquires, that country is to be made to pay that toll and tribute, and it has nothing to do with the case, whether it applies certain receipts received from the Government of this country, in one place or in another; but I have to do with the extraordinary unfortunate powers which under the contract were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and I say that we are deeply interested in that Company, in considering what these purchases have been. The general result of them is, that in order, as far as I can see, to get a line from Montreal to Callander, 347 miles long, the Company has acquired some 440 miles of railway in main line and branches, because there is another little bit of road, the St. Eustache Railway, which was bought at a price I cannot tell, and for a purpose for which I cannot conjecture, which, with the other sums, would make a total of about \$10,700,000, including a certain sum for expenditure on these works—of capital applied in this way—not all applied in cash, because, as I have said, \$3,500,000 are in mortgage, but \$10,700,000 are the obligations, of which all but \$3,500,000 have been raised in some way or another. Now, between \$7,000,000 and \$8,000,000 must have been paid or settled in some way on this account, and if the resources of the company are strained, and if, as the hon. gentleman has informed us to-night, more than once has happened to the company, it was in doubt, its present was in doubt, and it was doubtful whether it



would be able to go on—I ask whether this may not be largely attributed to the circumstance of its having, according to the hon. gentleman's view, to build the direct line, it has launched out, as it has launched out into the eastern part of the country. Now, the hon. gentleman says that these roads pay their working expenses and interest charge. Well, I observe that the traffic is estimated by the company itself in its prospectus on the Eastern section at \$3,200 a mile—that is their statement. I do not know what the operating cost is, but I dare say I am not very wrong in estimating the operating cost at 70 per cent. on the gross returns; and that would give you a net sum of \$460,000, or 4½ per cent. on the capital invested in the line. That would be a result of \$3,200 per mile, or a gross return for the working expenses of 70 per cent. Now we know at any rate the bulk of this amount, and I believe the Company contend on all of it we have to secure them in ten per cent—that they are part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, part of the main line—and therefore there is not, as the hon. gentleman has stated, enough money to save the country from loss. There is not enough money to free the country from the liability to keep up these tolls, so that on this increase of capital 10 per cent. shall be received. Before the mortgages are paid the increase will be about \$6,500,000, on which 10 per cent. will have to be paid or \$650,000. Did I say \$6,500,000? I retract. According to the hon. gentleman's statement to-night there is no doubt that the capital will be represented, every farthing of it, by stock issued at 60, and therefore the capital upon these roads will appear to be a much larger sum than \$6,500,000, and it would be utterly impossible to pay a dividend out of their earnings, and therefore these transactions involved a further charge on the trade and traffic of the North-West Territories for all time to come. I alluded to the apparent connection between the Company and the Credit Valley, and the Ontario and Quebec, and I invited information on this subject. The order passed, but the Company has made a return stating that they have no connection whatever with the Credit Valley and the Ontario and Quebec. That is the answer to the return, but there is a cable telegram which preceded the return a few days, signed by A. Tyler and addressed to Mr. Hickson, and by Geo. Stephen addressed to Van Horn in which these two potentates declare that an arrangement has been made under which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agrees to give the Credit Valley and the Ontario and Quebec to the Grand Trunk, but they have no connection; they have nothing to do with these roads—at least that is what they tell the House of Commons. When asked, they say they have nothing to say, but the President has telegraphed over that they have agreed to give them to the Grand Trunk. Are we to believe Mr. Drinkwater, who says they have nothing to do with these roads, or are we to believe the President who agrees to sell? Or are we to believe that the President agrees to sell without having the power to sell? Between these two conflicting authorities I am somewhat puzzled, but on the whole, I am inclined to believe the President who occupies the higher position—I am inclined to believe that they have some connection with the Credit Valley and the Ontario and Quebec. At any rate, it now appears that they are to acquire these roads, or, at least, they are to lease them perpetually and pay interest on their securities; and here again we have another illustration of the mode in which burdens are being placed on the North-West by virtue of the powers given and to be given by Parliament to this Company. The Credit Valley Railway is a road about 183 miles long, and it cost somewhere about \$20,000 a mile, or \$3,700,000 in all. How was that cost provided? There was aid from the Government of Ontario, \$457,500; aid from the municipalities in Ontario, \$1,165,000; stock subscribed and paid up, \$500,000; making \$2,082,000, as

appears by the hon. gentleman's railway statistics now on the Table of the House. If we deduct that amount from \$3,700,000, we have \$1,600,000 to be provided for; and bonds were issued to the amount of \$20,000 per mile, and were pledged in London and elsewhere for the raising of this balance of \$1,600,000. Ultimately the bonds were, to a large extent, disposed of. In fact, it appears from other papers which have been laid on the Table, that Mr. Stephen got \$1,650,000, and if you run out the figures you will find that the price is about 45 cents on the dollar. Now, what is the railway worth? According to railway statistics of the hon. gentleman, it earned \$35,900, while its expenses were \$239,000, leaving a surplus of \$46,000. Well, the interest charged on the bonds of \$3,670,000 of which \$1,600,000 only had been raised would be \$183,500, leaving a deficiency in interest of \$136,700 a year. I need not say that the bonds were not worth par—that they were not worth more than 50 cts., but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has undertaken to take them up and assume the interest—and if they are to be believed, the principal too. Now, I do not say that this is to be added, for the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) explained in the Railway Committee that he did not understand that it would be added to the capital, so that 10 per cent. would have to be paid on it. But he acknowledged that by legalizing the creation of the indebtedness we authorized the Government to pay the indebtedness, and we agreed, therefore, that they might pay \$183,500 upon a road which is only paying \$46,000 a year—I hope that its profits will improve, but it is obvious there will be a deficiency which will have to be paid before getting a dividend, which dividend is to be kept at 10 per cent., and therefore so much more is thrown on the North-West in order to acquire the Credit Valley Railway in the interests of the Company whose president, as was stated by the hon. member for Argenteuil, has an interest in it very much larger than in the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is to the interests of the Company to acquire it and to agree to assume the bonds on that road at par, when they are not worth more than 40 or 50, thus throwing on the back of the Canadian Pacific Railway from \$1,600,000 to \$2,000,000 more. In this connection I might refer to the hon. gentleman's arrangement by which he substituted these \$1,650,000 bonds for the \$1,000,000 deposits. I do not understand that that was according to law. The law provided that the Company might originally either deposit cash or approved securities, but the deposit being made there was no power of substitution. It provided for substitution with regard to land grant bonds, but not with reference to the \$1,000,000 deposit. The Company deposited in cash, and I believe there was no legal authority to take that \$1,000,000 out of the treasury and accepting any securities whatever in lieu of it. The hon. Minister on the 24th November—Mr. Angus writes his proposition on the same day, whether the letter was by telegraph I know not—makes enquiries, ascertains the facts, makes a report to council and recommends the consummation of the transaction. In that report he declares that the security represents a charge on the Credit Valley of \$12,000 a mile only, and considering the section of country through which the road ran, he believes it is good. Now I cannot make out any figures to justify the hon. Minister's calculation. If he assumes that the charge of the Credit Valley is to be reduced because these bonds represent only \$1,000,000, I accept that assumption, and with that assumption and the taking over the \$2,000,000 which are outstanding, I find that the charge on the Credit Valley Railway would be \$16,400 a mile instead of \$12,000 a mile. I ask the hon. gentleman to explain by what figures he justifies his calculation that the bond charge was only \$12,000 a mile. Then we were asked to grant a charter to the Ontario and Quebec. We were told that this was a Company which asked no aid,

which asked no subsidies, that it was an independent Company giving an independent line—not asking the Government or the municipalities for anything—asking no special favours and giving us an interior line. We thought it was an important thing that such a Company should be established; but it seems that it is to be taken over at a low capital by the Canadian Pacific Railway, including the bridge across the St. Lawrence. Now, these three operations involve an addition to the capital of from ten to twelve million dollars—the Credit Valley, the Ontario and Quebec, and a portion of the Atlantic and North-Western, are to be taken over, and if these enterprises do not pay interest at the full rate at which the money is borrowed to construct them, then the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has to pay the balance, and the balance is to come out of the North-West. Well, Sir, what was the object? I suspect that the object of wanting the bridge across to Montreal is to get a Boston terminus for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I observe that prominent gentlemen in that Company are prominent in the South-Eastern Railway, and I suspect that the next movement, after these arrangements have been completed and these contracts have been let, will be to arrange an amalgamation with the South-Eastern, by which Boston will become the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Some years ago we thought it very important to help the Grand Trunk Railway into Chicago; and having trusted the Government with the determination to expend the money that they were to receive for the Rivière du Loup Branch, in accordance with the public interests of Canada, the Government exercised that determination by deciding that it was in the public interest to expend that money in bringing the Grand Trunk into Chicago. But now we are establishing, not a competitive line with the Grand Trunk for the North-West trade, which I should rejoice to see, but a line which shall diverge from the Grand Trunk the North-West trade. No, it is utterly impossible for any railway to compete for the North-West trade upon equal terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway as long as the Canadian Pacific Railway retains the roads it has acquired in that regard, and until it has all the traffic it can bear over its road. The result will be that there will be no competition. There may be competition on the Western peninsula, but, with reference to a large class of interests, you will find no competition in the North-West between the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk so long as the Canadian Pacific has the only line into the North-West and will be able to effect this diversion of traffic over the new Canadian lines; so that the probability is that this very road, the Grand Trunk, which we extended with our money into Chicago, cannot carry that western trade. You are diverting the traffic from one to the other; you are not establishing competition where competition would be most advantageous, and you are giving over to the Canadian Pacific Railway the right to do the traffic of the North-West, to the exclusion of the other great Canadian line. And thus, Sir, have the great powers with which Parliament entrusted the Canadian Pacific Railway Company been used, and we dreaded they would be used, in a waste of financial strength and energy, not devoted exclusively to their great work, the building of the contracted line, but to other and extraneous works, upon which I commented, and which have worked injuriously to the Company as well as to the country; and if there has been a cloud in this company's prospects, if they have been twitted by the hon. first Minister with having failed to get into the London money market, it was due to the hostility of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway, and that hostility I attribute to the course the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have pursued in Ontario. These shareholders, one after another, declared at meetings of the Company that they were will-

Mr. BLAKE.

ing to be on amicable terms with this Company, but that they found it proceeding to make arrangements which would be injurious to them, and instead of taking its own share of the traffic, the Canadian Pacific was determined to take hold of what the Grand Trunk regarded as its share of the profits, and under these circumstances they struck back again. I say that was an imprudent course on the part of that Company, dependent as it must be upon the money market for its capital in which the shareholders of the other Company are so powerful. I said that the power of issuing paid-up stock was resorted to on a scale of the greatest magnitude, and with the gravest consequences. I showed that the public knew that the Parliament of Canada knew of only \$5,000,000 of paid-up Canadian Pacific Railway stock, but that the rumour was current every where that that stock had been increased, and instead of standing at \$5,000,000, it has been standing at a point which has been variously stated at from \$15,000,000 to \$25,000,000, exclusive of the new issue which has been lately announced. I said that we who had agreed that the tolls should have regard to ten per cent profit on the capital, were entitled to know the state of the capital account from time to time, and whether any or what increases had taken place; and among the information for which I moved was a statement of the increases of the capital, and what had been paid on those increases prior to the emission of the \$10,000,000 lately emitted. The hon. Minister of Railways acceded to the reasonableness of that proposal; he stated that Parliament ought to have that information, invited the House to pass the motion, and added that the Company had been instructed to give full information on that point. The order was passed, the return was brought down, and what has been done with regard to that particular item? The Company take no notice of it; they do not consider it worth objecting to, but they ignore it, and leave us without a word of information as to what extent the capital has been increased, to what extent it represents cash and to what extent it represents water. I pointed out then that, the Company having adopted this mode of issuing their capital stock, that is to say, issuing a larger amount than they required, and issuing it at a discount, it was probable that the original proprietors would recoup, or a good deal more than recoup themselves by increasing their holdings without paying value therefor. I pointed out that it was not unlikely that a great portion of the increase was composed of water, and I said that we ought to know that, because we had not agreed to pay dividends at ten per cent. upon pieces of paper issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, without value, but only upon the money which had gone into the construction of the road. But, Sir, we know nothing about it, only we are entitled to believe that a very large sum has been added to that capital without any value whatever being given therefor. Now, Sir, I was prepared to ask to-night what the condition of things was to be. I was prepared to ask upon what the dividends of ten per cent. were to be collected. I had asked before and I had got no answer; but, to-night, the response is made and it realizes our worst apprehensions. We are told boldly to-night that a dividend is to be paid and the legitimate capital is to be considered as having been created by whatever extent to which the Canadian Pacific Railway choose to emit stock. I have read to you the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's President's own letter in which he declares on the 5th of April, that: "The cash cost of the 334 miles of Railway will be \$54,000,000," the stock being issued at 60. And I am told that instead of paying ten per cent. on the cash cost, as he estimates it, without giving credit for the 17,000,000 acres of land, which he sets against it, the dividend is to be paid, not on the \$54,000,000, but on the whole \$90,000,000, making \$9,000,000 a year dividend, although

\$54,000,000 only go into the road. And the hon. gentleman had so little considered this subject, that he talked of this new stock all through, as bonds, and had to be corrected time and again. He said they sell their bonds at 60, as if the sale of bonds and the sale of stock had any parallel whatever. Why, if you sell bonds at 60 in the open market, it is because you cannot raise your money cheaper, and it is necessary, therefore, to pay that much money in the end in order to raise the money for which you sell your bonds. But if you are going to emit stock, and if you want \$54,000,000 of stock, you send that amount out to the public, and you get what you want. If you send out \$90,000,000 of stock you get no more; but all the advantage the shareholders have is under this contract, according to which they say they can get a dividend at 10 per cent. on \$90,000,000, instead of 10 per cent. on \$54,000,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They cannot do it.

Mr. BLAKE. There again I am confronted with the great difficulty in the case, viz.: that I find two voices on the other side of the House on this subject. The right hon. gentleman says they cannot do it, but the hon. Minister of Railways explained the policy of the Government, and he declared emphatically that the stock was to be treated—every shilling of it—as capital.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is for dividend purposes, but not for Tariff purposes. Read the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. I have read it, and know it perfectly well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But you do not tell us all about it.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot say all I have to say in a moment. I know the hon. gentleman's views about it and my own view, but I am dealing now with the hon. Minister of Railways' view. What the hon. Minister of Railways said was that the stock was to be counted for tariff purposes. The question I put in March last was whether the Company was to be entitled to 10 per cent. on the whole stock or not, and that question the hon. Minister of Railways has answered when he said certainly. What else was the sense of his answer? What cared I whether the Company made it \$90,000,000 or \$900,000,000 if it did not affect the question of 10 per cent., but it was in that express light that I quoted my own speech as to the effect of the clause and the hon. gentleman's assurance as to the meaning of the clause, and asked whether the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be entitled to exact 10 per cent. dividend on the capital stock instead of on the nominal cash put into the road. On that question the hon. Minister of Railways said that bonds and stocks were all the same thing, and that it would be better for the country that the Company should sell at 50 instead of at 60 rather than there should be a mortgage on our Canadian Pacific Railway. It would have been better had the hon. Minister of Railways consulted the First Minister before making his statement so that there might be concert among the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know which should have been the first to approach the other, but in some way or other they should have got together and decided what they should say. I recollect a story as told of an old cabinet secret—so old I suppose that it is not contrary to the oath to reveal it—Lord Melbourne, at a Cabinet meeting concerning the corn laws, placed his back against the door and refused to allow any of the Ministers to leave until they had decided whether to say the duty would raise the price of corn or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend is verbally accurate as to what Lord Melbourne said.

Mr. BLAKE. I may have omitted the expletive, but think the House will excuse the omission. I will adjure the hon. gentlemen as solemnly as I can without the addition of the expletive, to try and agree among themselves. This is a grave question. My opinion is that there is a difference of opinion in the Cabinet on this subject, and, as I stated on the 5th of March, I believe that if you allow this stock to be emitted and to get into the hands of the people; if you allow \$90,000,000 to be floated around as representing the Canadian Pacific Railway capital, we will be told later on that the good faith of this country requires they should get a 10 per cent. dividend on that amount. We owe it to ourselves and the country, and to intending investors, that the hon. Minister of Railways, and the hon. First Minister, should settle the difference between them; decide how the calculation shall be made; announce it to the country before there has been any considerable movement of this stock on the market, so that the people may not be able to say that they were deceived or misled. The Government should warn the Canadian Pacific Railway and the public that it is only to the actual stock, entirely irrespective of the nominal amount of stock, that the 10 per cent. clause applies. I am aware of what the clause is. I read it, and also the hon. gentleman's own speech about it. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman's view was that it applied only to the amount actually paid. I hung my hopes on that statement until I heard the hon. Minister of Railways' speech, but they were then dashed to the ground, and I felt that another construction was being adopted. There is, therefore, now additional reason for a decisive and authoritative statement. I pointed out that the Consolidated Railway Act, allowed only 6 per cent. interest on the capital expended during construction, but that this mode of issuing stock, allowed the Company to obtain 8½ per cent. if necessary. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that was a small matter not worthy of notice. With the hon. gentleman's tariff, and the arrangement he has made, it is probable that the profits of the railway in the future will, as they have been in the past, be good enough to pay the interest on the legitimate capital used in the construction of the road. They tell us in the return brought down the other day, that they have not taken out of the capital one dollar for interest as yet, because the earnings of the road have been adequate to pay interest on construction;—and what I complain of is, that a provision should be inserted enlarging the charge for interest during construction beyond that which the law has applied to this sort of payments, and I pointed out that separate sections of the Eastern and Western divisions ought to be made, that these divisions were separated by hundreds of miles, that they were worked entirely separate, and that they formed as much, or more, two separate systems of railway to-day as any two railways that could be found, that their traffic accounts and all other accounts must be separately kept, and that we ought to have a separate account. I pointed out that separate accounts were necessary, because we wanted to know about the regulations of the tariff, that we could not tell what the tariff was producing in the North-West unless we had an account of the results of the working in the North-West, and that to mix up the Eastern Division, and the old lines with the North-West and give us one bulk return, was to render it impossible for us to understand what was done in the east and in the west, to judge how far the eastern lines were paying their way and what the western lines were doing. Well, Sir, the House agreed in that, the hon. Minister agreed to it, the order was made, and we are told in answer that the works of the Company are so extensive, and are carried on at so many different points, that it is impossible to make these returns at more than one period of the year. I asked for a return for that period of the year up to the 30th June last, also for a later return, but they did not give us even a

separate return up to the 30th June last, although they kept their accounts separately, although in December they are able to point out what they had done for each end, what the running expenses were, what the earnings were, etc. They did not give to Parliament that information. Well, now, we ought to have that. The hon. gentleman has given them a new tariff, a highly increased tariff, but he has not been furnished with information which shows him how the old tariff worked, the House has not been furnished with it, we have got nothing which enables us to judge for ourselves how things have gone. Now, then, there are some points upon which I did not then touch. We contended when this contract was made that the power of regulating tolls would not be a satisfactory protection. Now, the law requires that the company shall frame a tariff and pass a by-law, that the by-law shall be submitted to the Governor in Council, and that the Governor in Council shall determine whether it will approve of it or how it will deal with it, so that you got in the first instance the Company's motion as to what their tariff should be, and then the decision of the Governor in Council upon it. Such was the course adopted last year and the year before. The company framed a tariff for local freight, they framed a tariff for through freight, they passed a by-law, they sent the by-law to the Government, the Governor in Council considered the by-law, they approved the by-law, they approved the tariff and they fixed the period of time. Later on that period expired, and in the meantime the mileage had been much increased. The company applied for an extension of the tariff to the new region, and also as to time, saying they were about to submit a reduced tariff later on. The Minister agreed with that view, and the tariff was extended in its operation for another period. The next year we find that the company, having stated they would submit a tariff, a new tariff, we are told, is submitted. The Minister has not brought it down; I have asked for it several times; I called attention to the defect in the return to the Minister of Public Works—in the absence of the hon. gentleman—and he said he would look into it. But I could get no satisfaction; I may assume, therefore, that this company has never submitted any further tariff than the first one. If they have, we ought to have had it, it was our right to have it, it was the duty of the hon. Minister to send it down to us. Now what has the hon. gentleman done? He ventures to frame a tariff, and he orders his chief engineer to frame a tariff, and his chief engineer submits one to him which, he says, he does not believe will please either party, he knows it is not considered liberal enough by the Company, and he thinks the hon. Minister will consider it too high, but he thinks it is a fair and a just tariff. He has given us something about the cost of labor, something about the cost of fuel, and the cost of working and his comparison. But we have not got the data that we would like to have had, namely, how had the old tariff worked? what had been done under it? What were the operating expenses? What were the earnings, what different conditions were to be accepted in the new? Now, we have the general results. We know by the returns to the 30th June, that in the year ending then the Company's operating earnings over their lines were \$1,548,000, and their operating receipts \$1,148,000, giving a surplus of earnings over operating expenses of \$400,000. We know not what was the result in the east, what the result was in the west, or how the old tariff had worked. We do not know, but I suppose if the hon. Minister had had that information he would have brought it down. Without it, then, he has acted and framed a tariff, without knowing, without getting from them those details which were essential elements in forming a judgment, he has caused to be approved a new tariff. Now, Sir, that tariff is extremely defective. The old tariff provided through

Mr. BLAKE,

rates and local rates on different scales, as was proper. The new tariff that the hon. Minister has given to this Company provides only local rates—no through rates—and, therefore of course, gives the Company right to charge mileage rates up to the mileage rates on through freight as well as on local freight. What they do in that regard in the way of diminution is done of free grace; it is not done under the hon. gentleman's tariff. That is an important difference between the old tariff and the new one. In the old tariff it was held important to indicate what they should be allowed to charge for through freight, or for freight interchanged with connecting lines. Now, this new tariff gives only one maximum. Now, Sir, the old rates and the new rates compare thus—taking the statistics which the hon. gentleman himself gave in his table of rates, given about this time last year: For distances of twenty to twenty-five miles, the old rates were, for first class freight, 17 cts.; second, 14 cts.; third, 11 cts.; fourth, 8 cts. New rates, 24, 20, 16, 12, or an increase of about 50 per cent. in the new over the old. For forty-five to fifty, the next stage the hon. gentleman gave us last year as furnishing a fair test, the rates were 34, 18, 15 and 12; the new rates are 35, 29, 24 and 18, or once again an increase of somewhere about 50 per cent. For the next grade the hon. gentleman took last year seventy to seventy-five miles, and the old rates were 29, 22, 19 and 15 cts.; the new rates are 45, 38, 30 and 23. For 95 to 100 miles the old rates were 40, 32, 22 and 17; the new rates are 54, 45, 36 and 27. The last which the hon. gentleman gave us last year was from 145 to 150 miles; for this the old rates were 45, 36, 29 and 23, while the new rates are 69, 58, 46 and 34, or, speaking roughly, on every grade of rates which the hon. gentleman gave us of merchandise last year for the purpose of comparison, the new tariff is an increase of about 50 per cent. on the old—in some a little less, in some a little more—but on the average an increase of 50 per cent. Well, I will take some of the results in freighting from known points. The old local rate from Emerson to St. Boniface, sixty-five miles, on first-class merchandise, was 27 cts., now it is 41; on fourth-class, old rate 14 cts., new rate 21; special, sixth-class, old rate \$24, new rate \$35, being an increase of 50 per cent. Take the new rates and you will see that this is a consequence of having omitted to give a through rate tariff and allow discretion to the Company with respect to through rates, equal to that for local rates. The old through rate for first-class merchandise from St. Vincent to St. Boniface was 18 cts.; now the through rate from St. Vincent to St. Boniface is 41 cts. The old rate for fourth class merchandise from Emerson to St. Boniface, was 10 cts., now it is 21; the old rate for merchandise, special sixth-class, from Emerson to St. Boniface was \$17 for half a car, now it is \$35. So the through rates have been increased on the short hauls by 100 per cent, while the local rates have been increased 50 per cent. Now, why was this? It was because the Minister did not prepare a tariff of through rates, but gave the Company the power to charge up to the maximum through rate, as well as the local rate, and they have charged up to the maximum on the hauls I have mentioned for both, and they have been able to double the charge for through rates on short hauls. I say, therefore, the increase is enormous, and that the increase is due to the circumstance that in framing a tariff for the Company the Minister chose to depart from the principle that there should be a defined distinction made by a tariff framed by the Government and approved by the Governor in Council, between through and local rates. But the Minister allowed the Company to exercise a discretion in these hauls, and they have availed themselves of it to the full extent. So it is of very little importance what the local rate is as compared with the through rate. The question is,

what is charged upon the great amount of freight? The old local rate from Winnipeg to Rat Portage, 135 miles, was: first-class merchandize, 41 cts.; now, 65 cts. Fourth-class, 21 cts.; now, 33 cts. Special, sixth, \$12; now, \$47. To points beyond Winnipeg, such as Brandon, Rat Portage and Portage la Prairie, the through rate into Winnipeg, and the local rate out, is very far in excess of the through rate direct to that point. I do not object to a difference. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the long haul has to be considered, and that the circumstances of the country have to be considered, and that they have to be considered with regard to opening up for settlement the further part; but the discrepancies are so great here, as undoubtedly to affect the interests of different parts of the country. I believe the extent of the discrimination is beyond what the hon. Minister should have considered. I had prepared some memoranda on this subject, but I will omit the figures and hand them to the reporters. They are such as to show enormous increases, and practically, not merely to prevent Winnipeg from being a distributing centre, but almost to force it in a very short time, and so soon as there are centres anywhere else, out of the fair rates for being the distributing centre for points at any considerable distance. I could show, as I have said, that the local rates have increased over 50 per cent. on short hauls, and on that part of the railway which covers the bulk of the trade, they have been doubled. The hon. Minister, however, says that this is all right; that the tariff is constructed on a parabolic curve—the rates for short distances being very high as compared with long distances; and he says it is a good tariff. The hon. gentleman further declares that the the tariff will not pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for some years. The old one did. It has enabled them to pay running expenses and interest on capital during construction. The hon. gentleman does not give details, but simply tells us that the rates will not pay. The hon. gentleman points to problematical difficulties, and declares that it costs four or five times as much to move freight as it does on the Grand Trunk. He makes comparisons with the Intercolonial, the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific, the St. Paul and Manitoba, and other roads. The hon. gentleman does not, however, assume on this occasion the attitude he assumed a year ago. He made comparisons then too. He made a tariff which suited him to make more extensive comparisons. On page 966 of the *Hansard* the hon. gentleman made comparisons of the rates of that day; and I will ask permission of the House to hand the figures to the reporters. The hon. gentleman did not confine himself to monopoly rates and to high-priced roads, to the roads which have created, to a large extent, the railway question in the United States with respect to tariffs, or to roads about which great grievances have arisen. He took the Intercolonial, the Prince Edward Island, the Central Vermont, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, the Canada Central, the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, the Northern and North-Western, the Grand Trunk, the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul, the Atcheson, Topeka and Santa Fé, the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, the Chicago and North-Western; and he gave us a table of rates for first and fourth-class freights, ranging from 20 cts. to 50 cts., 75 cts., 90 cts. \$1.00 and \$150. What did the hon. gentleman say? He said:

“As this is a matter to which the hon. leader of the Opposition devoted a great deal of attention, and which I understand he deplored more deeply than any thing else in connection with this contract, I am quite sure the House will bear with me if I take the opportunity, at some length, to show the hon. gentleman that his sympathy was thrown away; that it was not required, and there is no room for him to bestow any more of it in that connection. Of course, the charges upon railways are in proportion to the distance that freight is carried. This is the mode in which all railway Tariffs are constructed.

“The following is the comparative statement.”

This comparative statement, I put it in:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

Railway	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.									
	1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.					
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.		cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.		cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.		cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.		cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.					
Intercolonial Railway	14	12	9	7	20 to 25	14	12	9	7	do	20	16	14	10	70 to 75	24	20	15	11	95 to 100	30	24	17	12	145 to 150	45	36	29	23
Prince Edward Island Railway	14	12	9	7	do	17	14	11	8	do	20	16	14	10	do	24	20	15	11	do	30	24	17	12	do	45	36	29	23
Canadian Pacific Railway Co	17	14	11	8	do	18	15	12	9	do	25	19	15	12	do	30	23	19	15	do	35	27	22	18	do	45	36	29	23
Canadian Pacific Railway (under Government)	17	14	11	8	do	17	14	10	8	do	25	19	14	11	do	33	26	19	15	do	42	33	25	19	do	50	42	33	25
Central Vermont Railway	18	15	12	9	do	18	15	12	9	do	26	20	17	13	do	31	26	21	15	do	36	30	24	18	do	48	38	29	23
Toronto, Grey & Bruce Railway	18	15	12	9	do	18	15	12	9	do	28	20	17	13	do	38	30	24	19	do	48	38	29	23	do	58	48	38	30
Canada Central Railway	18	15	12	9	do	14	12	10	8	do	27	21	20	17	do	50	40	30	25	do	58	48	38	30	do	69	59	49	39
St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway	14	12	10	8	do	16	13	11	9	do	24	18	17	13	do	28	23	19	14	do	35	30	25	19	do	50	42	33	25
Northern & North-Western Railway	16	13	11	9	do	20	17	13	10	do	28	23	19	14	do	38	32	25	19	do	38	32	25	19	do	50	42	33	25
Grand Trunk Railway	20	17	13	10	do	22	19	17	14	do	35	30	25	22	do	45	45	37	32	do	55	45	37	32	do	69	59	49	39
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway	22	19	17	14	do	25	20	15	13	do	30	25	21	16	do	45	45	35	32	do	55	45	35	32	do	75	65	55	45
Atcheson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway	25	23	19	15	do	25	23	19	15	do	38	33	30	23	do	45	45	35	32	do	52	45	35	32	do	75	65	55	45
Northern Pacific Railway	25	23	19	15	do	19	18	17	17	do	33	28	23	21	do	45	45	35	32	do	61	50	45	35	do	80	66	59	48
Union Pacific Railway	19	18	17	17	do	18	16	13	12	do	33	28	23	21	do	45	45	35	32	do	45	42	37	35	do	66	57	48	39
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway	18	16	13	12	do	20	17	14	11	do	30	27	23	19	do	36	29	23	17	do	46	40	33	24	do	59	49	39	29
Chicago & North-Western Railway	20	17	14	11	do	27	21	17	14	do	27	21	17	14	do	36	29	23	17	do	41	34	26	19	do	59	49	39	29

He then alludes to the Atcheson and Topeka, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, and proceeds:—

"I am asked by my hon. friend behind me if there is any one of these sixteen railways which charges less than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the best of my knowledge, holding the paper in my hand, I do not see a single case in which the charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not as low as any one I have stated."

He then alludes to Government railways, and says:

"The Central Vermont I see is a cent lower, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, which has been complained of so much, is also 3 cents lower—that is in the short distance and for the first-class freight; but, as I said, I will ask permission of the House to publish this table exactly as it stands in the *Hazard*, as a matter of record, and a very useful one it will be in dealing with the very important question of freights."

So I find it, even earlier than I had expected. I find it extremely useful this evening in dealing with this important matter, for, as the hon. gentleman observed on that day, it would stand as a record and a guide for the future. Let it be a guide, and let us see how far the hon. gentleman has followed it:

"The Northern and the North-Western is 16 cents to 17 cents for the first-class, which is a cent over, but on the longer distance I do not see any of these in which I have the amounts given which is lower than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as I have shown in the distances of 145 miles to 150 miles it is very greatly lower. I think the same will be found which, referred to the charges for 70 to 75 miles and from 95 to 100 miles. I think it will be found that there are no charges lower than those of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the 95 to 100 miles. From 70 to 75 miles, the charges are 29, 22, 19 and 50 cents, but I see no instance in this table, which is compiled so far as the figures could be obtained for the various distances, in which the Canadian Pacific Railway is not the lowest. From 45 to 50 miles the charges are 24, 18, 15 and 12 cents according to the class of freight. I think for the distance from forty-five to fifty miles there is not a single instance, so far as I am able to see at this moment, among all these railways, that the charges are not higher than the Canadian Pacific Railway, etc."

That was the general statement then, and he called upon me to find some other subject upon which to waste or expend my sympathy, because, he said, it was entirely displaced as to this tariff. Well, time works wonders, and in this particular it seems to have arranged matters perhaps a little earlier than the hon. gentleman himself may have expected. The tariffs which are in existence show that there is nothing to which the hon. gentleman can refer in this connection. They show this: the rates which he gave us last year as the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in each of these cases, were the rates which have now been enormously increased. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company no longer bears a comparison with any of these roads whatever, except the four monopoly routes, to which he has now referred. It no longer occupies the position in which he placed it last year, and even with them, taking the long hauls, the comparatively long hauls, the comparisons may be made in taking first-class merchandize. For two hundred miles on the Canadian Pacific, the rate is 80 cents; on the Union Pacific, 67 cents, and on the St. Paul & Manitoba, 73 cents; so that even of the monopoly rates, two are considerably under the Canadian Pacific, according to the hon. gentleman's new table. For second-class traffic on a two hundred miles haul, the Canadian Pacific charge 67 cents, the Union Pacific 60 cents, and the St. Paul & Manitoba 54 cents. For lumber, shingles and special fourths, the Canadian Pacific, on a two hundred miles haul, charge 37 cents, the Union Pacific 36 cents, and the St. Paul & Manitoba 33 cents. For live stock, the Canadian Pacific charges 60 cents, the Union Pacific 55 cents, and the St. Paul & Manitoba 53 cents. For household goods and implements, &c., sixth-class goods, the Canadian Pacific charge 60 cents, and the St. Paul & Manitoba 56 cents. Now, Sir, when we complained of high freights from the North-West to Old Canada last year, they said, "Oh! it is all on account of this infamous St. Paul & Manitoba road." They have the right to charge

Mr. BLAKE.

what they like on their own railway. What have we to do with that? But as to the Canadian Pacific itself, the minute it gets inside the North-West its freights are low; but I have shown numerous instances in which the Canadian Pacific, under their new tariff, actually charge higher than the rates which were acknowledged grievances, of the St. Paul & Manitoba last year; and it has been taken entirely out of that proud category in which the hon. gentleman placed it by the useful record which he made in his speech last year, of the ordinary rates; and it is put among the high monopoly roads, and up beyond a good many high monopoly roads at that; so that, Sir, it is clear that my observation was correct—that the principle of regulating tolls by the Government would prove but a very unsatisfactory and imperfect method of obviating the evils of monopoly. This is the first instance we have of it. They commenced on a tariff which they say they believe is reasonable. Everybody is pleased. The hon. gentleman congratulates himself. We are branded through the country as having been raising a bogey. We find that the Canadian Pacific is going to carry freights as low as the Grand Trunk, the Northern & North-Western, the Toronto, Grey & Bruce—all these roads; but one short year elapses the prospects of the road are brighter than ever; and the hon. gentleman shows a double tariff—a tariff which goes far in excess of all these, and thus we see, so early, how little protective the power of the Governor in Council in regulating tolls is. We contended that the Company would be likely to sell the lands at high prices for speculative purposes to speculators; and that the restrictions should be placed so as to secure the settlement, but there again we were laughed at by the hon. gentleman. We were told that it was ridiculous; that the Company would never do anything of the kind; and last year, the hon. gentleman, in reading over our resolutions to prove their futility, turned to that subject, and said: Here is another resolution, we were told that restrictions ought to be cast around the Canadian Pacific; that they ought not to be allowed to sell their lands free of conditions of settlement, and now I prove to you by the logic of events, that this is all nonsense. I prove to you, that these alarms were uncalled-for. What does he say:

"Now, Sir, I ask that hon. gentleman in all candor to say whether, what has taken place between the time that he moved that resolution and to-day, it has not given him the most perfect and complete answer which it is possible for any person to give, to the resolution he moved. Why, Sir, what is the fact? The fact is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are placing the whole of their 25,000,000 acres of land in the market at \$1.25. Instead of adopting the policy of holding them which it was alleged they would adopt; instead of doing what the hon. gentleman feared that the Company would induce to do, namely, hold their lands until they would acquire a value by the cultivation of the adjoining sections, which would be taken for free homesteads, — what have they done? Why, Sir, they have said to the world: "We have determined not to sell our lands to speculators at any price." Offer them \$5 or \$10 an acre, or what you like for their lands, and the answer will be: "We do not want your money, but if you are ready to cultivate the land, you can have it for \$1.25." They have put up their lands at the maximum price of \$2.50 per acre, for the whole 25,000,000 acres, and for every acre cultivated within four years they return to the purchaser one-half of his purchase money, thus reducing the cost of every acre of land to \$1.25. They do more."

And then he states the regulation and continues:

"And in all their regulations from the very first, they have aimed at placing their lands in the hands of persons who would cultivate and settle them at the lowest possible rate—at a rate that cannot yield them more than \$1 an acre, because no person can say that they can administer their lands at less than 25 cents an acre; so that practically their 25,000,000 acres of land are open to all persons who will choose to settle on them at \$1.25."

Once again he says:

"These gentlemen show that they understand their business too well, to hold their lands at too high a price. That every acre of land put under cultivation is worth twice as much to them as it would be if they got \$10 an acre for it at the end of ten years. So that that difficulty is swept away, I do not wish to detain the House, &c."

And he proceeds to say :

" And they have been rendered so liberal that every difficulty in that respect has been removed, and the best evidence has been given that these gentlemen are willing to part with the whole of their lands for agricultural purposes at a price that will not return to them more than \$1 an acre."

Once again, Sir, one short year has vindicated our opinions. We find that the returns of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shew that they have sold 6,250,000 acres in round figures for \$17,300,000. We know that the great bulk of it has been sold not to settlers, not on condition of settlement, but to a speculative land company, the North-West Land Company. We know that that land has been sold not at \$1 an acre but at something which is equivalent to \$3 nominally—equivalent to \$3.70 per acre, allowing for the discount of the bonds and the prices at which they were taken. We know that the Company has not acted on the prices which were stated to us last year. We know that they have refused those who wanted to buy lands, and that they have promoted and assisted as far as they could the formation of the companies which have taken 5,000,000 acres of the choicest land at the net price of \$2.73 per acre. We know that our fears have been realized and that the settler has to pay a profit on to \$2.75 per acre to the speculator instead of getting the land at \$1 or \$1.25 from the Company. It has been proved to be clear and plain that our fears were justified, and that it would have been prudent and statesmanlike to put in a clause which would have prevented the Company doing what the hon. gentleman said they would not do, and by which the great bulk of the best lands of the North-West have been disposed of otherwise than the hon. gentleman contended they would be disposed of. Now, the cost of administration he said would be 25 cents per acre. I find that the cost of administration for the year was \$35,000. They sold several millions of acres, but they did not put in the big sale of 5,000,000 of acres, so that the cost of administering the lands was a mere fraction of what the hon. gentleman said it would be, and the net return to the Company will be \$2.60 per acre if you make a liberal allowance for administration. Now, the hon. gentleman stated with reference to the selection of the lands that the lands which they now get, and the lands which were sold, were the cream. Not so. 5,000,000 of acres are now estimated to be obtainable along the line of the railway out of the nine or ten millions which would have existed if every alternate section had been available. Two and a half millions of acres are supposed to be available under the first grant made to the south of the line, but that amount has been enormously extended since without any statement of what the acreage of that extent will be but we know that far more than the Company has disposed of is available along the line. The sale to the North-West Company, is only a part of these lands. It is only certain sections, and certain sections in the south-western part of Manitoba. That sale is distributed amongst the whole, presumably of some 10,000,000 acres of country which along the line, and in the southern part of the country, they may have. The hon. gentleman says that he rest is far superior; but did we not hear the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) say, when the subject of the Prince Albert settlement was discussed, that it was the choicest part of the whole North-West. Wherever the Company told the Government that they would build, wherever they wanted land, they projected a line, and they asked the Government to reserve sections, because they were going to build. Later, they have asked the Government to reserve them without their building through it, and the Government have reserved a large block of what is reported to be the choicest lands in the North-West—a block comprising, exclusive of Hudson's Bay and school lands, some 38,000,000 of acres, or of odd-numbered sections comprising 19,000,000 of acres; and the Minister of the Interior reports

that he thinks that out of that 19,000,000 of acres, after making allowances for water-stretches, lakes, &c., 12,500,000 acres would inure to the grant—that is, about two-thirds of the 19,000,000 would be available, and the lands are in the choicest parts of the North-West. So futile are the stories which would treat the whole area of the North-West, as if whatever you found within those distances, from north to south, and from east to west, was available land—so futile are those stories, that the Minister of the Interior, in proposing a reservation of 19,000,000 of acres for the Canadian Pacific Railway within limits of their own selection, says, that these 19,000,000 shall be reserved in order to secure them 12,500,000 proper, to be taken under the terms of the contract. If it requires 19,000,000 of acres to make up 12,500,000 fairly fit for settlement, in the blocks of the choicest lands in the North-West, what proportion will be required in the ordinary portions of the country? Certainly a larger proportion, and this statement indicates that a much larger proportion than the hon. gentleman stated, and asked the House and the country to assume, of the North-West is not fit for settlement. The hon. gentleman says that the arrangements which have been made, have been entirely in favor of the public. The arrangements with reference to the homesteaders seem to me to be very unfavorable to the public. The Government was asked late in the year to negotiate with the homesteaders, whose homesteads might be wanted for town sites, with a view of having them abandon their homesteads, so that the Company might build their stations upon them. Everybody heard that the Company were sending out speculative homesteaders—persons to squat as homesteaders along the line. Everybody heard that others were speculating in homesteads along the line; and hon. gentlemen agree that whoever might happen to be on a homestead, might agree with the Company to give up his land to them, and all the Company had to do was to send out men to squat, and then if they abandoned their land the Company were authorized to take them. That is an arrangement which does not seem to me to be in the interest of the homesteader, or in the interest of the public, but is entirely in the interest of the Railway Company as it enables them to acquire land which should either be the property of the homesteader or should have been reserved for town sites, so that the public would have got the benefit. The hon. gentleman has said a great deal about the branches of the road. He says they are going to do a great deal in branches, but they certainly have changed their tune very much about the branches. Last year the hon. Minister brought down a letter from the Company, in which they said that they had decided to build several branches in the North-West. There was the Assiniboine Branch, 300 miles; the Saskatchewan Branch, 435 miles; the Souris Branch, 200 miles; and the Pembina Mountain Branch, 100 miles, or a total of 1,035 miles of branches. They said they had not had time actually to locate the branches, but they sent in a plan giving an approximate statement of the lines so that the Government might reserve the land. These almost all seem to have been abandoned. The Saskatchewan has not been touched; the Assiniboine has not been touched, and instead of 1,035 miles of projected lines, the hon. gentleman talks about 280 miles in other parts of the country. In fact the energy which should have been expended in making the branches, has been expended in these eastern portions which I have already criticised. It will be remembered that we contended that the provisions with regard to the selections of the route were not sufficiently guarded. Now, there are several questions which arise with regard to this portion of the subject. For example, Callander Station apparently is a movable point, for now it has been fixed at a point ten miles eastward of the point at which it was originally located. The reason is obvious. If you could shove Callander to the east the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company which amalgamated with the Canada Central, and which was completing its line, would be able to draw land and money subsidy for every mile you shove Callander to the east. I do not mean that the whole contract price would be increased, because it is a bulk sum; but they would be able to take the money which should be otherwise reserved for the construction of the other part, the real 650 miles to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from Callander to Thunder Bay, and apply it to a road which should be built from their own resources. The hon. gentleman did not see any objection to that. He shoved Callander Station ten miles farther back to the east, and ten miles of road which was not part of the contracted line became part of it, and the Company claimed a subsidy for it and got it. That would be about \$400,000 in land and money, estimating the land at \$2.68 an acre, which they have realized on what they have already sold; and what is the consequence? There is a certain sum with which to build the line; but we have already handed over to them for the building of that which was not part of the line contracted to be built, \$400,000 in land and money, and consequently there is \$400,000 less available to build the contracted line, just as on the prairie section we have handed over many millions of land and money which were wanted for other parts of the line. With reference also to the route from Callander to Thunder Bay, there is a good deal to be said. Last year there was a great flourish. The hon. First Minister, in the fall of the year before, had stated that he had a letter from Mr. Stephen, which has not been brought down—but which he communicated to the faithful then attending upon him—in which Mr. Stephen had stated that the Company, although they had at first objected to building that line, would not now part with it; that they were going to build close to Lake Superior; that about thirty-five miles was then built, and that this would be a great advantage to the Province of Ontario; and the hon. gentleman congratulated Toronto, where he was speaking at the time, on the subject. The Company had said so. On the 30th of March, 1882, they applied to the Minister to approve of the line to Algoma Mills as part of the main line. The Minister said: "No; I cannot approve of it further than what would be a common point until you can prove to me that the line is practicable all through," and he was quite right. "But," he said, "I will approve it on condition that you prove it to be practicable afterwards." Well, that was the last we heard of it. The hon. gentleman, in his speech last year, made another great flourish of trumpets about this line. He said: "They are going near the shore, they will be able to build farther, the snowfall will be less, and the change of location will be a great benefit to the country." That has all been changed. There is no statement, and the Minister has withdrawn the application. All we hear about this grand affair, which was heralded the fall before last so loudly, is that the Company call the Algoma Mills line once more a branch, and it turns out that their plan is changed, but the Minister has not obtained from them any statement of the reasons why there was a change in the policy announced on the 30th of March, 1882, by the Company, and also by the First Minister, as tending to the great advantage of the whole community. It was proposed at that time to locate the whole line from Thunder Bay eastward to the head of Lake Superior during 1882. At any rate, this has not been done; there has been an approval of only a small fraction of that line. It was also stated by the hon. Minister that the road would be opened for immigrants in July, 1882. I would ask the hon. gentleman how many, if any, immigrants went in during 1882; whether that anticipation of the hon. gentleman, so confidently expressed a few months ago, was realized; and, if not, why we have not some explanation on this occasion? We are called upon to review the operations of the Govern-

Mr. BLAKE.

ment and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the year. We contrast the hon. gentleman's statements with his performances, and we find that, whenever anything occurs which was not calculated upon, he is dumb. Now, we know that some mysterious arrangement has been made by which the contractors on Section "B" are satisfied, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are satisfied, but the contractors have given up their contract, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company choose to construct, as well as to run the line. Then there is the location of the road west of Moose Jaw Creek. This was the most westerly point approved up to last Session, 454 miles west of Winnipeg. The hon. Minister distinctly pledged himself that no further appropriation should be given to any portion of the road west of that point until Government had decided as to the route through the Kicking Horse Pass. He said of that line:

"It then follows the general course of the Qu'Appelle River to Moose Jaw Creek, a distance of 404 miles from Winnipeg, which is the most westerly point up to the present approved of by the Governor in Council, and I may say here that it is not the intention of the Governor in Council to approve any further portion of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, or make any payments in regard to any construction west of that point until it is ascertained that there is a better line in the interest of this country, so far as we are able to judge, through Kicking Horse Pass, than we had previously obtained through Yellow Head Pass \* \* \* The Company expect to be able to lay some 500 miles of track in a direct westerly line during the coming season, but, as I have already stated, the Government does not intend to make any payment on any portion of the line beyond Moose Jaw Creek until they are satisfied that a better line can be obtained for the Canadian Pacific Railway by going south to Kicking Horse Pass than had already been obtained in the direction of Yellow Head Pass."

That was the pledge; what has taken place? On the 27th of September, 1882, approval was reported of 113½ miles west of Moose Jaw, from Moose Jaw to Swift Current Creek, on the recommendation of Acting Chief Engineer Lynch, in the absence of the Chief Engineer, through the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways. That report was approved by the hon. Minister, submitted to the Council, and adopted on the 30th September. I know the hon. Minister of Agriculture to be, by name as well as by nature, infallible, and I cannot think he made a mistake; and here was a positive pledge to Parliament that there would not be any payment upon or any approval of any portion of the line east of Moose Jaw until the Government had ascertained that there was a better route through Kicking Horse Pass than through Yellow Head Pass. Yet without having ascertained that, without having the information upon which it could be ascertained—for some of the information only came in the return the other day and some of it came since, which the hon. Minister communicated to the House for the first time to-night—without having the information upon which a decision could be reached, a decision was reached, or rather there was no decision, for there is no Order in Council approving it; but the hon. Minister caused approval to be given involving the payment of \$1,135,000 in cash and a grant of 1,418,750 acres of land which at the estimated value of \$2.68 an acre is \$3,802,000 or a total of \$4,937,000, without any reference to the question of the Kicking Horse Pass at all.

Mr. POPE. Referring to both passes.

Mr. BLAKE. No; because the hon. Minister of Railways had declared that Moose Jaw was as far west as you could go on the route to Calgary, except with reference to the Yellow Head Pass, because the hon. Minister of Railways had declared that he did not intend to allow a single mile to be approved in location or paid for on the route to Calgary unless it was decided the railway should go by Kicking Horse Pass; because the road does diverge there; because the engineer so reported; because the Minister so stated; because it would be quite out of the question to carry that road to Swift Current Creek and then go to Yellow Head Pass with



any degree of propriety unless the views formerly entertained by the engineer and the hon. Minister of Railways are entirely erroneous and uncertain. A little later, the 6th November, the hon. Minister of Railways himself received an application with reference to the location of the line from Swift Current Creek to the crossing of the South Saskatchewan, a distance of 148 miles. On that, the Chief Engineer, Mr. Schreiber, reported as follows:—

“That as far as the section referred to from Swift Current Creek to the South Saskatchewan River, a distance of about 148 miles, is concerned, and its suitability for a line of railway, the country is favorable both as regards gradients and curvature, being in this respect well within the conditions imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Act; and that if a line within the terms of this Act can be located through the Kicking Horse Pass the line laid down on the plan now submitted, though not so direct from that point as might have been desired, may be considered sufficient so as to warrant its approval.”

So that there was only a conditional approval given by the officer. But the hon. Minister, upon that, reported absolutely in favor of approval, and the Government absolutely approved. So, upon the 6th November there was an absolute approval of the continued line for another 148 beyond miles Moose Jaw Creek, making an aggregate, adding the 148 and 113½ miles together, of 261½ miles approved of, beyond the point in respect to which a pledge had been given to Parliament that there would be no such approval until the ascertainment that there was a better line in of the country through Kicking Horse Pass than had been the interests previously obtained through Yellow Head Pass. This action of the Government involved a further payment of \$1,480,000 cash, and 1,850,000 acres of land, worth \$2.68 an acre, \$4,910,000, or a total of \$6,390,000 in land and money. Now, Kicking Horse Pass had not then been approved. When last Session we were asked to give the Government authority to approve of a change, the hon. gentleman, in his speech last Session, quoted a telegram of the 17th April as his latest information, and the memorandum of Mr. Smellie, of the 15th April, as the next latest information. His understanding then was that seventy-nine miles would be saved if a straight line across the Selkirk was taken, and not if the big bend of the Columbia River should be followed. The subsequent information which has been brought down indicates that to go by the big bend of the Columbia, instead of by the straight cut, would involve a loss of 77 miles, so that according to all the information received, if you go round by the big bend of the Columbia, you get practically the same distance through the Kicking Horse Pass as through the Yellow Head Pass. The hon. gentleman stated that a further saving has been found of 79 miles since this report was made, but this report is very late.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That report does not refer to the Yellow Head at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not; but we had before that all the information concerning it, and according to that, seventy-nine miles would be saved by going through the Kicking Horse Pass straight across the Selkirk Mountains, as compared with the route through the Yellow Head Pass. There is no indication of any other change. Then they give the mileage from a certain point by the Kicking Horse Pass at 148 miles, or about that; then they show that seventy-seven miles, or thereabouts, of those 148 miles, would be taken by going by the Big Bend, so that practically the distance is the same. The hon. gentleman says that in some way or other, either by lengthening Yellow Head Pass or by shortening the Kicking Horse Pass, they have found a further saving of seventy-nine miles. On that I am not competent to treat, nor is Parliament competent to deal with it; for the information, though it arrived just in time to enable the hon. gentleman to make his statement, did not arrive in sufficient time to be laid on the Table of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have simply used the figures furnished by the Chief Engineer. I asked Mr. Schrieber what the saving would be by the line now ascertained, and he gave me the distance saved as compared with the Yellow Head Pass line, to be 119 miles. I have used Mr. Van Horn's statement as to the saving between the line by Kicking Horse Pass and the Selkirk Range, and that around the great bend of the Columbia River.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Whose figures did you use last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Last year we had not the accurate information that we have now.

Mr. BLAKE. We have got a report on this subject so late as the 18th April, 1883, which does not give the information the Chief Engineer gave the hon. gentleman. It does not inform us of this further saving. When or how, in which of the valleys or mountains this saving has been found, we have no information of, and it only shows how inaccurate must have been the previous explorations, if that is the result arrived at between the 18th of April and the present time. The question, as it presented itself to me, is a very serious one, for this reason. I quite agree that if the Company and the Government were committed one way or the other, we might look with very considerable confidence, though we would not give up our right of judgment, to a decision taken after full information on the part of the Company as to which road was best for themselves; but it is clear now that before Company had obtained information, and at a time the when it was quite uncertain whether proper means of crossing at the Kicking Horse Pass and going into Kamloops across the Selkirks could be found, they had determined, in their minds, they would go that way and they determined to build their railway in that direction. They determined to go on and spend their money—or rather our money—in that way, and the Government has acceded to that, and these many millions have been expended along the line leading to the Kicking Horse Pass, and of course the Government has got to make the best of it. Of course, having allowed them not merely to go on and build the railway as a branch, but having allowed them to build it as part of the main line, they approved the location, granted the subsidies, and having issued a large quantity of money on land, they have now to say to-night—what else is left for them to say? “The Kicking Horse Pass is the best.” If the Minister was right last year he ought to have reached his conclusion on proper evidence that the Kicking Horse Pass was best before he approved the location of a mile of railway beyond Moose Jaw Creek, or paid a dollar on that line. He tells us he would do it. I have read his language twice repeated; I have proved to him that his pledge was not kept; I have proved to him that twice the location was approved, and that all the information had been received rendering it possible to form a judgment which of those two was the best, rendering it possible to form a judgment in favor of Kicking Horse Pass over the Yellow Head Pass, and that having been done the Company come down to him and say: “Sir, upon receiving the fullest information we are obliged to conclude that the Yellow Head Pass is the best.” He, knowing that he would have stood self-condemned, because he had broken his pledge, and seeing that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had got him as tight in the vice as they have in some other matters, he was obliged to adopt their views. Now, Sir, I must confess that I am not at all satisfied with the remarks made on this subject in these various reports. In the first place if you take the road round by the Big Bend these reports show that that road is at one end so much longer than the road across the Selkirks, than even according to the hon. gentleman's latest information. The distance in mileage is a mere

trifle, but even round by the Big Bend you will have grades off from seventy to ninety feet—the report says that—so that you will have at this rate, in order to go by Kicking Horse Pass in the first place ascending west, five miles of seventy-five feet over the Rockies, and a grade on the western descent of twenty miles of 116 feet to the mile; then you will have a long route by the Big Bend, which contains several grades of from seventy to ninety feet per mile, besides much very difficult work. Now, compare that with a railroad where the maximum grade is only fifty-two, and very little of that. But I say that those grades I have just mentioned render it utterly impossible to compare a railway passing by the Big Bend and Kicking Horse Pass with the railway that the survey proposed, without coming to a conclusion in favor of the Yellow Head; but if you take the Kicking Horse Pass straight across the Selkirk's, then you find a great advantage if the report is true. Major Rogers reports that the whole difficulty of work at the Selkirks could be concentrated in ten or twelve months; but now we find it takes forty months, twenty on the east and twenty on the west. He reported 105 feet grades, but now it seems they will be too expensive, and that it will take 116 feet grades. But we are told that the Central Pacific has as high grades. In one of the letters I have read it is stated that the Union Pacific has such grades. I do not see in the papers I have been able to look at, any statement of a grade higher than 80 or 90 feet on the Union Pacific. I am not able to speak with positiveness for I have not been able to get the information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is correct; they are reduced to that.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the reduced grades we are talking about, because it is the improved Union Pacific that we are taking about. The hon. gentleman proposes in this contract to go by the Kicking Horse, giving us a grade of 116 feet to get down the Rockies in the west, and giving us two grades of 116 feet, each of these three grades being for twenty miles to get across the Selkirks. Well, I say he has no authority to do it. I say the authority to approve the route through Kicking Horse Pass is not an authority to alter the terms of the contract to that extent. The terms of the contract were that the grades should be as good, at any rate, as the Union Pacific grades, and the hon. gentleman will have to alter the contract again to get further power. But he assumes to himself the right, in case it turns out that the grades are more than the maximum of the Union Pacific grades, to go by that route, and these grades that we have an express bargain that were not to be worse than the Union Pacific grades, it is now proposed shall be worse by twenty feet than the maximum of the Union Pacific, and those for very long stretches. I certainly admit some of the general propositions stated in the last report. I entirely admit it is much better to have a concentrated steep grade at one point than to have a number of steep grades occurring at different points. It is obvious and proper. But if these grades are more severe, and they are now admitted to be more severe, than the standard which we stipulated for, I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can propose to Parliament to accept the view that he has authority to create a grade twenty-six feet worse than the worst grades of that road which is to be our standard. But, as I said, the hon. gentleman committed himself, and his colleagues who acted for him, committed him in September and again in November, and they decided absolutely to locate the line for the Kicking Horse Pass. Now, I think this has been an error of judgment. Early in the business, so long ago as in that same fall of 1881, the hon. First Minister made his speech, which referred to the new notion of going to Calgary. The Pacific Railway Company decided they would deflect this line to the Selkirks, and that was their general policy. But then they wished to take

Mr. BLAKE.

the whole country into their net, and if any railroads were built by Canada in that country, they must swallow them up unless they were built in the south; and having decided that they wanted to keep to the south, they wanted to go on at the cost of the Government and the country with their construction last year, and they induced the hon. gentleman to violate the pledge he had made to this House, and to take them along to the south of the Saskatchewan, after the decision on the subject of the Kicking Horse Pass. I maintain that having so done, it now having turned out that the saving by the Big Bend would be hardly anything in time, it having turned out that the grades on the track of the road are twenty-six feet more severe than the maximum contract grades, I maintain that that route ought not to be approved. But I have no doubt the Government is shut up to the approval of that route by the course they pursue. Now there is much more to be said, but I am not able to say anything more. In the review of the operations of the Government in connection with the construction of this railway during this year, in the particular which I have just now pointed out, and in other particulars which I have pointed out—in the particular of the eastern end, in the particular of the location of the western end from the Moose Jaw west, and in other regards, I maintain that the Government have shown themselves regardless of the contract, and neglectful of the pledges they made to this House when they asked it to sanction and give them authority to change the route of the railway. I maintain that the progress which has been made in the settlement of the North-West is not due to this contract. I maintain that it is due simply to a line having been built through the prairies of the North-West. However bright may be the picture of that country, under whatever load of difficulty it may yet be able to overcome and prosper, I ask all those who belong to the North-West, how much brighter would those pictures have been, how much clearer would have been the atmosphere, how much brighter the sky, how much plainer the course, if we had 500 or 600 miles built through the prairies now? Our lands would be improved in value, our hands free, and the country would not be bound up by a monopoly for twenty years. The rates would not be obliged to be run up to the enormous prices at which they are now, in order to give those profits, but we should have been left free to sell our lands at their improved value for the building of the ends. How much better and brighter would have been the picture, if only the prudent, reasonable and statesmanlike suggestion we offered: that the Government should not commit themselves—in the then condition of the North-West as to its lands, as to its immigration, as to its communications with the outer world, as to the knowledge of it by the world—to a bargain for the building of the whole line? We should have promoted the rapid development of the North-West; and having produced that state of things which exists to-day, marred and blotted only by the objectionable features of this contract, having provided that state of things without that marring and blotting, then, as I pointed out last year, we might have proceeded to build the ends at an enormous saving of money to this country, and still greater safety as to its future, in regard to extensions and monopolies, which are going to form, for a long time to come, a burden very difficult to be borne by the people of that country, who on the one hand are taxed with high duties, and on the other hand are to be burdened with enormously high rates. It seems to me that these considerations are plain and simple. It seems to me possible, notwithstanding the glamor which the hon. gentleman endeavors to throw over the scene—even if it is due to the activity and enterprise of the Government that 400 or 500 miles of railway have been constructed through the Prairie country—that all these things might have been obtained at a much less cost in the present, and an infinitely less cost in the future had the course

which we suggested been adopted. And, Sir, while the advantages which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, and which he has attributed to the contract, but which I say have been produced in spite of the contract, are in the present, the disadvantages are in the future. We are only beginning to feel and to see them. It is not so much when the settler is going to the North-West with his property and effects, and is investing his capital in the removal, in the purchase of his outfit and appliances, that he will feel the high freights, as when he has settled down to the normal condition of the farmer, living on his farm, and obliged to maintain himself every year and to buy the goods he wants out of the prices he receives for the grain and cattle he is able to send to market. It is not the time when a man in spending his capital, and \$100 or \$200 more is looked upon as part of the investment, but when he comes down to make up accounts of debit and credit between the receipts of the farm and the payments made out of them, that the freights which, under the monopoly and the 10 per cent. clause will be chargeable, will be found to diminish the value of the farmer's wheat and cattle which he has to sell, and will be found to enhance the cost of the goods he has to buy to an extent that will be extremely onerous. I believe, as I have said, that the apparent advantages are present, that the difficulties are only beginning to be discerned, that they will increase and grow from year to year, and with the monopoly and the 10 per cent. clause the bargain of the hon. Minister, instead of being a bargain of which he may feel proud, will be a bargain of which in time to come he will be ashamed.

Mr. POPE. I am not going, Mr. Speaker, to make a speech, but before the House rises I desire to point out some of the mistakes which the hon. gentleman has made, and purposely made, as the paper from which he obtained the figures he did give, contained also the correction, and after having done that I shall move that the House adjourn. The hon. gentleman declared in effect, that he came before the House as a superior man, and as such, would discuss the question. He had hardly entered on his task before he dealt with the subject in the most extreme and misleading manner. With respect to his quotations from the Canadian Pacific Railway tariff, I wish to show his disingenuousness, that he did not point out matters in the tariff, except in a way that must be misleading, and which he knew was misleading.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. POPE. I say the hon. gentleman knew, because he had the facts under his hand, and I am not out of order. What did the hon. gentleman say. Quoting from the Canadian Pacific Railway tariff, he said: that merchandise of the first class was 80 cts. per hundred pounds, while on the Union Pacific it was 57 cts., the distance being 200 miles. With respect to the rates for 400 miles he said nothing, and regarding those for 600 miles he said nothing. If he had told the house that they were \$1.97 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and \$2.47 on the Union Pacific for the latter distance, he would have told the House the truth and dealt with the question in a fair manner.

Mr. BLAKE. I had not the rates of the Union Pacific over 200 miles.

Mr. POPE. Then I wish to inform the hon. gentleman, that the paper which contained the figures which he did give, contained the information, and yet in view of that fact, he has led the House astray. In regard to second-class goods, the rate of the Canadian Pacific Railway was 67 cts., as against 60 cts. on the Union Pacific. If he had taken 400 miles he would have found the rate \$1.35 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and \$2.13 on the Union Pacific, and he would therefore have given the House some idea

what the tariffs really are. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about railways, he would be aware that almost all the goods are classed as third and fourth-class, and that the rate on first-class is of little importance, because the great bulk of the goods belong to the third and fourth classes. On the third class he informed us the rate is 54 cts. on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 51 cts. on the Union Pacific for 200 miles. If he had taken 600 miles, he would have found the rate \$1.08 on the Canadian Pacific and \$1.91 on the Union Pacific. Now, Sir, I desire these things to be understood. I think it well, after what has been placed before the House to-night, that this matter should not be left as the hon. gentleman left it. Now we come to the fourth class, which is the most important. The hon. gentleman did not quote these rates and why? Just for the reason that for fourth class goods for 200 miles, the rate on the Canadian Pacific is 40 cts. and 46 cts. on the Union Pacific. Then, Sir, why did he not take the rates for 600 miles? If he had taken 600 miles, he would have found that the rate on the Canadian Pacific is 86 cts., and \$1.59 on the Union Pacific. He quoted a little further. He said the rate for grain was 24 cts. for 200 miles on the Canadian Pacific. But against 24 cts, it is 46 cts. on the Union Pacific for 200 miles; and the rate of 42 cts. on the Canadian Pacific for 600 miles, is \$1.49 on the Union Pacific. Now, if he had taken flour, he would have found that while the rate is 48 cts. for 200 miles on the Canadian Pacific, it is 92 cts. for 200 miles on the Union Pacific; and while 84 cts. are charged for 600 miles on the Canadian Pacific, \$3.18 are charged on the Union Pacific. This, Sir, would have given a better idea of the true state of matters to the House. The rate for salt and lime is 66 cts. on the Canadian Pacific for 200 miles, and 70 cts. on the Union Pacific, and \$1.29 for 600 miles on the Canadian Pacific, and \$2.45 on the Union Pacific. If we take timber, shingles, &c., what the hon. gentleman mentioned, we find that \$37 a car for 200 miles are charged on the Canadian Pacific, and \$36 on the Union Pacific, while \$73 are charged for 600 miles on the Canadian Pacific, and \$118 are charged on the Union Pacific. If he had taken live stock, he would find that \$60 a car are charged on the Canadian Pacific for 200 miles, and \$55 on the Union Pacific; \$124 a car being charged on the Canadian Pacific for 600 miles, and \$180 on the Union Pacific. In the case of immigrants effects, the Canadian Pacific Railway rate is immensely lower, their figures being \$90 against \$180 on the Union Pacific; and so, Sir, it is to the end. My hon. friend (the Minister of Railways) explained when he rose, that if you take short distances you would find, perhaps, the rates a little heavier; but, said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) "we did not find this to be the case on the Pembina Branch." And why? There were no long distances on that road. My hon. friend, (the Minister of Railways) when he addressed the House to-night, said that they intended to encourage trade and to assist men who had gone a long way into the country, by giving them cheaper proportionate rates; and he (Mr. Blake) stated that this was all right. What I complain of, and am desirous of reminding you and setting right before the House—if possible before the country—was the comparison which the hon. gentleman made between the rates on the Union Pacific and Canadian Pacific. I might have carried my comparisons still further, but that I do not wish to detain the House at this late hour. But a further comparison would have proved the hon. gentleman to be still more deeply in the wrong.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

73. Canada Central Railway subsidy.....\$16,800.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this the final vote?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the balance of the subsidy to the line under the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the whole be paid then?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That covers the entire subsidy.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Government got in its hands some funds as a guarantee against the interest charge which they have guaranteed?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is the balance of money in our hands to pay the guarantee up to a certain period.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This discharges the entire liability to the Company for the subsidy, and the money to cover the guarantee of interest was deposited with the Government and remains.

74. Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River..... \$350,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some explanation as to details.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated in the course of my remarks to-day that about \$300,000 were required to complete the contract on Section B. The contract is practically closed on the other section. The original estimate as to the cost of Section A was \$2,300,000, and the estimate of the probable cost is, as nearly as we can arrive at it now, \$1,860,000, or \$440,000 less than the original estimate. It is approaching nearly to completion. The original estimate for section B was \$4,130,707, and the estimate of the probable cost is as nearly as we can arrive at it, \$2,905,000, or \$1,225,707 less than the original estimate, and this \$350,000 is to cover the expenditure to finish these works.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's statement with reference to Section A. That is for Eagle River to English River, as I understand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon. gentleman say it will be now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$1,860,000 to complete.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it will cost a little more than the estimate of last year? How did that come about? It was well on towards completion, and the hon. gentleman made his estimate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied with our saving half a million of dollars in completing the contract—the cost being that much less than the sum which was appropriated by Parliament on the best estimate that could be made when the work was commenced.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not satisfied, because the hon. gentleman stated that it would be completed for so much less. Then, as to Section "D," the estimate stands the same as last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it practically stands as it was.

Mr. BLAKE. Then as to this \$350,000?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That contract is virtually settled.

Mr. BLAKE. This will be payable to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I understand. What is the nature of the arrangement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have agreed upon terms of settlement with the contractors for that work, so as to transfer it to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company practically at the contract rate. They will virtually become the

Mr. POPE.

contractors with the Government for the portions of work to be done under the contract instead of the original contractors. That is an arrangement which, as the hon. gentleman will see, was absolutely necessary if we expected to invite traffic to be carried over the road this year. It was quite impracticable for one party to operate the road and another to complete the construction. As the time for the completion of the contract was July 1st 1883, and very little work could be done, it was arranged that instead of their providing the plant necessary to carry the traffic for this short period, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should complete the work and operate it besides.

Mr. BLAKE. I am informed that there has been a re-measurement of the contractors' work on this contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has been a re-measurement. Matters are now being investigated in reference to the exact quantities, and the claims of the contractors.

Mr. BLAKE. Has a report been made as to the result?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I have not received the report from the Chief Engineer. Some questions arose, and the engineer directed parties to make measurements. These measurements have been made to him, and the matter is now under consideration. No settlement has yet been arrived at.

Mr. BLAKE. I am told that the contractors complain that they have been much ill used with regard to the measurement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not at all unusual.

Mr. BLAKE. And there was some question of classification.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. The matter is now in the hands of the Chief Engineer who is now taking every possible means of arriving at results with reference to it.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman state what the claims of the contractors are?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I cannot state definitely. There is a claim as to classification and measurement.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe they have a right to run the road for traffic after construction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any arrangement been made with regard to the surrender of that right?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. They claim nothing for that. They were enabled to operate the road until the 1st of June next and then they were obliged to surrender it. They found that in order to handle the traffic which would come after navigation would open they would have to make a large outlay for rolling stock—an outlay which would not have justified them in making preparations for that traffic; consequently they were willing to surrender the right to operate it until the 1st of July, as the proceeds from the traffic would not compensate them for the cost.

Mr. BLAKE. How soon will the steamers be ready which the hon. gentleman spoke of?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are now being contracted for, and will be out this autumn and placed on the line of navigation at Algoma Mills for next year.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the character of the work to be done to complete this contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The filling up of a portion of it has to be finished. There is temporary tressel work, established sidings have been opened, and there is the completion of the filling and ballasting of the road.

75. British Columbia..... \$3,500,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I am not quite sure that I caught the hon. gentleman's statement with reference to this state-

ment. He gave us a detailed statement last year as to the different contracts, which showed a difference from the original calculation as to these contracts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that after another year's experience I have every reason to believe that my calculations will be verified as to the reduced amount.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand that remark applies not only to the general result, but as to the estimates on each particular contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman inform me—for I have forgotten—if that comprises the iron bridges, &c.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The ironing is provided for. The bridging was let by separate contract and has just been made in England. That is for the great bridge across the Fraser. It will be erected this year. The work is all included in the contract, and the Government find the iron. The rails are all on the ground.

76. Station Accommodation..... \$30,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for stations on the line between Thunder Bay and Red River.

77. Subsidy, Canadian Pacific Railway.....\$5,500,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. What is the calculation upon which that amount is based?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall require this amount, in addition to the \$8,500,000 provided to the end of the year. There will be 100 miles opened, I hope, on the 1st of July, running eastward from Prince Arthur's Landing. There will be some sixty miles opened during the season on the eastern end, in addition to the forty miles now completed, and there will be the completion of the line probably to the summit of Kicking Horse Pass—at all events to the Rocky Mountains. These are the principal items which will be covered by this expenditure. On the eastern section there is a gap of 486 miles that remains to be located between Sturgeon River and Wahnipitac River, which is expected to be located during the present season.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1.35 o'clock a. m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

SATURDAY, 5th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LORNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1883; and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 5th May, 1883.

Ordered that the Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

### BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. BOWELL, in introducing Bill (No. 121) respecting the Harbor Master of the Harbor of Three Rivers, said:— This is simply to give power to the Harbor Commissioners of the city of Three Rivers for the appointment of a Harbor Master, and to confirm the appointment already made.

Bill read the first time.

### INLAND REVENUE ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 115) to consolidate and amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one matter which I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue before the Bill passes. It will have been observed that we have now the Inland Revenue Laws consolidated into one Statute. There has been, on the whole, I think, an improvement in the arrangement in the clauses of that law, as those relating to distilleries are brought together as are those relating to tobacco and other branches of manufacture which are carried on under that law. I would suggest, as I did before—and I think the hon. Minister spoke favorably of the suggestion—that not only the Inland Revenue Laws, but the regulations and Orders in Council pertaining to those laws, should be prepared in a concise form, and then printed and distributed among those who have to work under them. There is another difficulty, however, and it is to that point to which I specially desire to refer. Some of the stipulations are very complicated in their nature, and it is possible that many men, desirous and anxious to do what is entirely right, may not be able to interpret them correctly, so that doubts may still arise among manufacturers as to what their duties may be. It may be said that the revenue officers in the various districts may be applied to. That is true, and I admit that these men as a class are very good men, and, considering the vexations they have to undergo, I believe they are very efficient officers. But the fact cannot be overlooked that, notwithstanding the efficiency of these officers, the law has not been carried out uniformly—that one state of things prevails in one district, and another in another. As the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) pointed out very clearly the other day, the law is unequally carried out in the different parts of the Dominion, and without casting any reflection on the officers, it is obvious that they are unable to attain to an agreement as to the construction of the law as it is operated in the different districts. Now, it is clear that, if the manufacturers in one district have the laws and regulations, and the stipulations and requirements made more exacting to them than they are made to the manufacturers of another district, they are at a disadvantage in the market as compared with the other manufacturers. I think it is now desirable that the law, or rather the interpretation of the law and the regulations, should be made more uniform—not especially in the matter of the distilleries, because there is an officer especially charged to overlook them, and a very efficient officer he is—but with reference to tobacco manufacture. It is undoubtedly a difficult matter to control, and it is rendered more difficult by the fact that the raw leaf is grown in our country, and, in a measure, enters into the manufacture of our goods sometimes mixed and sometimes in a pure state. That being the case, I think the only way in which the law can be made to work uniformly and equally on all classes—the only way in which the honest manufacturer can be protected—the only way in which he can be relieved from the danger of incurring penalties unknowingly, would be to make one of the inspectors a general inspector of tobacco manufacture, giving him powers over every district in all the Provinces. If he is

charged specially with that duty, there will be the double advantage in having a perfect uniformity in the working of the law, and of having all the manufacturers operating under it placed precisely on the same level. No undue advantage will be had by one manufacturer over another owing to a more strict interpretation of the law in one district than in another. It was just with the view of throwing out this suggestion that I rose, and if the hon. Minister sees anything desirable in it, I hope he will take it into his consideration and give effect to it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have listened to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, especially to that portion of them relating to the inspection of tobacco in the different Provinces. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says in regard to that subject; and I must say that I myself have felt that it would be an improvement if the inspection of tobacco could be placed under the control of one inspector for the whole Dominion. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that our present Estimates exceed considerably those of last year, and that was one reason for not adding to the cost of the Department by creating new inspectors. But I can give the hon. gentleman this assurance, that I intend, as soon as possible, to bring about that change. It may be brought about, I think, without any additional cost; but I think before very long that system will be adopted.

Bill read the third time and passed.

### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

198. Salaries and contingent expenses of the several  
Customs Ports..... \$779,140.00

Mr. BOWELL. The increases in the Province of Ontario are caused in some cases by the creation of additional offices, and in other cases by increases in the salaries of officers at the different ports. In the town of Berlin there is an expenditure proposed of \$750. That town has been erected into a distinct port, and the salary of the officer, formerly charged to Guelph, is now charged to Berlin, and we propose to increase his salary by \$100. Then \$50 for contingencies makes up the total item of \$750. In the Brantford office there is an increase of \$100, caused by a proposed increase in the salary of an officer who acts as clerk and appraiser—that is Mr. McMichael.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is another gentleman in a lower position than Mr. McMichael, who, I thought at one time would have an increase of \$100, to which I think he was justly entitled; but since the change of Administration nothing has been done. If I remember rightly his salary is only \$500, and he is an efficient officer; and, while commending the hon. Minister of Customs for his economy in this matter, there are some offices in which there is more economy than in others. If he will look into the business done by the Brantford office he will find it is done with the least amount of money, the least percentage, I fancy almost—I cannot speak positively—of any port in the Dominion. I mention that case as the circumstances are a little peculiar, and I have brought it before his notice now.

Mr. BOWELL. The gentleman referred to is, I think, Mr. Foster. I do not think my attention has been called to this before, and I am not aware where the hon. gentleman got the idea that there was to be an increase, except, as he says, when the country was so unfortunate as to lose the late Government. That may or may not be the case; but I simply say this: There are a large number of that class of officers, landing waiters, who are receiving no more salary than Mr. Foster. It does not follow that there is a large amount of work at a port where a large revenue is collected. There are many ports where the collections are

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

very much less than at Brantford, and where the labor is greater, such as frontier ports, where the frontier has to be watched, or where the manifesting on railways is very great.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At Windsor for instance.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and at Sarnia, and Coaticook, and other places, where there is no comparison between the volume of work done, and that at Brantford, though the receipts may be much less.

Mr. PATERSON. This is a very deserving case at any rate.

Mr. BOWELL. I should judge so from the representative who comes from there.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the proportional additional increase in Quebec on the total increase?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see that by the returns. It is not as much in the Province of Quebec, as a whole, as in the Province of Ontario. I take the hon. gentleman's remarks as indicative of the course they will pursue when they come again before the electors. No doubt then they will not declare that the hon. Minister of Customs has been extravagant, for they are all asking increases of salaries.

Mr. PATERSON. What we are asking is a readjustment, not an increase.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid a readjustment does not always suit the hon. gentleman. We heard a great deal about that, not only in this, but during the last Parliament, at the Elections. Although that may have been said jocularly, I say that readjustment is entirely the principle on which I have been endeavoring to administer the Customs Department. As an illustration, in the city of Montreal, although the Estimates show an increase of \$83,000 over last year, the total amount expended there is less by one-half than was expended in 1878, and there are about a dozen or fifteen less officers in the port than then. I have been very careful, when opportunities presented themselves, when vacancies occurred, through superannuation, or death, or any other cause, in posts where I thought there were too many officers, not to fill them up, but to increase the salaries of those deserving officers who I thought had earned an increase. I think, therefore, that the word readjustment, suggested by my hon. friend, is the correct one. In Brockville, there is an increase of \$3,000 through the appointment of two preventive officers on the frontier, at \$375 each, and to provide the difference between \$1.25 and \$1.50 per day to Mr. Simpson, who has never been put on the permanent list, but was appointed, he holds, by my predecessor. At Granton, I found it necessary, in the interests of the revenue, to appoint an officer, as the railway will soon be open to that point, and it is necessary, in the interests of the revenue and the shipping there, to make that appointment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Any officer at London.

Mr. BOWELL. At Morpeth there is an agent and a preventive officer who was appointed by my predecessor. I think he received only \$150 per year, and I gave him an increase of \$50, owing to his increased duties, and I gave him also the power of collecting at different ports, so that he will have three or four services to perform. At Clifton there is an increase of \$250, and in Collingwood an increase of \$75.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To the collector?

Mr. BOWELL. No; we have had to appoint a preventive officer at Spanish River, who receives \$100 a year. He is made an officer at the port of Collingwood. In Toronto, formerly Mill Point was an outport of the port of Napanee; it has been created into a port, and a collector is appointed. At Guelph, it is proposed to give an increase of \$100 to the clerk—a Mr. Hutton, I think.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There is a decrease at Guelph.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; but I called your attention a few moments ago to the fact that Berlin was formerly chargeable to Guelph, and is now made a port. There is an increase of \$100 to Mr. McNamara at the outport of Walkerton, attached to the port of Guelph. I propose to send one of the two officers at Dundee from there to Port Erie, because one officer only is required at Dundee. That is another instance of readjustment. There is an increase of \$250 at the port of Hamilton. Out of this we propose to give an increase of \$100 each to the two appraisers, Mr Wylie, the dry goods appraiser, and Mr. Thompson, the general appraiser; also \$100 to an old officer, and \$550 as salary to a newly appointed officer who was found necessary on account of the increasing business of that port. The increases are given on the ground of efficiency, and the small amount they receive now for the important positions they hold. I have expressed the opinion in this House before, that I thought the appraisers received too low a salary, and Mr. Wylie and Mr. Thompson received about as small salaries as are paid to that class of officers in any part of the country. Mr. Thompson, the chief of appraisers, is a very old officer, and one of the most efficient in the service, but he receives now only \$1,200; and Mr. Wylie receives \$1,000. The increase at Kincardine is to provide for the salary of the new outport at Wingham, \$300.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see the salaries and expenses for Port Dover are \$2,125. What are the outports of Port Dover?

Mr. BOWELL. Port Dover is one of the old ports, where the duties of the collector are not as great as they were twenty years ago; but as he is an old officer it was not deemed advisable to change the port. Simcoe and Port Rowan are outports of Port Dover. At Simcoe the sub-collector receives \$500 a year, and the officer at Port Rowan the same sum. Mr. Barrett, the collector at Port Dover, receives the old salary, \$875. At Kingston, a new collector was appointed at a salary \$300 less than his predecessor. We propose an increase of \$50 to Mr. Magher, an old officer of twenty or thirty years' service; also \$50 to Mr. Kidd, and an equal sum to Mr. Nugent, and the same to Mr. McMillan. D. J. Rankin, the newly-appointed officer at Collins Bay, gets an annual increase of \$50. In Kingsville, the \$25 is for rent. In London, the increase is \$1,700, and is for an additional appraiser at \$1,000, the balance to be given to the present officers. The business of that port has increased about 50 per cent. since 1878, and that is largely owing to the importation of goods. Notwithstanding the increase in business, the proposed expenditure is only \$12,500, while the expenditure in 1878 was \$11,402. The increase is the same in Brantford, and I propose to give \$100 to the gentlemen who have the most work to do there. At Prince Arthur's Landing, there is an increase of \$25 for rent; at Sarnia, there is an increase of \$550, to provide for another landing waiter, and an increase of \$80 to the messenger. There is an increase at St. Catharines, to provide for additional assistance. Mr. Spittal has been appointed at Port Dalhousie to take the place of the officer who died there. At Port Rowan, there is \$100 to pay the services of the Inland Revenue officer who acts for us though an officer of the Inland Revenue Department, and that saves the expense of appointing a new officer. In St. Thomas there is a proposed increase of \$100 to the salary of Mr. Smellie, for the same reason that I have given for Brantford.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the increase in business at St. Thomas compares very favorably with the increase at London, and I think the proposed increase to the salary of Mr. Smellie, the landing waiter there, is nothing in proportion

to the duties he has to perform. During the last nine months the revenue collected at St. Thomas was \$15,855 over the same period last year. Now, the hon. Minister must take into consideration the fact that the collector at St. Thomas has been a long time in the service. I have not one word to say against the efficiency of Mr. Dunham. He is an old officer, and was for a number of years at Port Jarvis, where he had very little to do, but he performed the duties devolving upon him in a most efficient manner. He was removed from Port Burwell and placed at another port. Another man was brought from Windsor, Mr. King, whom the hon. Minister well knows, an old man who does his work as efficiently as he is able to do, and as well as might be expected, considering his age. The other man, Mr. Smellie, whom it is now proposed to give a salary of \$700, and he has been receiving only \$600, is to a very great extent responsible for the whole work of the office. In early life he obtained a knowledge of mercantile business, and this has enabled him to be a very efficient officer in the valuation of goods, and in solving, to a very great extent, the intricacies of the Tariff during the last two years. Not only so, but he has in a great measure to keep the books and prepare the monthly statements and returns. Further, he is an honest officer, always ready to do his work, and one who will not take any advantage of the Government or anyone else, and he is entitled, I think, to more than \$100 increase. It is not a matter of economy to keep the salaries of officers who are industrious and efficient, down to starvation limits. This officer has a large family, and it is almost impossible for him to maintain them with any degree of comfort on the salary he receives, and I really think the hon. Minister might have seen his way—in view of the large amount of work performed at the St. Thomas Office, and the rapidly increasing revenue derived therefrom, which is advancing, perhaps, with greater rapidity than any other port in the Dominion—to have increased this officer's salary at least \$200.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt all the hon. gentleman has said is quite true as regards the efficiency of Mr. Smellie. If anything were needed to strengthen my belief in that fact, it would be by the speech just delivered by the hon. gentleman. My attention has been called to this officer very often, not only by the hon. gentleman, but also by his predecessor; nevertheless, it must be remembered that this officer was appointed by the late Government at a salary of \$500, and St. Thomas is one of those ports which has been readjusted. When the present Government assumed power St. Thomas was an outport of London, and it had two officers: Mr. Taylor and Mr. Smellie. Mr. Taylor was removed to another part of the service, and Mr. Dunham appointed collector, he being a good officer and a very honorable man, having been stationed at Port Burwell, a port which was formerly of considerable importance in the carrying trade, but whose business fell off with the construction of railways. Instead of appointing a new officer we removed him to St. Thomas, and appointed a preventive officer at \$200 per annum for Port Burwell. Last year the Government increased Mr. Smellie's salary \$100, and we propose an increase of another \$100 this year; and if he receives that increase yearly it will be a tolerably good one, until he reaches the maximum. As to Mr. King, I am not aware he should be superannuated. I saw the gentleman not very long ago, and he certainly appeared quite as capable of doing his work as I am, and he is about the same age. If Mr. King were superannuated the Government would be accused of putting a man out of the service who is quite capable of performing his duties in order to make room for another. I quite recognize the efficiency of Mr. Smellie, to whom we propose to give an increase of \$100. I should very much like to place all these officers at higher salaries; but if that principle were carried out all over the Dominion, I should have to come down for \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$50,000 more,

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman was mistaken in his statement that Mr. Smellie received an increase of \$100 last year. I think it was two years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was last year; however, I cannot be sure of it.

Mr. WILSON. The revenue of St. Thomas, for the ten months of last year, was \$68,365; for the nine months of 1882, the amount was about \$40,000. I should not like the hon. Minister to imagine that I wish to say one word against the efficiency of Mr. King, as far as he is able to perform his duties; but it must be remembered that very few men possess the perseverance and energy of the hon. Minister. I desire further to call attention to a letter which the hon. Minister has received from the town of St. Thomas, pointing out the necessity which exists for a detective officer being appointed in that locality, as considerable smuggling takes place over the Canada Southern Railway. I believe there are preventive officers appointed in other places, and it is nothing but just and right that the people of St. Thomas should be protected against those who are violating the law, almost every day.

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion is a very good one, and I will take it into my most serious consideration. But St. Thomas is an inland port, and I cannot conceive why more smuggling should take place, except by railway, than at any other inland port of the Province.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the case of Mr. Ellison, landing waiter at Stratford. My hon. friend will confess that he is a valuable officer, and though he does not do as heavy work, or as large an amount of it as is the case at many other places, still he is discharging his duty faithfully, and doing all that there is to do at this point. He attends, perhaps, at the arrival of as many trains as is the case at any other port along this line of railway. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that this officer has been there for a great many years, and yet he receives only \$400 a year. Complaint is made by an hon. member in this respect on behalf of an officer who receives \$600 as landing waiter, Mr. Smellie, while Mr. Ellison only gets \$400. The work to be done is very much the same, and he has to be at his post at all times, when trains come in; and whether the quantity of goods delivered be large or small, the duties in that sense are the same. I trust that the hon. Minister of Customs will take this case into consideration, as this is the worst paid officer, who acts as landing waiter, and I would be glad to see him get an increase of \$100. The hon. gentleman has partly promised my hon. friend from Elgin, on behalf of a man who gets \$200 more than my unfortunate friend, and I hope that he will take this case into favorable consideration also.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a case to which I called attention in my general remarks a few minutes ago, as that of a preventive officer receiving \$400 a year. It is true that I have not made a special appropriation for an increase in this instance, but I think it is a case worthy of consideration; and if you look at the Estimates you will find that, in order to meet such cases as that of my hon. friend from Stratford, I asked the House to give me \$5,000 to cover any unforeseen charges which it may be necessary to make. In the city of Toronto you will find an increase of between \$2,000 and \$3,000. This is principally for increases to different clerks, as in that office are to be found some of the best clerks in the Dominion—Messrs. Ardagh, Taylor, Verner, Preston, Patterson, and a number of others, who have for a number of years been receiving only \$600. I am under the impression that Toronto is equally an expensive place to live in as St. Thomas, and I propose to add from \$100 to \$150 increase in the salaries of many of the officers whose names I have mentioned.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I see that it is proposed to increase the daily wages in Toronto \$3,300.

Mr. BOWELL. That arises from the extra number of trains continually arriving, and the extra business done at the wharves during the summer months, when it is absolutely necessary to put on what we call temporary hands. They are put on in the spring in all the ports, particularly at Montreal, where it is a very large item, and in the cities of Quebec and Toronto. There will be a sum at Toronto for contingencies of \$1,000, in addition to the other expenditure. When I inform the House that, in 1878, the collections of the Port of Toronto were \$2,151,566, while last year they were \$3,836,227, showing an immense increase in duty, as well as in traffic, particularly by railway, it will be easily understood how it is that this increase takes place. In the town of Windsor, there is an increase of only \$100, but I anticipate there a much larger increase, which will have to be provided for out of the \$5,000, from the fact that the Canada Southern Railway have now established a crossing at Detroit and Windsor, and it will be necessary to have preventive officers to attend at this station. Thus, next year the probabilities are that this amount will be \$1,000, or \$1,500, more than is provided for here.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). On what principle is the appropriation asked for in respect to the daily wages for extra service? For instance, at Windsor, no such appropriation is asked for, while \$5,900 are requested for Toronto, and \$780 at St. Catharines. I see other places, such as Prescott, where nothing is called for; but \$620 are wanted at Ottawa, and \$400 at London; nothing at Morrisburg, nothing at Guelph, and nothing at other sea-port towns which I might name. It is all right enough, I suppose; but I want to know on what principle the appropriation is made at one place and not at another?

Mr. BOWELL. It is for the simple reason that it is required at one place and not at another. I cannot give any other explanation.

Mr. ROSS. This is no explanation at all. The hon. gentleman must know that.

Mr. BOWELL. It is the only explanation that can be given. Guelph, however, is not a sea-port.

Mr. ROSS. But Windsor is one, and Prescott is another.

Mr. BOWELL. Windsor is a port with stationary business, and the duties to be performed there are those of landing waiters, who attend more particularly at the ferry boats, and the trains crossing the river, with goods in bond, going eastward. The city of Toronto is a central depot, and distributing point for the whole of Ontario, or very nearly so. At Guelph, there is nothing particularly of that kind, except in regard to passing trains; and Prescott is in precisely the same position. We must have one or two officers there watching continually the ferry boats and the frontier, but there is no transshipment of any consequence of goods passing from one part of the country to another. It is not a distributing point—for the distribution of goods to other places. It is one of the smallest ports—if you look merely at the revenue collected—that is, it is a place where the collections are not very large; but we require there a large number of preventive officers to be constantly on the watch at the wharves from six o'clock in the morning until night, and they have also to attend to the transportation of the cars from the United States, in connection with the Ogdensburg and Grand Trunk Railroads.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am glad that the hon. Minister was kind enough to give an explanation, because, if I did not think it was required, I would not have asked for it. It is not, however, a very satisfactory answer to give, just merely to say, blankly and flatly, they are there because they are



required, and not there because they are not required. I was looking into the Estimates, and I wanted to see if there was a principle on which each expenditure was made. Perhaps I have got it, as nearly as I could expect to get it, from the hon. gentleman, and I must be satisfied thereby. I would like—though it may not belong to the hon. gentleman's Department, but to the Department of Public Works—to know why Customs houses are provided in some places where it does not seem to me the necessities of the service require them, while at other places there is no such provision. Does the hon. Minister make any report to the Department of Public Works as to the necessities of the service in this relation?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will tell me to what he refers I will give him an answer. In all cases, I believe, since Confederation, there have been a large number of places at which there has been just as much labor performed, and, perhaps, a larger amount of duties collected, where they have no Customs houses constructed at the public expense, while others, which might be considered to be of smaller consequence, have them. When representation is made to me at the different points, that a Custom house is required, I approve, or disapprove, as the case may be, and send the matter to the hon. Minister of Public Works. That is the principle upon which these buildings are constructed. Perhaps, I might say to my hon. friend what the late Minister of Public Works said to some one on that side, in answering a similar question. He said, that as the revenue would justify him, and as the port warranted it, public buildings would be constructed as required by the public service. I do not know that I can give any better answer to the hon. gentleman than that.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I had no intention of worrying the hon. Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. You are not worrying me in the slightest.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I did not propose to ask any questions but what were necessary and reasonable. I was going to say to the hon. Minister that I notice that he established a Custom house and post office at Gananoque, where the rents and contingencies were \$144, and the Customs receipts were \$13,838. Then take the case of Sarnia, for example, which is in my part of the country, though not in my constituency, and we find that the rents, &c., amounted to \$576, and the Customs dues to \$39,367, or nearly three times as much as those of Gananoque, and yet no such provision is made in Sarnia. I was anxious to know whether the hon. gentleman was acting on the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman for East York—that is, when the rents and dues are more than the amount of the interest on the investment, then such accommodation should be provided. I say that the rents here are trifling as compared with the cost of the erection of new buildings, and in Gananoque the Custom house receipts are much smaller.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to answer the hon. gentleman, but I do think that it would be as well to discuss the question of the erection of Public Buildings when the estimates for Public Buildings are under consideration, when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works could deal fully with the question. After all, however, when the explanation is made with regard to Gananoque, that matter will not appear such a hideous affair at most. In that place the Customs occupied a building near the wharf which was burnt down, and the property was about passing into the hands of others than the man who formerly owned it. It was proposed that \$2,500 would repair the building in which the office was held, and purchase the lot, so that all the expenditure connected with that building would be \$2,500; and I thought that instead of going to another part of the town, which was less commodious or

convenient to the trading public than the present Customs house, it would be better to accept that arrangement. I so advised the hon. Minister of Public Works, and he put in the Estimates the sum of \$2,500 to repair the building in which the Customs house had formerly been held, and to purchase the lot on which it is situated. If you calculate the interest at 5 per cent. on \$2,500, you will see exactly what the cost is to the country of purchasing that lot and repairing the building.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, as the hon. gentleman has said, it would be better to discuss these items under the Public Works Estimates; but as I understand that he recommended the purchase in this case, it would seem that we had reached the right quarter, and that he was the proper member of the Government to whom to address our remarks. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he was following the rule laid down by the late hon. Minister of Public Works, that wherever the public interests required such buildings they should be erected or obtained. I will not say that that is not the rule, which the hon. gentleman is following; but I warn him to take care that there should not be too many peculiar coincidences with regard to these public buildings, as they might excite some little doubt as to whether the hon. gentleman was solely actuated by the rule laid down by the late hon. Minister of Public Works. When you find that almost invariably—in fact I think I might say invariably—the appropriations for these buildings are made in the towns and cities which are fortunate enough to send representatives to this House to support the hon. gentleman, some people might be inclined to doubt whether he invariably adhered to this rule. In order to break the monotony, and to prevent such suspicion, I would suggest that occasionally, at very rare intervals, there should be found an appropriation for a town that might happen to have a representative in this House opposed to the hon. Minister of Customs if its claims happened to be as strong as those other towns which are receiving these appropriations.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt the facetious remarks of the hon. gentleman are very interesting. He discovered what might be called a mare's nest, and if he sets on it awhile there is no telling what the result may be. It is, indeed, a marvellous and a wonderful thing that the collector of Customs should represent to the Minister the requirements of a particular port; it is a wonderful thing that the hon. Minister of Customs should make a recommendation to the Minister of Public Works, and that the hon. Minister of Public Works should go to Council and ask for an appropriation. I wonder if the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) is a great admirer of this Administration.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He is individually.

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking politically now, as the hon. member for North Brant did; and if the hon. gentleman looks at the Estimates he will find an appropriation for \$15,000 for a Custom house and other public buildings in his town.

Mr. GILLMOR. Tell us all about those public buildings.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly I will. I went down to that port and found that there was no suitable accommodation. It was represented to me that it was necessary, in the interests of the town and in the interests of that port, and I represented to my colleagues that these buildings were necessary. The hon. gentleman knows the difficulty of protecting the revenue in the town of St. Stephens. He told us the other day that there were freebooters there by night, and I do not know what by day; at all events, it was necessary to keep watch night and day. So, in the interest of St. Stephens and in the interests of the revenue, without regard to the fact that the hon. gentleman is an opponent of the Government, we made an appropriation for

public buildings in St. Stephens. I hope these public buildings will be a credit to the town as well as to the Government, who are always prepared to do justice to every part of the country, irrespective of whether they sent representatives to support them or not.

Mr. GILLMOR. When did you make that discovery?

Mr. BOWELL. As soon as the matter was brought to my attention, which the hon. gentleman never did.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. gentleman went down just before an election. He did not know anything about the wants of the people there until that particular time, and I am told that the representative there never presented his claim at all.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, I visited St. Stephens the year before the election, but if the hon. gentleman does not want these buildings we have no desire to force them upon him.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. gentleman had never had any desire to force them upon me.

Mr. McCALLUM. I see the hon. gentleman has made a reduction at the port of Dunville of \$500, and if I understand him aright he is going to transfer one of the officers to Fort Erie. I would like to understand if he is going to increase the officer's salary in that case.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. McCALLUM. And I would like to know if he is going to increase the salary of those he has left behind to do the work of the office. I am glad that he has appropriated this sum to increase the salaries of those who are not sufficiently paid. I make a claim now for an addition in the salary of one officer engaged on the outside service of Port Maitland, who now receives, I think, the magnificent sum of \$100. I think I may fairly claim for him an increase of \$100 or \$200. Besides, I think it is dealing rather unjustly with this officer in removing him from Dunville to Fort Erie without giving him an increase of salary.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In looking at these figures, one thing that strikes me is that the great bulk of the Customs revenue is raised in the Province of Quebec. The largest amount of Customs revenue collected at any one port is collected at the port of Montreal; and the Montreal merchant before he can get his goods, is obliged to pay that duty and he has to run the risk of getting that duty returned to him by his customers. Although the Province of Quebec gives a yearly augmentation to the Customs revenue, yet, of all the Provinces, it is the one that shows a decrease in the salaries of the officers employed to collect that revenue. The percentage of the expense of collecting the revenue in 1882, was, in Ontario, 3.07, and in Quebec 2.15, and the rate of Customs duties, per head of the population was, in Ontario, \$3.82, and, in Quebec, \$6.74, nearly \$1 more than the previous year, when it was \$5.94. In looking at the Estimates, I find that there is an increase in the expenses of collection in Ontario of \$13,000, while in Quebec there is only the small increase of about \$2,200. At first sight this seems to be a gross injustice. I am willing to admit that it is less expensive, proportionately, to collect a large sum of money than a small amount, but the difference is such that I think we should have some explanation from the hon. Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into the larger question the hon. gentleman has propounded, as to which Province pays the largest amount of duty. We know that the city of Montreal pays a much larger amount of duty than any other city in the Dominion, and more than any other two; but I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman intends to convey the idea that all the goods

Mr. BOWELL.

that pay duty are consumed either in the city of Montreal, or in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No; I do not say that. I say that the duty is paid first by the Montreal merchant, and he has to collect afterwards where he can.

Mr. BOWELL. We do not deny that. The only point which I think the hon. gentleman should try to establish is that the officers in the Province of Quebec are not paid as well as those in the other Provinces, or that there are not a sufficient number to perform the duties. But I cannot see any reason why there should be more officers in the Province of Quebec or any other Province than are requisite to the duties they have to perform; and when the hon. gentleman says that the salaries of the officers in the Province of Quebec are not increased in the same proportion as those in other Provinces, he makes a statement of which he knows very little. In the city of Montreal, where the largest number of officers of all the ports in the country are employed, there are a smaller number of officers to-day than there were in 1878, although all the vacancies have not been filled, and the salaries of the officers performing the work have been increased. If a man has a sufficient amount of work to do, and he does it efficiently, his salary should be commensurate with the duties he performs, and it is much better that one man should be fully employed and receive a fair salary than that there should be two men with the salary divided between them to do that which one man can do. That is the principle upon which I have acted in every section of the Dominion, and I have found no place that required a greater readjustment in that respect than the port of Montreal. In the city of Montreal, I propose an increase this year over last year of some \$3,000; but you will understand why that is done if you examine the collections at that port, and the volume of trade that is carried on there. In 1878, the collections at the port of Montreal amounted to \$3,832,140, and the expenditure for the collection of that revenue was \$114,311; while the collections last year amounted to \$8,128,155, and the expenditure was only \$112,921, or nearly \$2,000 less than was expended in 1878 for collecting less than half the amount of revenue. I have not yet heard any complaints made on the part of the mercantile community that there was not quite a sufficient number of employes necessary to perform the labors. And I repeat, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that every year we have been decreasing the number at that port, and increasing in proportion, or nearly in proportion, the salaries of those who remain. I have provided for the salaries of two officers, one clerk and one landing waiter at \$600 each; and for the salary of an additional hardware appraiser, Mr. Bernard, \$1,200. I have increased the salary of Mr. Lavoie, who was promoted, \$100; and Mr. Lanthier has been promoted from the position of packer to that of full assistant appraiser, with an addition of \$500, for the reason that he was found to be an expert in that particular branch and deserved the promotion. Mr. Bonier is to receive an increase of \$100, and the cashier, an increase of \$100. There will also be an increase to Mr. Chambers, one of the best officers in one of the branches, of \$150, and to Mr. Gabler, appraiser, \$200. He received at first \$900, then \$1,200, and finally \$1,400, in view of the fact that he has a large amount of labor to perform of a peculiar character, he being the judge of all German goods imported into the country, and he being a very efficient officer and deserving of any promotion we may give him. Mr. Mercier will receive \$100 increase, and Mr. Faulkner \$100; and to pay the outside list that have to be employed when the different steamers come into port, night and day, will require between \$3,000 and \$4,000. This is the full explanation for the increase of \$2,620, so that my hon. friend will see that neither the Government nor the Department have overlooked the merits of deserving officers, no matter to

what port or to what nationality they may belong. I repeat, again, that though we have increased the salaries of the different officers \$5,000 to \$10,000, the expenditure last year was \$1,500 less to collect \$8,128,155 than was expended by the late Government to collect \$3,832,140. In New Carlisle a new officer will be appointed, with not quite as much salary as his predecessor, from the fact that the business of the port does not justify it, and that gentleman will have another office in connection with the Inland Revenue Department. In Quebec the same principle prevails. In St. Hyacinthe, as the business of that port increased, we propose to give the collector \$600 per year instead of \$400 formerly received.

Mr. BERNIER. What was the amount of the increased revenue last year at St. Hyacinthe over the preceding year?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not the figures before me, but I know that the business of the past has increased to such an extent that we would be justified in giving the collector this additional increase. In St. John's the acting collector will receive \$100 increase, and the landing waiter another \$100; but it may be necessary to appoint an additional landing waiter there, owing to the fact that a number of railways are converging there and the business will be largely increased. In Sutton, there is a decrease of \$200, owing to the death of one of the preventive officers whose place we do not propose to fill up. In Stanstead there is also a decrease owing to the death of one of the officers, and his successor being appointed at a lower salary. As far as possible we have adopted the principle that when a new man is appointed he gets a lower salary than his predecessor, and when more efficient the salary is increased.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would ask whether the collectorship of the Port of St. John's has been filled yet?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it has not. Mr. Pichard is acting there, with an assistant, Mr. Wolfe, who has been stationed at that port as assistant inspector.

Mr. SCRIVER. Where is the former collector now stationed?

Mr. BOWELL. He is employed at Napanee in place of Mr. Benson, deceased, formerly collector at Napanee.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to one peculiarity in the mode of managing the Customs in Quebec as compared with Ontario. In Ontario, I notice that although a very large revenue is collected there, a much smaller amount is paid for daily wages than in Quebec. Last year the amount paid for daily wages in Ontario was \$8,101, while in Quebec it was \$44,018. Last year the contingencies of office in Ontario amounted to \$19,038, and in Quebec to \$17,776. The larger portion of this sum for daily wages is spent at Montreal, the sum of \$37,000 being taken for the next year, or enough to pay 100 persons the whole year round at \$1.25 a day. I remember the time when the number of men employed in the Port of Montreal at daily wages was cited by hon. gentlemen opposite as an instance of gross corruption on the part of the Liberal party, because it was said that a great many additional hands were employed in the Customs at Montreal in view of a certain election that was going on. No election is expected in Montreal this year. The hon. Minister will excuse me for putting the question to him now. Why not employ regularly on the staff a sufficient number of men to do the work and do away with these daily wages, and avoid keeping a large number of men hanging upon the skirts of the Government looking for occasional employment? Is it impossible to manage the Province of Quebec without employing a greater number of people on daily wages than are employed in Ontario?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman seems to overlook the fact that at the ports of Montreal and Quebec there are brought in immense quantities of goods by ocean-going

vessels, and the tonnage and the amount of shipping at those ports are beyond anything of the kind at any of the ports in Ontario. This is the reason why so many men are required in Montreal on daily wages. It often occurs that when a vessel arrives at these ports loaded with goods, it is necessary to put on sometimes thirty or forty men at \$1.50 a day, and perhaps \$2 at night, in order to check all the goods that come out of the vessels and to watch that none of them are lost or taken to the wrong warehouses. Just in proportion to the amount of shipping and tonnage that frequent these ports during summer is the amount of daily wages required. It will be readily understood that it would be an unwise and extravagant policy to put all these men on the permanent list, because in the winter season some twenty or thirty of them are not required. Another reason why this amount for daily wages is so large is the fact that a very large number of clerks, landing waiters, tide-waiters and lockers, and laborers, are put on the list of what is known as the permanent temporaries—rather a contradictory term, but that is what they are known by—and they were put on that list by my predecessor. They have never been transferred to the permanent list, although under the change which will be made in the Civil Service Act, the Government will be enabled to put them upon it without passing an examination. I must tell my hon. friend that this Government did not inaugurate the system he complains of. In 1873, when his friends assumed office, the total expenditure at that port was about \$86,000 altogether, and it was owing to this very list of which he complains that the expenditure was increased some \$30,000 or \$40,000. And that is one of the difficulties that I have had to combat since I have been in office. I have found men in the employment of the Government there, whether by the month or by the day, or permanently, whose services were not required there; and I do not know anyone who would be more ready than the hon. gentleman himself to say if he dismissed one of these men, it would be for political reasons. Therefore, as vacancies occurred they have not been filled up, except in the higher branches, where it was absolutely necessary to keep the office positions filled. The only place in Ontario where we can apply the same principle of daily wages is the city of Toronto, where there is quite a large sum spent for that purpose, and where you have to put on additional men in the summer. Coming now to New Brunswick, in Fredericton there is \$50 increase for contingencies; at Grand Falls it is proposed to give the sub-collector an increase of \$100, and to put a preventive officer on the frontier at \$50. Among the increases is one of \$100 to the salary of an office at Moncton, where the responsibilities have greatly increased. Four or five years ago the collections were covered by a few thousands, but last year they were over \$50,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is in connection with the sugar refinery, and will involve very little work.

Mr. BOWELL. On the contrary, all the sugar has to be graded, tested and bonded, and there are only two officers to perform the work, with the occasional assistance of an officer from St. John. At St. John there is an increase of \$100; but a comparison of the expenditure with the expenditures four years ago will show a reduction. At Woodstock there is a preventive officer appointed at a salary of \$200. Mr. Kearney is the officer.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. Minister appointed, at Woodstock, a Mr. Jacques.

Mr. BOWELL. I will promise the hon. gentleman that Mr. Jacques will have his salary paid him.

Mr. VAIL. There is a decrease of \$1,800 under the heading Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOWELL. Read the various items making up this decrease.

Mr. VAIL. I hope the hon. Minister, at the next Election, will explain to the people of Nova Scotia that a decrease has taken place under this head. It is claimed that the hon. gentleman never superannuated officers who discharged their duty. He has forgotten what took place in the county of Digby a few years ago, when a very efficient officer, who was well able to discharge his duties, was superannuated. I should like to know the reason, as no reason has yet been given. It was said at the time that he was superannuated, or removed, because he did not attend to business very strictly, and allowed smuggling. But that could not be the case, because at the other end of the county the officer at Bear River was removed, because he was too strict and seized property which the Government felt disposed afterwards to return. The Government could not remove one officer because he did not do his duty in regard to stopping smuggling, when they removed another officer because he did his duty in that regard. I do not rise to make any complaint; but it seems strange, as the hon. Minister never acts from political motives in these matters, that two collectors in Digby, who were Liberals, were removed, while all the rest, many of whom were much older, and in many instances not so competent nor so attentive, but happened to be supporters of the present Government, were allowed to remain in office.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is as much at fault in the statements he has made as he usually is when he addresses this House; and I do not think that it would be to the advantage of the collector at Digby to give the reasons why he was superannuated.

Mr. VAIL. He was not at Digby.

Mr. BOWELL. No it was at Weymouth?

Mr. VAIL. Surely the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. BOWELL. I do know; he was at Weymouth, and I know that he was superannuated because he was totally inefficient, and neglected to perform the duties appertaining to his office; that is the reason why this gentleman was superannuated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was a case for dismissal.

Mr. BOWELL. No; the object of the Superannuation Law is to place gentlemen who prove to be inefficient—I think that this is as mild a word as I can use—on the retired list, either owing to age or to any other cause; and this was the case in Weymouth. He would not have been superannuated, I dare say, had it not been for the reports of the officers, whose duty it is to report to the Department as to the efficiency of the different officers in the Customs Department. The hon. gentleman is mistaken altogether when he says that the sub-collector at Bay River was removed from his office because he too ardently performed his duties. He was removed from office because he allowed merchants to take their goods out of the bonded warehouses without paying the duties; this was the reason, and I explained it to the House before. I have no desire to make these statements, unless they are drawn from me by their over-zealous friends, who compel the Government to give explanations and state the real facts; but when an officer has charge of bonded goods in bonded warehouses, and allows them to be taken out without first collecting the duty, I would like to know what safety there is for the revenue. For no other reason was that gentleman relieved or dismissed from his office. The hon. gentleman says—and this is a new charge certainly against myself—that he made seizures, and I gave them up. I am glad to know that somebody says I had leniency enough to surrender anything to any person; in all cases, I can assure the hon. gentleman, where seizures are made by my officers, and I find that they have over-stepped their duties, and that there has been no guilt, the goods are surrendered at

Mr. BOWELL.

once; but I have endeavored to enforce the law where people have wilfully violated it. If it is any grain of comfort to my hon. friend, I have given the facts, and I am quite prepared to go to the country and leave it to the electors as to the whole management of the Customs Department under his *regime* and under that of the present Government. I can tell him this: that notwithstanding the fact that we have been increasing salaries at different points throughout the Dominion, the expenditure last year was \$709,855, as against \$719,711 in 1878-79. The hon. gentlemen who were administering the affairs of this country in 1878-79 collected only \$12,939,540, while last year this Government collected \$21,708,837, or a difference, as regards cost, of between \$719,711 and \$723,855. I do not desire to mislead the House. I have deducted from this amount the expenditure for the Board of Appraisers; but adding the Board of Appraisers, how does it stand? This Board cost, last year, \$14,058, and I have no hesitation in saying that they have added tens and scores of thousands of dollars to the revenue, still the only increase in collecting \$21,708,837 as against \$12,939,540, was the difference between \$719,711 and \$723,913, or \$4,202 more, including the expenditure of over \$14,000 for the Board of Detectives and Appraisers to collect \$21,708,837 as against \$12,939,540. The comparisons are not such that we need be afraid of them, if we are to go before the people, and to ask them to judge upon the merits of the administration of the Customs Department now, as when my hon. friend was responsible for the work.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman might, however, supplement his remarks. I do not want to detract at all from the efficiency with which the hon. Minister manages his Department. I have not hesitated to say—and I consider—that he administers it with a great deal of efficiency; but when he seeks to leave the impression on the minds of the country that there has been about double the amount of work done for a very slight increase in the amount it was done for—and I say that this is the tendency of the hon. gentleman's argument: that there has been nearly double the amount of work done for very little more pay—I say that this is not the correct way of putting it. It is entirely a misleading way of putting it. The hon. gentleman knows very well, in fact he illustrated the point admirably himself a short time ago, in response to the hon. member for L'Islet, when he instanced that they were enabled, at the Port of Montreal, to more than double their collections without any increase in the staff whatever—that it is no more trouble and no more work for the Collector of Customs to take 35 cts. on the dollar on an invoice, than to take 17½ cts. They have not increased work to do; and I only point this out, not to attack the hon. gentleman, because I am not afraid to say as I repeat now, that I believe he does administer his Department with a great deal of efficiency, but to prevent his leaving a wrong impression on the minds of the House, and more particular on the minds of the country, because he is talking about the question being discussed before the country; and he puts the figures in such a way as to lead the people to suppose that nearly double the work has been done for very little increased pay; and this is not, I say, the fairest and most candid way of putting it. The work may be as great as it was under the late Administration, it may be a little more; but to suppose that the work of the officers is anything like proportionately advanced with the increase in the revenue, the hon. Minister know is entirely erroneous, and something that will not bear investigation at all, from the simple fact that where these officers collected, under the late Administration, 17½ cts. on the dollar on invoices, they in a great many cases now collect 35 cts. The calculations to be made by the officers, and the amount of money to be counted over by them, and all that, is very slightly to increase

the work, as any man must know. I just think it is desirable that these remarks should go to the country in connection with the statements of the hon. gentleman in order that the people may understand aright, not that the hon. gentleman does not administer his Department efficiently, but that he must not claim or seek to get credit for doing a vastly greater amount of work, with the same number of hands, than was done under the late Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says there is a very slight increase in the amount of work particularly in collections. Well, I do not know what the hon. gentleman's idea of small and slight amounts is. His business may be of such magnitude that a few millions dwindle into insignificance. The difference in the amount collected between 1878-79 and 1882 is 70 per cent., while the increase in total expenditure of 1882 over 1878 was about  $1\frac{2}{10}$  per cent. The hon. gentleman estimates that there is no more work now in connection with the revenue than there was in 1878-79. I did not intend to leave the impression that there was double the amount of work; but any one who will take the present Tariff and go into the Customs House, particularly in the case of Montreal, will see that this Tariff—which it would not be improper to call an intricate Tariff—requires more calculation, a larger number of appraisers, and a greater number of outside officers, from the fact that there are more goods coming into the port. Hon. gentlemen will find, when they compare the expenditure of 1878 with the expenditure of last year, that the latter, less the Board of Appraisers, was not so great by nearly \$10,000, than was the expenditure for 1878. This is a matter for which, I think, any Government may take credit to themselves. The hon. gentleman says that the Government have taken the credit for the fact that they did the same amount of work with the same officers. I say that there are fewer officers in the city of Montreal, to which he referred, than there were in 1878, although the amount of money collected is larger, and the work greater.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The volume of the imports would be a better test.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. VAIL. I wish to point out that unfortunately for Nova Scotia, in every case she gets a very small share, while the other Provinces get a larger share, so that I do not complain that the amount is too large, but rather that it is reduced. With regard to Weymouth, I do not think the amount collected shows any more deficiency on the part of the present officer than his predecessor, as the amount has really been less.

Mr. BOWELL. The number of vessels seized has been much increased.

Mr. VAIL. Yes; but the amount of money inuring to the Customs Department could not have been very large or it would have shown in the returns. While I am on my feet, it may not be out of place for me to mention the fact that some of the Customs officials are in the habit of leaving their office business on election days, instead of attending to their official duties. I have been in politics a good many years, and I have for a good many years been in a position which would enable me to have officials removed if I chose, but I have never had a county official removed in my life. During the last Election we witnessed the unseemly sight of the late collector going around in his waggon during the day carrying voters to the poll, and then presenting himself at the polling place when he was very much astonished to find that he could not vote. I hope the hon. gentleman will give his officials to understand that their place is in their offices, and not at the polls, on election day.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see there was a very large increase in Manitoba, which perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain.

Mr. BOWELL. The increase in Manitoba is very large. There is required this year about \$25,000 additional to carry on the work in Manitoba and the North-West. The increase arose from this fact: Last summer when the blockade took place, it was utterly impossible to get goods through, and telegrams kept coming in so rapidly to myself, that I sent Mr. Mewburn, the Inspector, to Winnipeg, with instructions to get as many men as were necessary to perform the duties at that port. He at once employed some sixteen or twenty men at from \$2 to \$2.50 per day, which was the lowest sum at which he could get good and responsible men to do the work. When I tell the hon. gentleman that the number of cars arriving and departing per day by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as I ascertained when I went up, was 600, he will see the absolute necessity of increasing the expenditure at that port.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman will excuse me. I notice that there was a collector and staff at Emerson, and I notice that the salaries of the collector and the whole staff at Emerson are given in the Public Accounts, but not in the comparative statement in the Estimates.

Mr. BOWELL. That arises from the fact that Emerson was formerly an outport of Winnipeg, but it has been erected into a distinct and separate port with a collector, landing waiter, &c.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I see that this item in the general statement for Manitoba is not correct. The hon. gentleman is asking in the Supplementary Estimates, which were brought down to day, \$25,000 additional, which is not embraced in the list of expenditures for the current year.

Mr. BOWELL. These are the expenditures of last year in reference to the old Provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE. These expenditures altogether for 1882-83 are put at \$19,900, when they are really \$44,900.

Mr. BOWELL. This \$25,000 is to make up the deficiency in the present year. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, for in the comparisons which I made just now I did not include the expenditures and collections for the North-West, which are kept entirely distinct and separate. The expenditures for the North-West—in which, of course, is included Manitoba as well—will be about \$25,000 more than was estimated last year, and that amount will be required for next year. The same reason that I gave for not putting on a large number of officials on the permanent list at Montreal, applies in the case of Winnipeg. The permanent staff is very small. As we establish ports to the westward, at Portage la Prairie, at Brandon, and at Regina, which we propose to do as soon as the House rises, a certain proportion of the work which is now done at Winnipeg will be performed at those different ports; and as soon as the road is opened from Thunder Bay, a large proportion of the Canadian traffic which now passes into the country through the United States will go by that route, and the manifesting and checking of goods that now takes place will not occur. All the goods that pass into Manitoba through the United States have to be bonded at the frontier when they enter the United States, and have to be checked and entered in precisely the same way as foreign goods, the only difference being that the duty has not to be paid. The officers will be relieved of that labor, to a great extent, as soon as our own road is opened. Last year from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 worth of goods passed in bond from old Canada to Manitoba through the United States. Every dollar's worth of those goods, whether they were emigrants' effects, or goods manufactured in the country, or purchased in

Montreal, had to be bonded and released when they arrived at the port of destination. If they were all foreign goods, the Committee will at once see the immense amount of revenue that would have been derived from them; but all the work pertaining to the bonding, the releasing of the bonds, the making of the entries, and the keeping of the books, is nearly as great as if the duties had to be collected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). After the establishment of the ports at Brandon, Portage la Prairie and other points, the increased amount the hon. Minister is taking will not be expended at Winnipeg; but it is simply taken under that head for the sake of convenience.

Mr. BOWELL. They will all be outports, and the expenditure in connection with them will be chargeable to Winnipeg. By-and-bye, in case they become of sufficient importance, they will be made independent ports.

Mr. SCRIVER. I see that no provision is made for the increase in the salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors in accordance with the resolutions introduced the other day.

Mr. BOWELL. No; there is no provision. In the Civil Service Act it is provided that the maximum salary of an inspector may be \$2,500 instead of \$2,000 as at present.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is it intended to increase their salaries in the coming financial year?

Mr. BOWELL. It has not been decided.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). By what way do goods going into the North-West reach Fort McLeod and other distant points, without being entered at some port? Are goods sent to these points in bond? Have we any bonded warehouses at any of these points?

Mr. BOWELL. Not yet. The goods now pass in by way of Fort Benton.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are any permanent agencies to be employed in the North-West this year?

Mr. BOWELL. No; except that, as I have said, we propose to appoint a sub-collector at Regina, and the two other points I have mentioned. The goods that are entered at Winnipeg pay the duty there, and go westward; but a vast proportion of the goods for the Far West go in by mule trains *via* Fort Benton, and when they reach their destination they are taken charge of by the Mounted Police, and the duty collected upon them. We propose to continue that practice at all points where the Mounted Police are stationed, except the places where we may appoint sub-collectors. A large proportion of the supplies of the contractors of the Indian Department will, during the present year go by the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as it will carry them, and will then be transferred to ox or mule teams to be conveyed to their destination.

Mr. ROYAL. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to appoint any officer at Turtle Mountain?

Mr. BOWELL. Not at present. If, upon investigation, it is thought necessary to do so, we shall be able to appoint one and pay him out of the extra \$5,000 that we have taken.

Mr. ROYAL. I suppose there is an officer stationed at Gretna.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I have established that as an outport, and Mr. Leslie, who has been there for a number of years, will be appointed a sub-collector. If it should be found that he requires assistance the hon. gentleman will be informed of the fact. In British Columbia there is a slight increase. The business at Victoria is increasing to such an extent that we have to furnish additional help, and we give a slight increase to Mr. Finlay, the Chief Clerk, as well as to Mr. Milne, who acts as an appraiser, and I am under the impression that we shall have to appoint another

Mr. BOWELL.

landing waiter. We also may appoint a landing waiter at New Westminster.

Mr. DAVIES. I should like to ask the hon. Minister if he has done anything with regard to the claim I spoke of the other day.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not had time to look into it yet. It was a claim, I think, on behalf of an officer for work said to have been done in 1878, the man having been put on the staff contrary to the orders of the late hon. Minister of Customs. I think Mr. Gurrie, then collector, was instructed to employ no men without the consent of the Department. One claim came before me in which it was proved that a man had performed the duties for which he was employed; the collector was dead, and unable to pay him, and looking at the matter from an equitable stand-point, I concluded that he ought to be paid. If the officer to whom my hon. friend refers occupies a similar position, we will endeavor to treat his claim in an equitable manner.

Mr. DAVIES. The person I speak of stands in precisely the same position. He was employed at the same time, by the same man, doing the same work, and I hope, that, if the one has been paid, the other will not be left out of court. The only reason I can see why his case was not dealt with is that he is a poor man, and has not the means of bringing it before the Department as Mr. Ferguson had. I want to call the hon. Minister's attention to what I conceive to be a very unfair discrimination made against the officials of the Department of Prince Edward Island, as regards pay, as compared with similar officials in the adjoining Provinces. A great deal of complaint has been made the last year or two on this account, and if the hon. Minister will give the matter his attention, he will find a good ground for complaint. The interest of the public service is not advanced by underpaying officials. These officials in the Customs House at Charlottetown are very good officials, and some of them are clearly underpaid. Although they are political opponents of mine, I must say this good word in their behalf. I find that while the collectors at Halifax and St. John get \$3,000, at Charlottetown the collector only gets \$1,800. I submit that while these officials must possess the same qualifications and do the same class of work, there should be no discrimination made. The chief clerk in the Department at Charlottetown gets only \$350. He is a very excellent official, does his work well, and it is not fair that he should get less salary than the same officials in the adjoining Provinces who are paid \$1,500. If he were the employé of a mercantile establishment he would get \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year. Take the cashier in the Custom House at Charlottetown, he gets only \$500. It is absurd to say that a man possessing the qualification necessary to fill that position is only worth \$500. In the adjoining Provinces the same officials get \$1,200. This is very unfair, and I have no doubt the hon. Minister, if he has time to give it his attention, will remedy it. While the landing waiters in the adjoining Provinces get \$900, in Prince Edward Island they only get \$500, though they are good men, and have been a long time in the Department, and with the increased cost of living they cannot live comfortably on that salary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They would be very sorry to resign.

Mr. DAVIES. Possibly they would, for I do not know what they would do in Charlottetown if they did, for there is no other work there for them that I know of. If the hon. gentleman will look into the figures he will find that the discrimination is very unfair, and the salaries inadequate to the work these officials are obliged to do. I would also ask the hon. Minister to look into the salaries paid sub-collectors at the chief outports. He will find that it will be in the public interest that these men should be paid a reasonable

sum so that they may be able to give their full time to the country. It is generally believed that our public interests suffer materially because of the small salaries paid these men. I rose particularly, however, to call attention to the salaries of officials in the Custom House at Charlottetown.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman would look a little beyond his own port, he would find that in the city of Toronto, where it is certainly more expensive to live than in Charlottetown, quite a number of officers only receive \$600 a year, and at Quebec and Montreal, where the cost of living is also greater, tide waiters receive from \$500 to \$550 a year. I am not saying that it is too much, but that the hon. gentleman should not have left the impression on the House that landing waiters in other sections were receiving \$900, while in Charlottetown officers were paid less. He selected the very highest grade of that class at Montreal, Toronto, and some other places.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not mention Montreal or Toronto.

Mr. BOWELL. That is where you got your sum. Some landing waiters in those ports receive \$900, some \$1,000, and one or two \$1,200, but they are the chiefs, having supervision over all the others. The hon. gentleman says, there is an unfair discrimination between Charlottetown and the other ports. Considering the cost of living in other places you will find that his statement is not strictly accurate. The officials in Charlottetown, in proportion to the cost of living there, receive a proportionate amount to those in other ports. I was discussing this point the other day with a Senator from that section, and I asked him if he would take \$800 a year, and live in Charlottetown, in preference to \$1,200 a year in Montreal, or Halifax, and he said he would prefer the former.

Mr. DAVIES. He was not fair in doing that. I made a fair statement, taking the same grade of officials in St. John and Halifax where the cost of living is no higher than at Charlottetown. I find that while the first landing waiter in both these places get \$1,000, in Charlottetown he only gets \$600. I submit that a man in the position of chief clerk or landing waiter ought to get the same pay in Prince Edward Island as elsewhere.

Mr. BOWELL. Halifax is an open port for the whole year, while Charlottetown is closed during the winter.

Mr. DAVIES. Still the Charlottetown clerks have to be at their desks the same hours through the year, and are not permitted to engage in any other business. I am sorry my hon. colleague is not in his place if it is to him the hon. Minister referred as having said he would prefer \$800 in Charlottetown to \$1,200 in St. John. There is not another man in Prince Edward Island who would take his views, as the cost of living is the same, and the character of the work as onerous, if not quite so heavy.

Mr. HACKETT. I have waited on the hon. Minister frequently with the view to having the salaries of officials raised, and always found that when a good case was made out, that the hon. gentleman was ready to do the fair thing. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, that the salaries are not as high as they should be in Prince Edward Island; and I think that when Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, justice was not done the officials, or they would have been placed on an equal footing with those of the other Provinces. For that we have to blame the friends of the hon. gentleman who fixed their salaries. The Island came into the Union when his friends were in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Island came into the Union when the other side were in power.

Mr. HACKETT. But the hon. gentleman fixed the salaries of the officials and cleaned out every official who was a Conservative. I may say that some of those officers held their commis-

sions from the Dominion, and still the hon. gentleman had no regard to that, and dismissed them. With regard to the chief clerk in the Charlottetown office, I believe that gentleman ought to have an increase of salary. A vacancy occurred a short time ago through the death of the chief clerk, and the gentleman now in office was appointed to take his place, and I consider that in all justice and fair play he should receive the same salary as his predecessor. I hope the hon. Minister will readjust the salary and place him at the same amount that was formerly given. I would also say, with regard to the collector at Alberton, that he is a very efficient officer, and attends faithfully to his duties the whole year round. He cannot engage in any other business, but he only receives \$250. I think the hon. Minister did give a small increase not long ago, but that officer should receive a higher salary as well as the officer at Port Hill. I think, as a general principle, the Government ought to pay its civil officers such salaries as will enable them to live without being obliged to engage in any other business.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not going to make any complaint about the dismissals that have been spoken of. My opinion is that the hon. member for East York did not dismiss enough officers when he came in. I do not care under what Government these salaries were fixed; the question is, whether these salaries are just in themselves at the present time. The reason they were fixed so low was this: When Prince Edward Island entered the Confederation, the cost of living there was cheaper than in any other Province, and a man could then live on \$1,000 a year, while it would be impossible for him to do so now. I say the hon. Minister has unjustly discriminated in the way he has fixed the salaries in Prince Edward Island as compared with the other Provinces. I trust he will consider, not only the salaries I have mentioned, but those in King's and Queen's counties also.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Under this item I observe \$15,000 to meet expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and outside detective service, including \$800 salary of the Commissioner of Customs as chairman of the Board. Is the Chief Commissioner to be paid this \$800 the current year by the same rate?

Mr. BOWELL. He is paid out of this \$15,000 as chairman of that Board, and this is the third year that he has been so paid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not complain about the amount, for I have not considered it; but would it not be better if the Commissioner was to receive \$300 more on his salary as an officer of the Customs Department, and make it \$1,000? This is practically evading the question of salary in the office he holds and charging \$800 to an outside service. He is really getting \$1,000 a year, while his salary is apparently only \$3,200.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but it will scarcely bear the designation of evasion. The sum is in the Public Accounts, and was last year, so that any member of the House could see what it was proposed to pay the Commissioner of Customs as chairman of the Board. I am sure my hon. friend knows that in connection with that Board this gentleman has a great deal of additional labor imposed upon him. Sometimes he is engaged till 8 or 9 o'clock in the evening, and as at the same time he fulfils all the duties of his Department, he deserves extra compensation. I am not prepared to say, however, that the suggestion made by my hon. friend would not be the best; and as the Civil Service Act provides for granting the salaries of the deputies in proportion to the labor they perform, the suggestion deserves the serious consideration of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am glad the hon. gentleman thinks so, because I think it is an evil practice, and it has existed to some extent both under the late Government and the

present one, though, I think, we put an end to it in some cases. I see several instances, in the Supplementary Estimates just laid before us, of extra payments made for special services to officers of the Departments. That is not a right method of making payments. If they deserve more salary for special services let them be paid that in the regular way, and let it be charged to the Department properly, and not to the outside service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has laid down the correct principle, that as a general rule a civil officer should be paid a salary in any particular Department which covers all his services. However, that rule cannot always be applied. The Deputy Minister of Customs acts as chairman of this Board and as long as this Board is continued he will act as chairman and get an additional salary; but if that Board be dissolved he returns to his salary of \$3,200.

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

### After Recess.

168. Salaries and disbursements of fishery overseers and wardens..... \$110,100.00

Mr. BLAKE. With respect to the vote for Ontario, I should like some little information. I observe there is a slight increase here. The experiment of propagating salmon in Lake Ontario has, I understand, been given up. What kind of fish are now intended to be propagated at the fish hatcheries?

Mr. BOWELL. The additional amount of \$1,000 is acquired for the readjustment of the salaries of the present officers, and provides for the appointment of a new officer, as well as to meet the increased cost of experiments. The fish breeding in Ontario is confined, I am informed, to salmon trout and whitefish.

Mr. BLAKE. Some suggestion was made, either in a report or elsewhere, in regard to propagating some coarser kinds of fish, such as carp, and that this fish would take the place of salmon. I was not aware that salmon trout was being propagated, and it was the true salmon to which I referred. Has any attempt been made to introduce carp?

Mr. BOWELL. Experiments are now being carried out, but the officers are not in a position to say whether they will be successful or not.

Mr. McISAAC. I see an item of \$25,000 for fish breeding, fish-ways and oyster beds. I should like to ascertain what proportion of this vote is expended on the construction of fish-ways, and whether it is expended on building fish-ways or not?

Mr. BOWELL. It is expended partly in building fish-ways. In many cases the parties interested in the different localities contribute a certain amount, or the Government can insist upon their bearing the whole expense where they desire any improved ways, but when the work is considered to be in the general interest of the public the Department appropriates a certain amount to assist in the construction of those ways.

Mr. McISAAC. I wish to bring to the notice of the acting Minister a fish-way on the River St. Marys, in the county of Guysborough, Nova Scotia. I have brought it to the notice of the head of the Department on several occasions, and have laid before him the condition in which it is, and he has promised to see that it shall be so improved as to carry out the object of the law. This is one of the most important fishing rivers in Nova Scotia, and on the Antigonish branch of it there is a mill dam, about five miles from Lake Lochaber, which is five miles long and one wide. It is about twenty-five miles from the mouth of

Mr. MACKENZIE.

the river, which is navigable for about eight miles. There is only one mill dam in the whole distance to this lake. The fish-way in the dam perhaps fulfils the law because the law may be complied with by a certain model or pattern of fish-way, which as in the present case may be entirely insufficient to carry out the object of the law. The dam is impassible, and, therefore, since its erection no fish have entered the lake, salmon particularly. Before the erection of the dam this lake was, perhaps, the best spawning ground in the whole Province, not only salmon but a variety of fish resorting to it. Since the construction of the dam, however, the river has been deserted by fish. I do not find fault with the Government in this matter, but I believe a subordinate of the Department is to blame, to some extent, for the manner in which this fish-way has been attended to. I find in the report of the Fishery Inspector, Mr. Rogers, an extract from the report made to him in 1881, by the local overseer, who says:

"The fish-ways are in good order as is evident from the number of fish seen ascending them when there is sufficient water."

This is not true, I am myself in a position to say that it is not true. They are not in good order at this dam, the fish-way is altogether impassible, and, as far as I know, there are only two fish-ways in the whole district over which this overseer has jurisdiction. If the Department had not interfered before now, although the matter was frequently brought to their notice, I hope that the acting Minister, in the absence of the Head of the Department, will see that a proper fish-way will be erected in a very short time. I pressed this on the hon. Minister early this Session, and urged that he should send the Provincial Inspector to see the locality, when he would be able to see the exact condition of this fish-way, and have a proper one placed there at the opening of navigation. At this very time salmon and gasperaux and other fish would, had this been done, have frequented it in great abundance and run up along the river and to the lake. I hope this will be attended to at once. I believe, from what I hear from experienced persons, that too much money is expended on artificial fish-breeding compared with the benefits that result from it. This money would be far better expended in keeping open the routes to the natural spawning grounds, such as the best lakes in the different Provinces, and that can only be done by having proper fish-ways placed in the dams. In most places where hatcheries and artificial modes of fish culture are used, this entails very great expense, and are found not so productive of good as would be the case if the same amount of money were applied in making the natural spawning grounds accessible to the fish which are in the habit of resorting to them. I trust that this matter will receive attention.

Mr. FORBES. I see that the grant here is increased by \$1,000, and I would like to know how it is to be expended. Whatever is the cause for this increase, I am glad to see it; I only wish it were more; but at the same time I do not know where it is to be applied, as the expenditure in our section for these objects has of late years been cut down. The objects in view are very important, but at the same time I do not think that they meet the ends for which they are intended, because although we might have lots of salmon and other fish there, they are gradually decreasing in numbers all the time. Under the circumstances, I would like some investigation made as to the facilities afforded to enable the fish to reach their spawning grounds. I coincide with my hon. friend in the opinion that the fish-ways do not answer the purpose. The better way would be to permit the fish to ascend the river to the great spawning grounds in a natural way. Some years ago, for instance, a dam gave way, opening the river straight up to the lakes, and the result the next year, and for several years



afterwards, was that we had a large increase in the number of the fish. Large quantities of gaspereaux and salmon were then caught. I believe, myself, that the fish ladders do not answer their purpose. Some fish by these means may get over the dams now and then, but, as a rule, the fish are almost entirely destroyed. During something like a month or two months in the year the water comes over the top of the dam with such force and violence that some salmon jump over and get up as far as the lakes, but I have no faith in them whatever. I once thought that they were useful, but during the last three or four years, since I have been there, I have paid particular attention to them, and my own conviction is that these ladders do not accomplish their object. They are not at all efficient. The large amount of \$35,000 is to be expended this year, in opening up fisheries, erecting fish ladders and improving oyster beds, and it seems to me that while we have been now for a long time placing these ladders in dams, we ought to be getting some benefit from these exertions; and if we are going to spend so much more money, with no better results, we had better use the money for something else—for instance, in opening the dams in such a way that the fish can go straight up through or under the dams in a natural manner. No more water would be thus lost than is the case in the fish ladders, and the benefits would be greater. It has been proposed by those interested in these matters, and by the officials of the county, that a fish-breeding establishment should be established on this river, as being one of the best places for fish culture in Nova Scotia. There would be very large reservoirs for the fish, large lakes and capital breeding grounds. In years gone by vessels came there and were loaded with salmon and alewives, but now we can hardly get any of these fish for ourselves. The other day several salmon were taken there, and the Indians got for them 50 cts. a pound; and we could just as well encourage fish-breeding and have any quantity of salmon and alewives. I would be greatly pleased if the Government would turn their attention to the location at this point of a fish-breeding establishment. Fish can be got there in abundance. They need not be imported from Halifax and other places. The eggs and the salmon could be plentifully obtained on the spot, and it would be the easiest and best place for raising and breeding salmon in the Province. I would be very sorry to see the project dropped. Indeed, I thought that this establishment would have been in operation long ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. Allow me to say a word about this fish-breeding business for which I assume the responsibility. I will only say that so far as regards Ontario the fish-breeding establishment in Lake Ontario for the production of salmon was always looked upon as an experiment. Indeed, it is a matter of doubt among scientific men whether the salmon which were caught in Lake Ontario ever went to the sea, and after some years of experience, though it has not proved as successful as we had hoped it would prove—the money which was expended upon it has not been entirely thrown away. In regard to the fish-breeding establishments upon the rivers which flow into the Atlantic, and those in the vicinity of the Atlantic, no one can say that they are a failure. I have watched them with considerable interest, and as Minister of Marine I took considerable interest in the encouragement of the example which was set in other countries for the purpose of producing these fish in this country, which is perhaps as well adapted to fish-breeding as any other country in the world. The experiments which we have made I do not at all look upon as failures; on the contrary, where partial failures have occurred they have been due, I believe, to the want of experience on the part of the persons who are in charge of them. It is true that we have not scientists to take charge of these establishments. We had to create the men and teach them their business—in fact it was necessary that these men should learn by

practical experience before they could successfully conduct such experiments. Taking the establishments altogether their success has been such as to warrant the Department in continuing what I believe to be a good work. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) has stated that he believed that it would be very desirable, instead of spending the money on these fish-breeding establishments, to spend it in encouraging the protection of the fisheries in other ways. I do not know how my hon. friend would propose to encourage the protection of the fisheries. The records of the Department show that since 1867 very great efforts have been made to protect the fish by seeing that they were not speared at improper seasons, and that the close season was observed as well as possible, considering the extent and character of the fisheries of the Dominion; and the officers of the Department had to assume grave and serious responsibility, and to perform very unpleasant duties in their protecting the fisheries. We all know how the feelings of the people are aroused when they are not permitted to catch fish from the banks of rivers which pass through their property for the purpose of using them as food or selling them on the market to make a little money. I say, after some considerable experience, that in my opinion the fishery officers deserve the moral support of the community, and instead of being found fault with, as they often are, they should receive a great deal of credit for the manner in which they perform their responsible duties. The hon. gentleman suggests that some means should be taken whereby the rivers should be kept free from obstructions, so that the fish could pass up. That is one of the serious questions which the Department has always had to deal with. It becomes a question whether we would not entirely prevent facilities for the prosecution of manufactories by the use of natural water power from one end of the Dominion to the other. The lumbering business is just as essential to the prosperity of this country relatively, at all events, as the fisheries, and it would be very likely to create difficulty and trouble to the Government of any country if we were to say that we were to allow no dams to be placed across rivers which are the natural breeding places of fish. We cannot in this country do away with the local laws which give corporations and individuals power to place obstructions across rivers which are not navigable in the sense designed by the line of demarcation between the power of the Local and the Dominion Governments. When this Department was called into existence in 1867, we found those obstructions existing which would prevent the rise of fish from the sea to their proper breeding places. We could not sweep away those obstructions and have the streams in the condition they were in a century before, but we adopted a mean between the two extremes of sweeping them off altogether, and leaving them as they were—we adopted such means as experience had proved to be successful in older countries. We endeavored to secure the most improved description of fish-ways, and we also interested the mill owners by allowing them a certain proportion—one-third or one-half, I think, of the cost of putting in these fish-ways on an improved pattern which would be approved by the Department. So far as my experience is concerned, the efforts which were made to carry out that policy were at least comparatively successful in this country. I have no doubt that the complaints of my hon. friend from Antigonish may be explained by the fact that the most improved kind of fish-ways have not been adopted, and I know how difficult it is to get a proprietor who goes to an outlay of perhaps \$400, or \$500, or \$1,000, in putting up a fish-way, to make any alteration or improvement. I have no doubt, however, that the attention of the Government having been called to the matter by my hon. friend, it will receive such consideration as will result in the removal of the difficulties which he has stated. It is often said in the

counties along the Atlantic coast in which I have been in the habit of travelling, that they do not catch so many salmon as in the old times; but I had the pleasure of being in my own constituency last summer, when I saw 300 taken out of one net in one morning. I asked one of the largest salmon fishermen in my county whether he thought these fish-breeding establishments had or had not benefited the fishery interests of the country. He said: "It is true many people complain that we do not catch as many fish, because there are three times the number of net fishermen that there used to be; they have found the business a profitable one, and instead of having to sell their fish at 2½ cts. to 5 cts. a lb., as was the case for years and years until the Intercolonial Railway gave to our fishermen the markets of New York and Boston, they now get from 25 cts. to 50 cts. a lb." My belief is, and I have great pleasure in stating it, that the fish are as abundant as ever in the second river of the Province from which I come, the river that runs through my county; and looking at the great number of nets, and at the increased number of people who are employed, I think the salmon business is more profitable to the people who pursue it to-day than it was twenty years ago, and I believe quite as many fish are caught to-day as were caught ten years ago, before these fish-breeding establishments were adopted. The whole system of marketing salmon, the great fish of commerce in our country, has very much changed. The immense freezing establishments which have been put up enable the people to freeze their fish for months in a fresh state, so that, instead of being obliged to salt them down and sell them for from \$10 to \$15 a barrel, they are able to market them fresh, not only from May to July, the time during which the salmon are chiefly caught, but all the way up to February, March and April. If you go into the fish market of Boston, New York, or even Montreal, you will find these fresh fish bringing from 25 cts. to 50 cts. a lb., instead of from 2½ cts. to 5 cts. a lb., which these people had to accept when they were obliged to salt them down. The people engaged in the fishing industry have reason to be thankful for all the protection given to them during the past fifteen years. The Government of Canada—I am not speaking of either party in particular—have faithfully carried out the policy initiated in 1867, of giving a reasonable protection to the fishing interests of this country, with due regard to the expenditure. The Parliament of Canada, by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, have given a means of marketing our fish, and with the additional railway facilities which are now being created, I have no doubt that the industry will be largely extended in the future. I am very glad to have had the opportunity of making these few remarks, and I trust that the hon. Minister will not feel that I am trenching upon his Department in speaking as I have done, because I feel myself somewhat responsible for the bringing about of these changes.

Mr. KIRK. I do not know whether the results obtained from this large expenditure in fish-breeding establishments have been satisfactory or not. I think, however, that it is a reasonable expenditure; it has been successful in other countries, and I think it is the only way in which rivers which have been entirely fished out can be restocked with salmon and other fish. But I believe that it would be better to protect those rivers in which the salmon are not entirely destroyed; that would be the cheapest way of increasing the supply. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) has spoken of the River St. Mary's in my county, and of one or two dams being on that river, with fish-ways constructed through them. The dams are not on the river itself, but on streams flowing into it. The dam on the Antigonish branch, in which he is most particularly interested, was constructed many years ago, and before there was a fish-way erected in it the salmon were entirely

Mr. MITCHELL.

destroyed in that stream. Salmon were known to go up that stream before the fish-ways were erected, and the fish-ways are of such peculiar construction that I venture to say that no salmon will go up them. I suppose they are the same kind of fish-ways that are constructed in other parts of the country. I believe, however, that gaspereaux and trout may go up, if the fish-ways are properly protected. There is no one there who has any authority to see that they are kept open, and it is not likely that mill-owners will be anxious to keep the gates up to allow the water to run. I think it would be well for the Government to appoint some one near the dam whose duty it would be to see that the fish-ways are kept open in the proper season of the year. There are dams on other streams running into the St. Mary's River quite as important as this one. There is one, for instance, a short distance from where I live, in which there is a fish-way, but it is kept in such a state that no fish can go up, unless at the time of the freshets, and these freshets occur when there are no fish in the stream. The difficulty in this place is, however, that the Government officer there is the proper owner of the mill. There is also another dam in sight of my own door which is in such a condition that it is impossible for the fish to ascend it at all. This stream was one of the best for gaspereaux and trout we have in the whole district, but since the dam has been built, or at least since ten years after it was built, not a man has gone to that stream to catch fish of any kind. They have been completely destroyed in consequence of the fish-way not being properly kept. There is another stream I may say a word about—the Stornoway—where there has never been a fish-way at the dam. I believe this used to be a very important stream for catching gaspereaux and trout, but now it is entirely destroyed. It is necessary a fish-way should be erected at this dam that people may have an opportunity to catch a supply of fresh fish during the spring. I believe, with regard to these two dams, that the owners are the Government officers, and consequently they will not look after them. So far, at any rate, they have never done so. The St. Mary has two branches, west and east. On the east branch there is a dam, and I believe a fish-way there is useless also. There is a dam on the west branch where there is no mill; it is built for lumbering purposes. That dam has a proper gate, which, if kept open in the proper season, is all that is required. I am told that it is not, and that it requires to be looked after. I wrote to the Department some time ago stating that the fish warden had left the district, and there was a distance of twenty-five miles without any warden. I asked the Department to appoint some one to see that the fish were protected, and if the Government has not complied with my request it is important that they should. With regard to the laws, I think they are quite stringent enough, and if properly enforced are quite sufficient to protect the fish; but I do not think they are properly enforced, as far as my county is concerned, and I think the Department should see that the local officers do their duty. A number of alterations have been made in the fishery wardens, I fear for political purposes, and to one I wish to draw particular attention—that is at the still water near the forks of the St. Mary, a most important section of the river where the people are poaching, seining, and spearing continually. When the late Government were in power, I succeeded in inducing them to appoint a very efficient officer in that district, and he succeeded in breaking up the poaching altogether; but the present Government dismissed him and appointed in his place an old man who would not venture for his whole salary to go through the district one single night lest these poachers might get hold of him. I do not say this thing was done for political purposes, perhaps it was done in the interest of the fishery, but nevertheless it was done, and the Government should look into it. There are other similar

cases, but I will not refer to them, except to say that every fish warden appointed by the late Government during the five years they were in power, in the district of St. Mary, were dismissed and others put in their place, with one exception, and I am sure they did not improve the breed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to call the attention of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a letter I received from a gentleman at Lake Erie who is, I believe, an authority on matters of this kind. I had written to this gentleman after having received a letter from Mr. Wilmot, offering to distribute a certain amount of white fish and salmon which should be put into Long Point Bay, Lake Erie, and he writes to me evidently much discouraged with the operation of pound net fishing, and says he hardly thinks it worth while to take any fish from the hatchery owing to the destruction of fish by this means. He writes as follows:—

"I am informed by reliable fishermen that for every marketable fish taken in these nets, there are destroyed from 25 to 100 or more of the smaller fish which have become fastened in the meshes of the nets and there remain until decomposed when they fall to the bottom of the Lake covering it frequently to the depth of several inches all over the fishing grounds. So long as such wholesale destruction of young fish is permitted by the hon. Minister of Fisheries there can be no earthly use in going to the expense and trouble of placing other fish here to be likewise destroyed. I am informed that the New York, Pennsylvania, and, perhaps the Ohio State Legislatures have prohibited pound net fishing in consequence of the great destruction of small fish, and have made it a punishable offence to offer for sale, any fish so taken, no matter from whence they come, as they are frequently unfit for food from long confinement in these nets, &c., &c. If you can do anything in the way of abolishing 'pound net fishing' you will confer a great blessing upon the poor fishermen along the Canadian shore of Lake Erie, whose occupation is being so rapidly destroyed. If you can persuade the Governor in Council to abolish pound net fishing you will have done more in the interests of the fisherman than all the hatcheries in the Dominion. The fisherman along our Lake shore are completely discouraged and in many instances reduced to a state of destitution by this destructive system of fishing, which is depriving them of a legitimate occupation.

"Yours respectfully,

"J. M. SALMON."

This is a letter from J. M. Salmon, M. D., of Simcoe, a gentleman of high respectability, and it is a matter which may well engage the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I am aware, from my own knowledge, that it is a very destructive mode of fishing. In proportion to the quantity of marketable fish taken, a very large amount of small fish are destroyed.

Mr. DAWSON. I am very happy to think that the fish hatcheries have been so successful. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken refer principally to the sea coast, but we have lake fisheries also, and I am happy to say that the system pursued there has also been successful. In some cases they reserve fishing grounds, and these are frequently just as good as fish hatcheries, and the result is that when a certain space of ground is reserved, and no fishing whatever allowed in it, the fish breed very fast and spread to the surrounding sections. Now, an instance of this has occurred at Lake Superior, where a large island has been reserved, and the fish have increased so rapidly at that place, where they are not molested, that the surrounding bays for a considerable distance are again becoming stocked with fish. Now, that is a clear instance of the advantage of having reserves where fish are not allowed to be caught. I quite concur with the hon. gentleman who has spoken last about these pound nets. Pound nets are infernal machines, as it were, to the fish, and are very destructive indeed. They have been used on the American side of the waters to such an extent as almost to annihilate the fish in the lakes, and I really hope that they will not be encouraged on our side. They have not been tried to any very great extent on our side, and I hope the Department of Fisheries will keep them out. I am happy to say that I consider this Fishery Department, so far as regards our inland lakes and the waters with which I am acquainted, an exceedingly well arranged Department of Government.

Mr. DAVIES. I may say that I am in full sympathy with all the efforts made by the Department for the establishment of fish hatcheries throughout the Dominion, and for the improvement of the fisheries. But I think that as regards those in Prince Edward Island it is yet too early to say what the results may be. I think the money expended in that direction will produce good results in the near future. I have been at the hatchery a good many times since it was established, and although we cannot say yet that it has improved the catch of fish in the river, the general opinion of those who have fished there very often is that it is improving the stream. But I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister to a statement made by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Kirk). Theoretically the system adopted is capital, but practically it does not work well, because too much politics are imported into it. The men appointed as guardians of the rivers do not do their duty. There is no use disguising the fact. It is well known and openly talked of. These men receive their pay, but do not attempt to protect the fisheries as they should do. But I rose specially to ask the acting Minister whether the statement of the hon. member for Northumberland, with reference to the establishment of fisheries, is correct? I understood him to say the Department were prepared to pay half the cost. That has not been acted upon in Prince Edward Island, but if it is so I am glad to hear it. I have a number of letters from parties who have been applied to by the Government who has charge of the fisheries of the Island, asking them to establish these fish-ways, and stating that they should do it at their own expense. They demurred to that, and I think it is rather hard. Some of them have been on the river forty years, and they think it is hard to be obliged to build those fish-ways at their own expense. I would also like to ask the acting Minister with reference to the great oyster beds. There is no more important industry in Prince Edward Island than the cultivation of oysters. We have the reputation of exporting the best oysters in the Dominion, yet our beds are becoming rapidly depleted from want of looking after. I am not aware that any steps have been taken by the Department so far for the protection of this particular branch of the fisheries, or for providing the manner in which oysters should be fished. I would like to know whether, with this \$35,000 he has asked for, he contemplates the establishment of oyster beds in any part of the Dominion. I know very well that the late Judge Pope of Prince Edward Island, at his own expense, established some oyster beds in Prince county, where the best oysters are grown. Financially it was not a success, but he produced some magnificent oysters, some of the best ever exported. I would like to know whether the Government contemplate taking any steps towards planting these oyster beds. It would astonish hon. members were I to give them the figures showing the quantity of oysters exported from Prince Edward Island from year to year. I am sorry to say that while the figures are very large, the beds are now being depleted and destroyed; and I for one would cordially endorse any regulations issued by the Department for the purpose of protecting these beds or of planting new ones.

Mr. BRECKEN. I cannot agree with my hon. colleague in his statement that the reason why the fish hatcheries in Prince Edward Island have not been more successful, is because too much politics are imported into them. Now, I happen to know something about the appointment of the fishery wardens, and I am not aware that those gentlemen who were appointed by the present Government are at all open to that imputation. My hon. friend will agree with me when I state that when his friends were in power they never would look at an applicant for any office or position if the applicant happened to belong to the Conservative party. Why, Sir, a man would have been looked upon by

the Liberals of Prince Edward Island as fit for a lunatic asylum if he attempted anything of the kind. I may state the only charge that is brought against the Conservative party of Prince Edward Island, is, that they do not follow our Liberal friends in that respect; they are a little too good natured, and sometimes they do allow a Liberal to get into office under the Administration of the present Government—a political sin that my hon. friend and his party in Prince Edward Island were never guilty of. I was not in the House this afternoon when my hon. friend expressed his regret that the slaughter which took place among the Liberal-Conservatives in 1878 was not more extensive than it was. I think that my hon. colleague has been guilty of the sin of ingratitude. If he would look back and remember the officials who were retained in office and whose salaries were increased under the Administration of the Liberal Conservative party, I think he would feel himself guilty of the sin of ingratitude. I am glad to say there is one point on which we can agree, and that is, to express the hope that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will see their way to do something to protect and develop the oyster fisheries of the Island. I do not suppose in any part of the world a better quality of oyster can be found than in our Province. In the early history of the Island it was surrounded with oyster beds, but owing to the want of protection and cultivation they have been destroyed. A great enemy of the oyster is the mussel. Mussel mud destroys the oyster, and that mussel mud which we use now, which is dug up during the winter months, and is a very valuable manure, is nothing more nor less than old oyster beds. In Prince county there are still good oyster beds, as my colleague has stated; the late Judge Pope and the late hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries having devoted a good deal of time and money in establishing an oyster plantation, and with some success. But both of those hon. gentlemen had a variety of other occupations, and were not able to devote that time and attention to the matter which the value of the interest would no doubt command from others. The exportation of oysters is very large; and yet with the exception of the oyster plantation which was first started, as I have said, by Judge Pope, in Cascumpec Narrows, there is no place where they have been protected and cultivated. The increase of oysters is something miraculous, if they receive a moderate amount of protection. No shell-fish propagates more numerously than the oyster, and the oyster fisheries are much more valuable than any inland fisheries, even the salmon fishery—of course, I do not allude to seal fisheries. I am very glad my hon. colleague has referred to this matter, and I am sure if the Government and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the present acting hon. Minister, were well acquainted with the wealth which that fishery brings to the Island, they would consider it well worth their attention, protection and encouragement, not only to preserve but to increase that fishery. The fame of Prince Edward Island oysters has reached this city, and in no part of the Dominion where an Island oyster can be obtained do connoisseurs care for the oysters from the United States or any other country. I hope the hon. Minister will devote attention to this subject. I can assure him that a very small amount of money expended, and it will not take much, will be productive of great results. Richmond Bay, Cascumpec Narrows and that locality afford good oyster beds. I have spent some days at Judge Pope's plantation, and saw Indians bringing oysters there and disposing of them at \$1 per barrel, of two and a-half bushels. That part of the Island is peculiarly adapted to oyster culture. The fish require a hard bottom, and it is advisable to have rocks or brush to which spawn may cling. If every spawn were allowed to live and grow they would block up the harbors in a very short time, but the oyster has many enemies and fish feed on them. The cost involved in dealing with this question would be very small

Mr. BRECKEN.

and the benefit very great, and the result would be not only to confer advantage on the Government, but to add a source of great wealth to the people of the Island who live in the vicinity of the oyster beds.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to ask the acting Minister what is being done in the way of hatching fish, what quantity of the young fish has been distributed, and in what localities? I desire to impress on the Government the advisability of instructing the Fish Inspectors to look carefully after fish-ways. That is a most important matter in connection with the fisheries. It is a matter surrounded with great difficulty, but it is one to which I hope the Government will turn their attention, and also the advisability of instructing the Inspectors to prevent, in every possible way, the destruction of fishing streams by sawdust. No doubt one cause of the enormous destruction of fish is the amount of sawdust poured into the streams, which are thereby poisoned.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I observe that over \$16,000 are paid for the maintenance of fish works in Nova Scotia. I do not intend to find fault with the present Government in regard to this matter, because the late Government are responsible for the condition of the river fisheries in Nova Scotia; but that expenditure, as now going on by the Marine and Fisheries Department, is a perfect waste of public money. The river fisheries of Nova Scotia are in a most deplorable condition. It is true they have an Inspector of river fisheries, and officers in every county of the Province, but the money expended under that head is simply thrown away. There is not a river on the south side of the Province where fish are able to find their way to the interior of the country in any great quantity. The present Inspector of river fisheries has given some attention to the erection of fish ladders on those rivers; but in many instances the fish have been unable to get up them. There is no more important industry in Nova Scotia than the river fisheries, and on its protection and development depend, not only the river fisheries, but the shore fisheries as well. I desire to obtain some information in regard to this item of \$16,000. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that there was paid last year \$1,400 to Mr. Rogers, who was also paid \$1,264 for travelling expenses. An officer receiving that amount should do a great deal of work, and we should be able to see some benefit accruing from his travelling all over the Province inspecting the rivers. I also find there was a salary paid to F. D. H. Vieth, as Inspector. I wish to know who this last gentleman is, what his duties were, and something about him? I cannot understand why the Government, besides wasting \$16,000 in the way it has done, have appointed two Inspectors of river fisheries for the Province of Nova Scotia, and I would like the acting Minister to give some information on that point.

Mr. BOWELL. He was appointed to assist the other officer in looking after the river fisheries and in endeavoring to enforce the laws.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Do I understand that this officer was appointed because the other officer was incapable of enforcing the law?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that. Because there are thirty-five fishery overseers in Guysborough, it does not follow that every one of them is incapable of performing his duties.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not by any means. That is a different thing.

Mr. BOWELL. It sometimes may occur that an Inspector has more than he can possibly do; and he may have a very large number of officers to assist him in enforcing the law.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Has this officer made any reports to the Department?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; he has made the usual reports.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Why are they not printed, or laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed that the custom in the past has been to print only the regular reports of the Chief Inspectors unless they are specially asked for. If the hon. gentleman wishes the other reports, I will have very great pleasure in asking the Department to furnish them, and I will lay them on the Table.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think it is of the utmost importance, as far as I can learn, that these reports should be laid on the Table when they come down, and I wish that the acting Minister would give some attention to them. Will they be laid on the Table before Concurrence?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; if they can be prepared.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will then postpone my further remarks until these reports are on the Table.

Mr. BAKER. I see in the vote for British Columbia an increase, I am happy to say, of about 30 per cent. as compared with last year, or \$500; and I would like to know whether this is to go to increase the pay of the Inspector of Fisheries for the Province of British Columbia, because he is an officer of great ability. His whole time is taken up with the inspection of fisheries, which necessitates a very great amount of work that is daily extending, and for which he receives the very small sum of \$50 a month. I would like—if this is not already down—that provision should be made in the Supplementary Estimates to give this officer a tangible increase to his salary, the necessity of which I beg to strongly urge on the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend from Northumberland for relieving me of the duty of replying to some remarks which were made by my hon. friend from Antigonish. The hon. gentleman has treated that subject from the personal knowledge which he has himself, and from his long experience as Minister in this Department; hence I am relieved to a very great extent from further discussing that matter. My hon. friend complained of one of the fish-ways in St. Mary's River as not accomplishing the object for which it was constructed; but I am informed that this fish-way is not of the improved character which is now insisted on by the Department—an improvement which, I believe, is patented. This dam may not be of the character which it should be. I believe, that there are two mills on the stream; and if the mill owners have not complied with the law, as they should have done, the Department will see that this great interest is protected in that river. The Department has not lost sight of the difficulties which have arisen, and which have been pointed out by the hon. member for the county, for they have already instructed the Inspectors to make a special report on the subject, so far as it affects the immediate locality to which the hon. gentleman refers. I am informed by the Commissioner that this report has not yet been received; but I think I can safely promise the hon. gentleman, that as soon as the errors to which he has called attention have been pointed out by the Inspector, steps will be taken to remedy these difficulties. The question of fish-ways is one, I know, upon which there is great diversity of opinion. The hon. member for Northumberland has, however, fully dealt with that subject, and I will not dwell upon it. I am also informed that as to the Liverpool River, to which my hon. friend from Queen's (N. S.) referred, the information they have in the Department is, that there are a greater quantity of fish, both of gasporeaux and salmon, now caught in that river, than has been the case for a great number of years, and that they are increasing

in number; also that the most important and best fish-ways in the country are in that river. It may be possible, owing to the reasons given by the hon. member for Northumberland, that complaints may arise from the fact of there now being such a greater number of fishermen, than was the case in the past; and every one of them cannot obtain the same quantity as formerly, when there may not have been so many fish and not one-tenth of the number of fishermen. The increase of \$1,000 in this service is required to pay salaries and the disbursements of additional fishery overseers and wardens which it may be found necessary to employ in accordance with growing requirements. If the hon. member for Queen's will refer to page 241 of the Report for 1882, he will find that a full detail of the salaries of the fishery overseers and wardens of Nova Scotia is given. My hon. friend from Guysborough called attention to the absolute necessity of protecting the rivers, and particularly those in his own county, and complained that these officers did not do their duty. I have no doubt that there is a very extensive coast, and perhaps the inland waters may be much more extensive than I have any idea of; but I find in the report that no less than twenty-five fishery overseers are employed in that county. I am not sure how many wardens there are on the two branches of St. Mary's River, but I think there are some three or four. I know that in the whole county from the statement I have before me, there are no less than twenty-five officers, and they ought to be efficient, because the head of the list commences with a Tory. It is a fact, and no one knows it better than the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), that it is difficult to protect rivers, and especially the mouths of rivers, from the depredations of those who are constantly poaching at seasons of the year when they should not poach. I have no doubt that he knows also that parties even in this particular river have been arrested, and tried and punished for taking fish at improper times. I quite agree with him that if these officers, and particularly the Inspectors, are to be of any use they should instruct the overseers to carry out the law rigidly. But everyone knows, and especially hon. members of Parliament, the difficulty of enforcing laws of this kind in almost any locality. The moment that anyone violates the law influences are used to get them clear, and I have no doubt that some of the twenty-five cases mentioned by the hon. gentleman were of that description. I notice, at any rate, that one of these men bears the same name as the hon. gentleman opposite, and I am quite sure that anyone bearing that name cannot possibly be a useless officer. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) called attention to the destruction of fish on Lake Erie by the use of pound nets. I believe the Department entertains much the same opinion about these nets as the hon. member for Algoma; but the difficulty which has arisen in connection with the use of these nets is the fact that the United States Government allow them to be used, and a great deal of discontent would be produced among our fishermen if we were to prohibit their use. However, the licenses contain clauses to prevent the destruction of these small fish, and if anyone is caught catching and destroying them in the manner described by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), his license is subject to be annulled. It is a question to which I have called the attention of the Commissioner, and he will take means in future, through the Fishery Inspector and overseer on Lake Erie, to prevent this destruction. As to the question put by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), regarding the assistance in the construction of fish-ways, the fact is that where the mill owner has complied with the requirements of the law, and it may be considered that the law is not sufficiently broad to enforce the placing of ways of a better character, or in case a freshet carries them away, then the Department assists in the rebuilding of these fish-ways. The

law provides that a grant may be made to a certain class of ladders or fish-ways if they are considered to be of sufficient merit to justify the public grant. In such cases they are prepared, when applied to, to give at least one-half of the amount required to construct them, after an examination has been made by the Inspector.

Mr. DAVIES. My question had reference to mill owners who have had dams built for 30 or 40 years. I know of two cases, at least, in which the Inspector required them to build fish-ways. Has the mill-owner in such cases to bear the entire cost, or does the Department assume part of it?

Mr. BOWELL. The law has been in existence since Confederation, and it compels mill owners to construct those fish-ways, whether upon old dams or upon new ones. But in case increased facilities are required to enable the fish to ascend the rivers, and the Inspector reports that they are of sufficient importance that assistance should be given, then the assistance may be granted by the Department.

Mr. DAVIES. I also asked the hon. gentleman a question with regard to the \$35,000 which he proposes to vote for oyster beds. Is any portion of that to be expended on the cultivation of oysters in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. BOWELL. The question of the cultivation of oysters is a subject to which the Department has given a great deal of consideration for many years. The system which is followed in the United States is to encourage private individuals to plant these oyster beds by giving them exclusive rights in certain places where the industry can be carried on successfully, and I believe that is the best mode which can possibly be adopted to encourage the industry in this country. Last year two licenses were granted to parties in British Columbia upon this plan, on the condition that when they begin to market the oysters they are to pay the Department 2½ per cent. royalty upon the gross proceeds of their sales. It is not the intention of the Department to plant any oyster beds themselves, but this vote is asked more particularly for the purpose of obtaining all possible information, scientific and otherwise, on this subject. The great difficulty in the past has been in obtaining the services of men who have studied the question, and whose knowledge of it is such as to justify their employment in the cultivation of oysters. I have no doubt that the Government and the Department, on mature consideration, will come to the conclusion to adopt the American system which has already been adopted to a limited extent in British Columbia, of granting an exclusive right to private individuals of sufficient means to carry on the enterprise to plant oyster beds in localities which are adapted to that purpose. I believe that that means will prove most successful in accomplishing the objects which the Department has in view. With regard to the oyster beds in Prince Edward Island, I have no doubt that any person of sufficient enterprise to carry on the industry successfully will get assistance. As to the vote for British Columbia the increase is for the purpose of providing for increases in the salaries and disbursements of the Inspector of Fisheries. There are two officers in British Columbia, an Inspector and an assistant, and the \$600 increase is for the purpose of increasing their salaries. My hon. friend from North Bruce asked a question as to the extent of the fish-breeding, and the results that have followed from it. I may state for the information of the Committee that the total number of fry distributed during the spring of 1882, was 56,000,000; the total number of eggs laid down during the fall of the same year was 58,162,000, being an increase over the previous year of over 17,000,000. The only statement I have as to the distribution of the products of this spawn relates to the hatcheries at Newcastle and Sandwich, and shows that 3,200,000 young fish are to be placed in different parts of the country, more particularly in Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not yet received the information I asked for? I wish to ask what portion of the \$35,000 for fish breeding, fish-ways, and oyster beds, is to be applied to oyster beds and where it is to be spent. I understood from the hon. Minister that no part of it is to be spent in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BOWELL. When I spoke, I spoke generally. I did not say that nothing was to be spent in Prince Edward Island or any other Province. What I did say was that I was not aware that any portion of that money was to be expended in the planting of oyster beds by the Government. I have given the hon. gentleman all the information that is in the Department with reference to that subject. The Commissioner of Fisheries, who has given the subject a great deal of attention, informs me that there is no intention, so far as he knows, on the part of the Government to plant these oyster beds; but they purpose obtaining further information from scientific and practical men, with the view of assisting private individuals in the planting of oyster beds, and a portion of this money will be utilized for that purpose; and I have no doubt that any enterprising gentleman in Prince Edward Island who asks the Government for assistance, will receive it in the same proportion as people in other parts of the Dominion. I can only regret, considering the importance of the cultivation of oysters, that the Government do not see their way clear just now to expending any large amount and taking the matter into their own hands.

Mr. BAKER. I wish the hon. Minister would more fully answer my question about the officer of whom I spoke, because if the whole amount of the increase for British Columbia were given to him, he would still be insufficiently paid. I would like to ask what proportion of the \$600 is going to this particular officer?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to say; but I can assure him that the Department will do that justice to him which he deserves.

Mr. BAKER. I wish to urge the hon. gentleman at the head of that Department to take the matter into consideration, and to pay the officer in proportion to the services he renders.

Mr. VAIL. If I understood the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), he said that there was very grave doubt in his mind whether the Dominion had the power to compel owners of dams to erect fish-ways; but I understood the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that the Dominion has that power. It is important that this question should be decided, because if the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries makes one statement, and the acting Minister makes another, I think the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are likely to take advantage of the statement of the ex-Minister, and say that they are not obliged to build the fish-ways. I would like also to know from the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries what the results have been of planting these small fish in the rivers of the country? We have had hatcheries now for some four or five years. If I am correctly informed in regard to fish culture, in three years we ought to see salmon of a pretty good size. I would like to know whether these fish have been taken and in what river, so as to ascertain, if possible, where it has been a success and where not? It has cost a good deal of money, and it is time we should know a little more about the result.

Mr. MITCHELL. I simply rise to tell the hon. gentleman that he entirely misunderstood what I said. There was no doubt as to whether the Dominion or the Local Government had the right, but I referred to the erection of dams across non-navigable streams. I did not profess to give a legal opinion. I merely rise to set my hon. friend

right, and I do not think any difference exists between the hon. Minister and myself.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood the hon. ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that when he was in charge of the Department it was customary in every case when a fish-way was required, for the Department to bear half the cost. The acting Minister says it is merely a matter in the discretion of the hon. Minister, and no doubt it will be allowed to friends and disallowed to others. If the statement of the ex-Minister is correct, the rule followed by him was a very good one, that whenever a new fish-way was required in an old dam, the Department bore half the expense. If, however, it is to be left to the discretion of the hon. Minister, very grievous wrongs would occur.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I said was, that, speaking from my recollection of some years ago, my impression was, that the Department allowed either one-half or one-third of the cost where a proper case was made out. I never meant to convey the idea that, as a matter of right, any person could get one-half the cost of putting a fish-way in the dam; but I will say, that whenever a case was made out during my administration of the office, in which parties could fairly claim they had a right to get aid in the putting up of fish-ways in dams, they invariably got it.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not understand the hon. member for Northumberland to say, that upon all occasions it was imperative on the part of the Government to give one-half, or even one-third the cost, but only when cases were made out that would justify the Department in doing so. When my hon. friend from Queen's states that he knows if it is left optional to the Government there will be gross wrongs perpetrated, insinuating that only a certain class of people will obtain assistance, I simply say to him that he should not judge others by himself. The mode of conducting a Government ought to be in the interests of the whole; and in the establishment of these fisheries, I can assure the hon. gentleman that, no matter who the party may be, wherever the river will justify the expenditure of any amount of money, to protect the fish, every attention will be given that river. We will not stop to argue, whether it is the hon. member for Queen's or any other gentleman, but the meed of justice will be dealt out to every one; and until the hon. gentleman is prepared to point out an instance in which this approval on the part of the Government has been abused, it will be time enough for him to throw out his insinuations and make the charge he has made. It was easy for a gentleman representing any particular locality, when he cannot have his particular views carried out, on all occasions to charge a Government with corruption and palpable wrong—whether this question be one that has anything to do with politics or not—simply for the reason that the person who made application belonged to one particular party. That is not the principle upon which this Government has administered affairs, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman who presides over this Department will never allow, as I would not, a feeling of that kind to interfere, when a great interest is at stake, and particularly so great an interest as that of the protection of our fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wish to be understood as making a general charge. I only ask for information and wish to make no political capital or charge of any kind. I am very glad to have the assurance of the hon. gentleman that the administration of the Department will be carried out irrespective of politics. I wish to call attention to a particular fish-way in my county which was erected a year or two ago at a mill in Bonshaw, in which the owner of the mill had to bear all the expense. He was a strong supporter of my own, and I came to the conclusion that that probably was the reason why he received no assistance; but after the

assurance of the hon. Minister, I have no doubt that an application from him, asking the Government to bear a portion of the cost, will be favorably considered.

Mr. BURNS. My observations will be directed, not so much to the matters which have already been discussed, as to the matter of the fishery bounty. As I understand, this bounty of \$150,000 is provided by Statute, therefore, it is not necessary to vote it. The Committee will bear in mind that the value of the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada, as set forth in the Report of 1881, since which time they have largely increased, amount to the sum of \$15,000,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That item is not before the Committee.

Mr. BURNS. Then I shall have to go into the question of dams in that country. With reference to this question of dams I will simply say that, in my opinion, the Department should be very careful as to the construction of fish-ways. It is a patent fact to those who know anything of the subject that there are more fish destroyed in small streams on which dams have been erected and on which fish-ways have been constructed, than in any other rivers. As a rule dams are on small streams, and in passing over the dam the fish run great danger of being slaughtered by the settlers. In some cases these streams run through forests, and there it is difficult for the officers to exercise any care or watchfulness over them. I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland that fish culture has not been a failure. From what I can learn in my own neighborhood it is quite well known that these fish establishments have been productive of good. I think I am right in saying that in the Restigouche, on which there is a hatchery, the benefits which have been derived from that establishment have already been felt. The hon. member for Northumberland also made a statement as to the value of the salmon fisheries which I am called upon to refute, as it might carry a false impression to the Committee. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman made that statement in good faith, but he did not go far enough and explain why salmon are now worth from 25 cts. to 50 cts. per lb., as against 2½ cts. to 5 cts. some time ago. The impression he conveyed to the House was that the salmon industry is a very profitable one. While it is true that, sometimes, this fish sell for 50 cts., yet the average price realized does not amount to 20 cts. per lb., and that 20 cts. does not go to the fisherman, but to the persons who buy from him, and who, at great expense of labor and material, cure that fish, after they have kept them for a length of time in what are called freezers. I think the price coming to the fishermen is from 8 cts. to 10 cts. per lb. Now, I desire to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Fisheries to the fact that the salmon fishermen are entitled to some consideration from the Government. While the deep sea fishermen derive considerable benefit from the appropriation, the salmon fishermen do not receive any benefit from it. It is true that they participate in the benefits that accrue from the Treaty of Washington in having the American market for their fish. I wish also to say to the hon. gentleman, that these fishermen are entitled to a reduction of the tax paid on their nets. I should be glad to see the tax abolished altogether, and if it cannot be abolished altogether, to see it reduced one-half. Those engaged in the coast fisheries are subjected to much greater risk and much greater loss than those engaged in the river fisheries. Now, Sir, I have this to say with reference to the fishery officers in New Brunswick, that a more zealous lot of men I never came in contact with. The zeal of the fishery officers in New Brunswick is proverbial, and I must say that their services are not adequately compensated. I rose to address the House on that point, but as I am out of order, I will simply refer to another fish, and that is the smelt. To those hon. gentlemen who know nothing about the fisheries it may be a matter of very little importance,

but to those who live by the sea it is one of considerable importance, and should be treated with more gravity by both sides of the House. What I want to do is to call the attention of the Department to the indiscriminate fishing in the rivers to which smelt resort. They are becoming a very important article of commerce; they amount to some millions of pounds, and the catch in New Brunswick, taking the price at 6 cts., amounted in 1881 to the value of \$115,000. That fishery is one which demands the serious attention and consideration of the Department; and no better evidence can be brought to bear in support of the statement I make than this: that when those fish are put into the market in limited quantities in the early season of September and October they realize in New York and Boston very high prices, as much as 20 cts. to 25 cts. a pound; whereas when the market is glutted with them, during January, February and March, the price falls to such a low figure that it does not pay the cost of taking the fish and the carriage. The point I want to make is this: To suggest to the Department whether it should not prohibit altogether the taking of smelt by nets, and confine the fishing to hook and line.

Mr. KIRK. I would not ask the indulgence of the House for a moment were it not that the acting Minister misrepresented my remarks—I do not say intentionally, but he misrepresented them, nevertheless. I did not complain against the fishery wardens of the county of Guysborough, as a class, as was represented by the hon. Minister. I believe the overseers and fish wardens of the county are as faithful and capable a class as are similar officers anywhere in Nova Scotia, or other parts of the Dominion. The only parties I spoke of were two who were interested in dams where fish-ways were, or ought to be, and could not be expected to see that the fish-ways were kept in the condition in which they should be kept because their first interest was their mill property, and then came the interests of the public. I pointed out that one man was incapable, because he was old; but I did not find fault with the officer, because he could not help it, but I said the Government were wrong in placing such a man in the position. The Minister says there are twenty-five fishery officers in the county. I do not know whether that is so or not, but if there are twenty-five there are five more than there were when the late Government went out of office, and if those twenty-five were properly distributed through the county I would not ask the Government to appoint another. I simply ask for one additional warden on a certain stream where there is not an officer, and where there is an inefficient fish way. Suppose there are twenty-five officers, I do not say the number is excessive, for in Guysborough there are ten rivers, including four of the most important rivers in Nova Scotia, and upwards of two hundred miles of sea coast. The hon. Minister discovered that there was a warden there having my name. Is he any the worse for that? I might ask how many BOWELLS there are in offices in the county to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and how many office holders there were bearing the name of other hon. Ministers, but it is not necessary. If this officer in question is not efficient the Government should dismiss him and make another appointment. I am not saying, and have not said anything against any officer, except one and therefore when the hon. Minister sought to convey the imputation that I complained of all the fish wardens in my county, he conveyed a false impression.

Mr. McISAAC. I understand the grant for the development of the sea fisheries, &c., \$150,000, is not open for discussion, this being a statutory grant, but I am at liberty to ask for information respecting it. The last section of the Act of last Session is as follows:—

"A statement shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within the first twenty days of the next Session, of the mode in which the said grant  
Mr. BURNS.

shall have been expended, together with copies of all Orders in Council relating to such grant and expenditure; and during the same Session, and each Session thereafter, a statement shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, of the mode in which it is proposed to distribute the grant in the ensuing year, and the assent of Parliament shall be obtained thereto."

I desire to be informed when the statement, to which we are entitled under the Statute, will be laid before Parliament. We have arrived at almost the close of the Session, and it is most important that the Order in Council, under which the next distribution is to be made, should be submitted to Parliament. It will be in the recollection of the House, that at about the close of last Session, the Statute was passed providing for the distribution of the money, and subsequently an Order in Council was passed which was most defective. I will read the Order for the benefit of those who are not so much interested in fisheries as we are, and any one who pays any attention will see it is most defective and fails to carry out the purpose for which provision is made in the Statute. The Statute says the grant is for the development of the sea fisheries, and the encouraging of the building of fishing vessels and improving the condition of the fishermen. The Order in Council says:

"A bounty of \$2 per ton will be paid to Canadian vessels of ten tons and upwards, having been engaged during three months of the current year in the catch of sea fish not exempted under the Washington Treaty; one-half of such bounty being payable to the owner, and the other half to the crew."

There is a limitation as to time, that limitation being three months. No matter how the vessels have prospered, if they have been engaged in the fisheries one day less than the three months, they forfeit any right to participate in the grant. I consider that a hardship, and the rule should be relaxed, or made more elastic, so as to reach those engaged in the fishing business without such restriction of time. The second part of the Order is still more unjust. It provides for those fishing in boats, and there is a discrimination against them which makes the operation of the Order in Council more unjust to them than the former provision is to those fishing in vessels. The second provision is this:

"Fishing-boats under ten tons, engaged fishing for a similar period, and having caught not less than 2,500 lbs. of sea fish per man, are also entitled to a bounty of \$2.50 per man; one-fifth of which being payable to the owner, and four-fifths to the men."

We must bear in mind that this class of fishermen is much more numerous in the Maritime Provinces than the class employed in vessels. I find by the last return of 1881 that, in the Maritime Provinces in that year, there were 32,644 men employed in boats, while only 7,254 were engaged on vessels, and the number of the former being so much the larger, the injustice done is so much the greater. The object of the Statute, as I mentioned, is to improve the condition of the fishermen. Now, boat fishermen get only \$2 each altogether, and they must be three months actually employed in order to obtain it; and besides, they must catch 2,500 lbs. of fish. When the Order in Council is brought down, it should be so modified as to give the benefit of the bounty to a greater number of fishermen, because it is absurd to say that if a man is out fishing one day less than the three months, or catches one pound less than the 2,500 lbs. although he were out for six months, he shall forfeit the bounty. Can the acting Minister tell us when the Order in Council will be submitted for consideration to the House, under which the \$150,000 is to be distributed during the coming year? I hope it will be made to reach the lobster and salmon fishermen, because the importance of these fisheries will be seen when we consider that their combined value in the Maritime Provinces amounted to nearly \$3,000,000 in 1881.

Mr. BOWELL. The statement as to the amount expended has not been laid on the Table, for the simple reason that this could not be done, the Department being so busily



engaged in distributing the money; and I can promise the hon. gentleman that the Order in Council referring to the further distribution of this money will be brought down at once. I will endeavor to place it before the House on Monday or Tuesday next.

Mr. VAIL. It is stated in the papers to-day, that an Order in Council has been passed, giving boat fishermen \$5 instead of \$2.50. Is that correct or not?

Mr. BOWELL. The Ministry is not responsible for what appears in the newspapers. If the hon. gentleman will give notice of his question, I will give him an answer.

Mr. KIRK. Why are lobster fishermen not included as participants in this grant?

Mr. BOWELL. The only reason for this is because they are not affected by the Washington Treaty. The basis on which this money was voted, was, that it was compensation for those who were supposed to have been deprived of certain rights under that Treaty.

164. Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms ..... \$40,000.00

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). In the absence of the member for Lunenburg, I wish to direct the attention of the acting Minister to the fact that the lighthouse at Fox Point, in the county of Lunenburg, to which attention was directed the other day, does not appear to be provided for in the list. Is it the intention of the Department to provide for this in the Supplementary Estimates? I may remind the hon. gentleman that the Government steamer *Newfield* was sent to that point about ten days before the last General Election; that Mr. Kaulbach, the Conservative candidate, was one of the passengers; and that the commander of the *Newfield* landed in company of Mr. Kaulbach, and selected a site for which they agreed on behalf of the Dominion Government to pay \$80. The Minister promised, when the statement was brought down, to give us information as to whether this lighthouse would then be provided for, or at a later period in the Session. I trust that the Minister proposes to erect this light, and if he does not, I hope that the acting Minister will rebuke the commander of the Government steamer *Newfield*, for allowing this steamer to be used to advance the interests of the Conservative candidate in the county of Lunenburg. I have that faith in the acting Minister that he would not permit such things to be done. In administering his own Department, I will give him credit for that; and I hope, that in this case, he will rebuke the commander of the *Newfield*, if he was a party to this, and if he acted without instructions from the Government. I would like to know the reason why the light will not be erected this year?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a lighthouse erected at West Harbor Island, and a report was asked from the officer at Halifax as to the necessity of a light at the point to which the hon. gentleman has referred. As soon as that officer makes that report—which he has not done yet—the question will be decided by the Department, and if it is found necessary, and in the interests of shipping, that a beacon light or a lighthouse should be erected there, the extra appropriation will be sufficient to meet that requirement.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that, because the item is for the completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms, and if it is intended to complete lighthouses which are not now under construction, I fear the vote will be like the Irishman's blanket—it cannot cover all these things. Will the hon. gentleman give us some details about the number of these lights and where they are to be put.

Mr. BOWELL. I am utterly unable to give the hon. gentleman the exact localities, but I suppose, that after the surveys are made, these lights will be put up as much as possible on the parts of the coast where they are required

in the interests of commerce. It will be seen by this statement, that a large proportion of this expenditure is for western harbors, the eastern portion having been sufficiently lighted for the accommodation of the commerce of the country. The growing commerce of the western lakes is such as to demand a large expenditure, but I am not able to give the details of the location.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). At what time, may I ask the Minister, was the officer instructed to make the report to which the hon. gentleman has referred?

Mr. BOWELL. April, I am informed.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Then, I understand, that on the 10th of June last, the captain of that vessel had no right to make such an enquiry, and that his action was simply dictated in the interests of the Conservative candidate in Lunenburg. I hope the hon. Minister, with the fairness which characterizes him, will not fail to reprimand the action of the captain, for there is no doubt that his action in that case had the effect of strengthening the interests of Mr. Kaulbach and the Dominion Government. I am glad to know that he was not acting in his official capacity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Carried.

Mr. BLAKE. The right hon. gentleman says "carried," but this is a matter which should not be passed over. The hon. Minister of Customs has declared that a report was called for last month for the first time on this subject, and now it appears that nine months before that time a Government officer in command of a steamer professed to purchase a site for a lighthouse at the period of an election. I think such a statement made by an hon. member of this House deserves the attention of the Government, and that some statement should be made by the hon. Minister reprehending the unwarrantable conduct of this officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that the bringing up of a question of this kind on the items in Committee of Supply does require reprehension. It looks as if hon. gentlemen opposite were determined wilfully to waste the time of the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). The acting Minister of Fisheries promised us this information on the floor of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Keefer), asked a question for information on this subject, and he was told that he would have this information at this particular time.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that I would bring down the papers and give such information as I could obtain.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I want to ask information about another matter. I have been trying for some years to get a fog-whistle erected at the entrance to Shelburne harbor. Judging by some remarks that have been made from the other side it is the intention to erect some kind of a fog-whistle at this place, and I would like to have an official statement upon that subject. As the representative of that county, and speaking in the interests of that county, and for the shipping interests of Nova Scotia, I beg to enter my protest against the waste of money which will be involved in the erection of a small fog-whistle at that place. As I have already stated, that harbor is one of the most important in the Province of Nova Scotia, as there are ships coming there constantly from European ports, belonging to Yarmouth and other places in Nova Scotia. A requisition in favor of a fog-whistle at that point was signed by the representatives of all the insurance companies of the Province of Nova Scotia, by the representatives of the Cunard Line, and by Lloyd's agents in Nova Scotia. They asked for a good substantial fog-whistle to be erected there, such as the one erected at the entrance of Halifax harbor, at Sambro, or

at Cape Forchu, Yarmouth, and others of the most important harbors of the Maritime Provinces. This harbor is a most important one, because it is a port of call, and millions of dollars worth of property seek refuge there for that reason. As I understand there has been appropriated the sum of \$3,000 for some kind of special fog-trumpet—not a whistle—at that particular place, and I am told by master mariners that such a trumpet cannot be heard for any great distance, and is not at all suitable for that place.

Mr. GILLMOR. I hope to see an appropriation made for a fog-alarm on the Island of Grand Manan. I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I know of no work that is more needed than that. I know that no Government can give every lighthouse and fog-alarm that is asked for, and I think both Governments have contributed a great deal of money since Confederation on the Maritime Provinces and they deserve well of the shipping interest. Some hon. members may recollect that three years ago at this point that the *Western Empire*, a large ship, was wrecked and several lives were lost. Petitions were got up representing 400 fishermen, and the number could have been increased if they had been circulated among the fishermen in other parts of the Grand Manan. This coast is very liable to fog, and fishermen find it very difficult to make the harbor. I know of no part of the Maritime Provinces in which a fog-alarm is more needed than at this point. I have spoken to the hon. Minister of Fisheries on the subject, and he has admitted the necessity for this fog-alarm, from the information he has received. I am quite aware that the Government cannot build all the fog-alarms that are wanted in one year, but this is more important than any other. I have no object in referring to the matter, except in the interest of a very large class of fishermen, and it is equally important to the mercantile marine. I had hoped that provision would be made for that work this Session. I speak feelingly on this subject, because I myself have seen women there blowing horns in fogs in order to direct their friends to the shore. I do hope, if it is possible for the Government to provide for an alarm there this Session, that they will do so. I am delicate in urging this, because I know that the large number of lighthouses and fog-alarms which have been erected must have produced a great drain on the Treasury. I have no reason to complain, for both Governments have been liberal in that respect; but this is the most important fog-alarm that could be erected along the coast.

Mr. WELDON. I can state, with reference to what my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has said, that when vessels go on that coast in a fog, a large number of lives are invariably lost.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman state what the system of lighting the river Sault Ste. Marie is, and what is the estimated cost?

Mr. BOWELL. The intention of the Department is to apply the vote of \$1,500 to placing small beacon lights along the Sault River. That river is very intricate and winding, and a few beacon lights on the rocks, it is supposed, are all that will be necessary at present. While I am on my feet I might say that I hope the statements of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) are usually more accurate than his statement as to the tonnage of the port he mentioned. I find that by the official returns, instead of being 100,000 tons the arrivals are 11,224 tons, and the departures 9,850.

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to the lights to be placed in the Algoma district, I may say that there has been a great loss of shipping there within the last few years. Vessels have been burned and lost in different parts of the district, and these lights are exceedingly necessary. The shipping of the great lakes is increasing very rapidly, so fast that

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).

Thunder Bay has now become the third port in Ontario. There is an immense line of coast between Sarnia and Collingwood and the upper end of Lake Superior, and it is as yet very imperfectly lighted. The putting up of these lights is a step in the right direction; they are to be placed where they are most needed, but it is only the beginning of a system of lighting that will be required with the opening up of the immense North-West trade by way of Thunder Bay. The Sault Ste. Marie River, I suspect, will have to be lighted in conjunction with the United States Government, because it will require a system of range lights to enable vessels to run up the river in the dark. Day beacons will be required on the shores of Lake Superior before lighthouses can be erected; at the entrance of the harbors, especially, these beacons will be very important. With regard to the lighthouses at Algoma Mills and at Manitowaning. It was at Manitowaning that a steamer was burned last year, and a large loss of life took place. Manitowaning Bay is off the main channel, and it is very difficult for vessels to make it out at night; in fact if the night is at all dark, they have to remain till morning. But with this light, a great deal of time will be saved to them. I believe the lighthouse at Algoma Mills is to be in connection with the opening of that harbor by the Canadian Pacific Railway: and it is a necessity. Before resuming my seat, I would suggest to the acting hon. Minister of Marine that the Department should drop at once and for ever the use of that term—fog-alarm, and use some more descriptive term, such as fog-whistle, fog-horn, or something that the people will understand.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I wish to correct the statement of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The statement he made had reference to the vessels that were entered at the Custom House, discharged their cargoes and took other cargoes on board. If the hon. gentleman resided in the Maritime Provinces, and knew what a port of call was, he would know that ships that go to a harbor and take their orders from the pilot broker, without being entered at the Custom House. They are not bound to report, and they do not report; they go simply for orders, and in many instances they do not wait an hour. The statement I made was prepared by Mr. Kelley, one of the leading ship-brokers of the port, and it was perfectly correct.

199. Excise..... \$288,380.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. We will have the same number of inspectors of Inland Revenue, one chief inspector and nine inspectors. We had three inspectors last year receiving salaries of \$2,400. This year we have four receiving that salary, one who received \$2,200 last year having been promoted. This year we have four of a second higher grade and a decrease of the third-class inspectors. The one that has been promoted is Mr. Borden, now in Nova Scotia. There is no change in the fourth or fifth grades. The extra allowance for inspectors of distilleries is \$100 less than last year. We have three collectors of Inland Revenue at \$1,800, the same as before; we have two collectors instead of one last year at \$1,600, and eleven instead of ten at \$1,400; these two are by promotion. We have five at \$600, instead of four last year, by promotion also. The total number is the same, 37. Deputy and assistant collectors—in the second class we have seven this year, instead of two last year, giving an increase of \$16,000; we have at \$1,000 four instead of seven, a decrease of three, and an increase of two of the fourth and fifth classes receiving \$900—making an increase in the staff of three, or a total increase of \$3,650, and a decrease of \$4,150. Of excisemen and officers there are twenty, the same as before. In the first class the number is reduced from 29 to 22; in the second class from 34 to 30; in the third class the number is increased by twelve. The number of probationary excisemen is

increased by eight, and of unclassified by two. There is an increase of eight accountants. The \$5,213.34 increase in the first item is accounted for in this way: The inspectors have increased \$300; the collectors \$800; the deputy collectors and other officers \$3,650; the excisemen \$463.34. The largest increase is in the deputy collectors, which is chiefly owing to the reclassification of these officers. The item of \$14,000 is brought about as a consequence of the Civil Service Act. The Commission in their report showed that certain classes in the Excise branch were underpaid, and in the framing of that Act their recommendation was acted upon and the following changes took place:—Under the old school the maximum salary that the collectors of the larger ports or divisions could reach was \$2,000; under the Act the maximum was raised to \$2,200. The maximum of deputy collectors was \$1,200, under the Act it was made \$1,500. The salary of the special class of excisemen was fixed at \$1,000, with an allowance of \$200 while on special service; by the Act the salary was made \$1,200, and the allowance \$200. Of first class excisemen \$800 was the maximum; second class \$700, and third class \$600. The Act changed that without classifying them at all, by making the minimum \$600 and the maximum \$1,000. In order to carry out the Act as far as the Department of Inland Revenue was concerned, certain regulations were proposed to give effect to it. The divisions have been classified according to the volume of business, and salaries will be based on the volume of business transacted. Collectors and deputy collectors will be graded. For instance, the collectors will receive a salary graded according to the division in which they are placed, and within the limits and provisions of the Civil Service Act, so that a collector in the first division would get \$2,000 as a minimum salary, and \$2,200 as a maximum. A collector in the second class division would get from \$1,600 to \$1,800; in the third division, from \$1,400 to \$1,600; fourth class, from \$1,200 to \$1,400; fifth class, from \$1,000 to \$1,200; sixth class, from \$700 to \$1,000; seventh class, from \$500 to \$700, &c.; and the Department collectors in the same proportion. As to the excisemen, the Civil Service Act provides that their salaries shall vary from \$600 to \$1,000, independent of classification. We propose to classify them under three heads, first, second and third class excisemen, and within the limits of the salaries fixed by the Civil Service Act. We define it in this way: third class excisemen shall have salaries from \$600 to \$750, second class excisemen shall have salaries from \$700 to \$850, and first class from \$800 to \$1,000. So we put them in three classes, the lower class of men at the minimum of the Civil Service Act, and the first class reaching to \$1,000, five per cent. on the minimum to be added yearly until the maximum is reached. It is upon this system that the estimates this year are based. I will give a statement to the House of the increases generally. We have thirty-seven collectors and twenty-two deputy-collectors; the increase to these fifty-nine officers in all amounts to \$4,190. I may explain to the House again, as I did while the Bill was going through, that there is a set-off against these increases. We have taken from these officers their profits and their share in seizures that they had before the passing of the Inland Revenue Act, and it is quite possible that the increase will not come out of the Revenue, as a portion of the seizures which used formerly to be divided amongst these officers, will very likely come back to the Treasury. The increase I wish to account for is \$16,513.34, of which I have already accounted for \$4,190. We have twenty special class officers. These officers have received an increase of \$4,000 by the Act itself, which, as I have stated, is not a Departmental measure at all. The Act has changed their salary from \$1,000 to \$1,200, making an increase in that item of \$4,000. We have twenty-two first class excisemen, who have received an increase of \$615. An increase of \$900 has been distributed over thirty second class excisemen, and an increase of \$450 among forty-two of the third

class, which amounts to but very little for each. There are thirty-three probationary officers that must be promoted because they come in under the Civil Service Act and are obliged to serve six months before they can be considered permanent officers. It will require \$2,700 to be provided for the increase of salary they will be entitled to under the Civil Service Act as permanent officers. There is an increase of \$1,445 distributed among thirteen accountants and book-keepers. There are thirteen unclassified officers of the Department that get no increase at all and have the same salary as before. They will be put upon the permanent list. Then two additional excisemen at \$600 each, make \$1,200; two inspectors, \$300; \$200 to the chief inspector, and \$100 to the other. That makes up the whole increase of \$16,513.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask the Minister for specific information on some of these items. I see the number of inspectors remains the same, with an increase of \$300, which he has accounted for. I notice among the collectors that there has been an increase in the case of the \$1,400 officers. There are now eleven where there were ten. In the case of the \$1,600 officers, there are two where there was one, though the total number remains the same.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman asks about the increase from \$1,000 to \$1,100 last year, I will explain it. I will give the information item by item.

Mr. PATERSON. At first blush it appears from the classification that the amount of revenue derived by the office should be the test of the remuneration that is given to the collector. There would seem to be something fair in that. But there is another aspect of the case. You may have an efficient, painstaking, hard-working officer for collector in the Department, when the revenue will be nothing like what it may be in another. For instance, where you have a large distillery, the officer might not have as much duty to perform as another officer might in a district where no distillery existed, but where there might be several manufactories, or something that does not return revenue. But the specific information I would be glad to get is the name of the officer, in what division he is, that had been promoted to the \$1,600—for I take it these are all promotions, as the total number has been increased. I would also like the name of the officer and his division, who has been increased to \$1,400.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Kenney is the name of one; he was sent to Winnipeg, at a salary of \$1,600; the additional \$1,400, was owing to the salary of the collector at Ottawa being raised to that sum. In the latter case, Mr. Battle is entitled to \$1,400, as an old officer, and in order that he may be placed on the same footing as other officers in cities doing a similar volume of business. It is not a high salary compared with other cities, or even with classification. It is not inconsistent with the statement I have already made, taking the receipts at Ottawa.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, salaries will be based, in the future, on the volume of the receipts?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As nearly as possible.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a decrease in the salaries of two of the \$1,200 men.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Two \$1,200 men were promoted, namely, Mr. Battle and Mr. Kenney.

Mr. VAIL. Can the hon. Minister tell me what salary Mr. Borrodaile received when he was inspector of this district, and what he is receiving now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When he was removed to Nova Scotia he received \$2,200 as inspector; Prince Edward Island was afterwards added to his division, \$200 increase was given him. He received \$1,800 salary before he left Ottawa.

Mr. CHARLTON. In regard to Inspectors of Inland Revenue, there is an increase of one receiving \$2,400, and a decrease of one receiving \$2,200. Was that a promotion from one grade to another?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That was the case of Mr. Borrodale which I have just stated.

Mr. PATERSON. There are seven deputy collectors at \$1,200, instead of two deputy collectors. Would the hon. Minister state the divisions in which those officers have received the advance? There seemed to be three additional men in the service; will the hon. gentleman state where they are located?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The additional men are Power at Guelph, W. Dustan at Halifax, and Davis at Winnipeg. Two receive \$1,200, and one \$900.

Mr. PATERSON. Were they entirely new men in the service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; they were first class excisemen.

Mr. PATERSON. Then they were put over the heads of assistant and deputy collectors. I understand the position of deputy and assistant collectors to be higher than that of excisemen, and the hon. gentleman tells me, he passed them over to make these promotions; three new men got into this new service; and then that they were not new men, but acting excisemen. Excisemen as I understand it, rank lower than assistant or deputy collectors. If three men were transferred, or promoted from being excisemen to be deputy collectors at salaries as high as \$1,200, then I say that the assistant collectors who get \$1,000 have been passed over in order to give places to excisemen; but I do not understand this in connection with what the hon. gentleman laid down as the system to be pursued in filling these positions.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose one went to Winnipeg: of course the salary there is \$1,200. I think the salaries are a little higher there than elsewhere for special reasons, such as the cost of living, &c.

Mr. PATERSON. Was the exciseman that was promoted to Winnipeg—if I understand the hon. gentleman aright—acting in the capacity of exciseman in Winnipeg, or was he taken from some other division?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He was taken from a division in Ontario.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the hon. gentleman took an exciseman from a division in Ontario and promoted him to the position of assistant collector in the division of Winnipeg, passing over others who rank higher than he did—the assistant collectors in other divisions?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; there was no higher rank. This man was not only an exciseman but a special class exciseman, who was entitled to that position. It was not necessary to pass over the head of any one, certainly no one was better qualified, for the position carries with it the highest qualification.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not understand the distinction between special class excisemen and deputy collectors. Special class excisemen are put down at \$1,000, and here is an exciseman drawing \$1,200. There are deputy collectors who draw \$1,150, and \$1,100, and \$1,000. If we leave \$1,000 out of consideration, deputy collectors getting \$1,150 and \$1,100, should certainly not be passed over for the promotion of an exciseman.

Mr. HESSON. If the hon. gentleman goes down the list, he will see that some officers draw \$900, and some \$600, and he might as well select some of the lower salaries and speak of promotions from them, though they were not qualified to discharge the duties required at that port.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for North Perth does not know.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Special class officers are entitled to receive \$1,200, and that is all he gets at Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman will remember, that in sending an officer there to a new division, it was necessary to select a man who possessed special qualifications, and he was sent up there to work the division up, on account of the special qualifications which he possessed for that purpose; and, being a special excise officer, he was entitled by law to receive \$1,200. The Civil Service Act fixes the salary at \$1,200. I did not say that he was placed over anybody's head.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the law fixes the salary of special class excisemen at \$1,200, then the hon. Minister gives to twenty men \$200 a year less than he should; and he asks us to commit that injustice. Twenty men here receive \$1,000 each. None of them obtain a higher salary; but if the Act entitles them to \$1,000 each, on what principle is the hon. Minister acting?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will find that this is provided for in the \$14,000 in the Estimates?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What \$14,000?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I explained in my opening remarks that, under the old Act, special excisemen were entitled to \$1,000, and to \$200 additional while on duty on special service. I then stated that the Civil Service Act raised that amount from \$1,000 to \$1,200, as permanent salary, with the same pay of \$200 per year while on duty on special service; so that the salaries of special class excisemen are actually \$1,200 a year.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me a very imperfect manner of explaining this matter. If the \$14,000 referred to provides \$200 for each of these twenty men to be an addition to their salaries, surely it would be much more reasonable and sensible to put down special class excisemen at \$1,200 and give what the salaries were, instead of our finding the salaries stated in one part of the Estimates at \$1,000, and in another part provision for an addition to their salaries for the same year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That might have been more convenient perhaps, but we had to show what salaries were paid, and I suppose that the intention was to show what changes which were made under the Civil Service Act would be. The difference which the Civil Service Act would make, will be \$4,000 with regard to these twenty officers.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; that would have been shown, if the hon. gentleman's details gave the special excisemen \$1,200, which for twenty men would make \$24,000, as compared with special excisemen at \$1,000, or \$20,000 for the previous year. We would have the comparison then, but now we have to eliminate it by explanations.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is only another way of showing it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was asking about the seven deputy collectors who got \$1,000 each, while four get \$1,000 each now. The others were promoted, I suppose? If so, I would like to know what divisions they were in, and to what divisions they have been transferred?

Mr. BLAKE. Three of the \$1,000 men have been promoted, apparently.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask, has there been any addition made to the staff of the Sarnia office?

Mr. COSTIGAN. One vacancy was filled, and it is all I know of.

Mr. LISTER. Who was the person that resigned, or died, or was removed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Sarnia is a portion of the London Division, and I think that an additional man was asked for there to fill a vacancy in the particular district of Sarnia.

Mr. LISTER. Not to fill a vacancy at all?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not in Sarnia.

Mr. LISTER. It was a new appointment?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Who was the man?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think Slattery.

Mr. LISTER. When was he appointed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not long ago.

Mr. LISTER. Within the past year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Within the past six months?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, perhaps within the past six months.

Mr. LISTER. Will you state his salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. His salary, I suppose, is \$500.

Mr. LISTER. \$500 a year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Will you say who recommended him?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. Was his appointment asked for by the officer in charge?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. What was the cause of the appointment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. What was the cause of this appointment? Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to rush through these Estimates, but they must remember that they kept us here for nearly eight weeks without doing anything.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The cause of his appointment was that his services were required in that division.

Mr. LISTER. And asked for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say they were asked for.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the appointment is concerned I believe it was made immediately after the election last June, and the gentleman whom the hon. Minister appointed took a very active part in the elections on that occasion. I have no doubt that his appointment was made as a reward for the services he has rendered to the party which the right hon. gentleman leads in this House. He has generally taken a very active part in these elections, but on this occasion his service mainly took the shape of circulating a very remarkable document known as the Smith, Costigan, O'Donohoe manifesto, and for the very efficient services which he rendered in the distribution of that document he received this office. If the office had to be filled I have no objection to Mr. Slattery's appointment, but the general opinion was that the appointment was uncalled for, and that the man in charge of the office never asked the hon. gentleman to appoint any one to assist him. I believe the inspector of the district never asked the appointment to be made.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Does the hon. gentleman know it?

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was a matter of contract, probably.

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Does the hon. gentleman know it?

Mr. LISTER. I asked the hon. member if the appointment was asked for?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I told the hon. gentleman that it was asked for.

Mr. LISTER. By whom?

Mr. COSTIGAN. By those who had a right to ask for it.

Mr. LISTER. Probably Mr. Slattery.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, not Mr. Slattery. The hon. gentleman has assumed that the appointment was made for political purposes, and he says Mr. Slattery circulated some document during the election. I never met Mr. Slattery, I do not know what document was circulated, or what part he took in the elections. I do know, however, that he attended the qualifying examinations and passed them successfully. I know that a vacancy existed, and I know that he was the only man qualified under the law to fill the place. Under these circumstances, I ask the hon. gentleman if he objects to the appointment? I ask him, if he says that he does, should I have passed over that man simply because he was an Irishman, and was the only man who passed these examinations?

Mr. LISTER. There was no vacancy in the office, and there had been none since it ceased to be an outpost. The man in charge never asked for an assistant to be appointed. There is not work enough for one man at even \$500 or \$600 a year; and though I do not object to Mr. Slattery, I do object that this office should be created and made a permanent charge upon the people simply to reward a political favorite.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. Minister can undoubtedly state whether the revenue derived in that division is greater now than it was before—whether there are less or more officers employed now than there were two years ago. Then we can judge whether this man's services were needed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. An officer was sent there because his services were required. Hon. gentlemen need not laugh, because we know that in some divisions, especially in the Excise Department, officers are moved about from one division to another to help to bring up the work, but we do not appoint a man permanently because his extra services are required for a certain time. In this case the chief officer reported that another additional officer was required there, and I acted upon that recommendation. I think the hon. gentleman is very unfair, because there are gentlemen in the Department who belong to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who know that they have been as well treated as Conservatives in the Department have been treated. They know that in regard to those appointments I have not been influenced in the slightest degree by political considerations. I have tried to do honestly and fairly by all parties, and I have no more to do with politics in making these appointments than the hon. gentleman has himself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question is not so much as to the politics of this officer, but as to whether the duties of this office have really increased?

Mr. LISTER. I do not complain that Reformers have not been as well treated as Conservatives; but my complaint was that an office was created for a man without necessity, involving a charge on the country of \$600 a year. There was no vacancy there, there had been no vacancy, and the office had been run by one man for two years; and this additional man was put in for the purpose of giving him employment.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question upon which we seek information is, as to whether the revenues of that office have increased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that my hon. friend will, on Concurrency, furnish information as to what were the receipts last year, and what are the receipts this year, and what his expectations are for next year. The hon. gentleman, in the course of this extraordinary cross-examination, has stated that Mr. Slattery was appointed to

this office on the statement of the Chief Inspector of the district that another man was wanted. In answer to the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that Mr. Slattery was appointed for political reasons, the Minister of Inland Revenue says that the Chief Inspector reported to the head of the Department that an additional officer was wanted. The only qualified man he had under the Act was Mr. Slattery, and there was no one else to appoint if there was a necessity of appointing anyone.

Mr. LISTER. The right hon. gentleman has stated that this man was appointed on a recommendation of the Inspector of the district. I did not understand the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue to say anything of the kind. He could not say who recommended him, but he said the recommendation came from some person who had the right to recommend him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard the hon. gentleman make the statement that it was made on the representation of the chief officer.

Mr. McNEILL. I heard the statement most distinctly.

Mr. LISTER. I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. None are so deaf as those who will not hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said that the Inspector asked for an additional officer; and as to the recommendations, he might be recommended by fifty persons with whom the hon. gentleman had nothing to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What the hon. gentleman said was, that he was recommended by those who had a right to recommend him. Is it the fact that the Chief Inspector reported that another officer was necessary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I make no appointment until I receive a report from some officer of the Department. The District Inspector reported that an additional man was wanted, and some time after that I recommended the appointment of this man.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman state whether or not the Sarnia officer is a probationary exciseman?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Every appointment is a probationary appointment. He would be a probationary exciseman for the first six months, at any rate.

Mr. PATERSON. Was he a probationary exciseman at London, and then transferred to Sarnia, or did he discharge all his duties at Sarnia alone?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only duties he has performed, he has performed at Sarnia. Another officer was required at Sarnia; this man was living on the ground; he had qualified himself by examination, and we appointed him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think it is most fortunate for the service that Mr. Slattery was there.

Mr. HESSON. A great effort has been made to-night to waste the time of the House. The hon. Minister was very explicit in the information he gave to the Committee, and the hon. member for Brant came in very late, and was, therefore, unfortunate in not getting all the information. Then it had to be all repeated again, and hon. gentlemen opposite have questioned, and cross-questioned, and mixed up their questions in such a way as to waste a great deal of time.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. member for North Perth was asleep on his desk, and unable to see that I was in the House, it is certainly very ill-advised on his part, when he wakes up, to charge me with not being in. He has been wasting a great deal of valuable time. He is guilty of what he has been guilty of on previous occasions, trying to explain something that he knows nothing about. I was on hand, and was anxious to get information on this subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. HESSON. I want to say one word. There is not a gentleman in this House who has seen me asleep at my desk. The hon. member for South Brant has no right to make that statement here; I will not permit him. I repeat what I said before—the hon. member for South Brant was not in his seat. He is usually able to understand what is said, and I am sure that he would not have required the Minister to go over the whole ground again if he had been in his place.

Mr. PATERSON. Out of deference to my hon. friend's feelings I preferred to suggest that he was asleep to charging him with being stupid during what ought to be his normal condition. There is no desire whatever to delay the House. Those who remember how the Estimates were criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House, will remember that it was sometimes impossible during a whole sitting to get more than one item passed. If I speak a little more than my colleagues, I do so only in discharge of my duty, and I defy any gentleman to point to any question that I have asked to-night that was not necessary in the interests of the country. My hon. friend from Lambton was quite within his duty in calling the attention of the Committee to this matter; and if it should appear on Concurrence that the hon. Minister is unable to show that there has been an increase of duties at that particular port, and an increased revenue therefrom, he will remain under the suspicion that there has been an increase made when no increase was demanded in the public interest. As to this gentleman being properly recommended, I can quite understand that that is so, for in disseminating that literature, he was sufficiently recommended. With reference to the fifteen supervisors of tobacco who were appointed last year, but for whom no vote is asked this year, I wish to know if their services have been entirely dispensed with, or if they have been employed in other branches? The same question will apply to the five excisemen employed for the inspection of petroleum last year, for whom no vote is asked this year.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Those employed in the inspection of tobacco have been continued wherever their services could be utilized in the Excise branch.

Mr. PATERSON. Have they all been employed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; I cannot say how many.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:50 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 7th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 123) respecting County Court Judges in the Province of Ontario.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 124) respecting the High Court of Justice for Ontario.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 125) to make provision for the taking of evidence in relation to criminal matters pending in Courts of Justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions, or before foreign tribunals.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

### CLAIMS OF NARCISSE ANDRÉ PELLETIER, AND OTHERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to pay the claims of Narcisse André Pelletier, and others, of the Parish of St. Roch des Aulnets, county of L'Islet, for damages done to their fences by the fire from the engines of the Intercolonial Railway; and if so, when?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the evidence before me, I did not consider the Government were liable; but as the parties thought they had additional evidence, I have referred the case to an official arbitrator for investigation and report. That was done in November last, but the report has not yet been received.

### STEAMSHIP NEWFIELD.

Mr. FORBES enquired, Whether the return asked for in March last in reference to services of the steamship *Newfield*, in aiding the steamship *Moravian*, and also the tenders, reports, correspondence, &c., relating to the projected breakwater on the west side of Liverpool Bay, will be brought down before the Session closes? I see that the first part has been answered by returns laid upon the Table on Saturday, and I would ask an answer to the second part.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The return will be brought down in reference to the second part.

### RAILWAY BETWEEN PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING AND RAT PORTAGE.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has obtained possession from the contractors of the line of road between Prince Arthur's Landing and Rat Portage? If so, when will it be opened for passenger traffic, and have the rates of freight been fixed by the Company, and confirmed by the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I supposed arrangements were made with the contractors for the transfer to the Canadian Pacific Railway of the road. I have just this moment learned that some difficulty has occurred in connection with that transfer. The intention was to have the road open for traffic with the opening of navigation.

### DUTY ON HEMLOCK BARK.

Mr. BOLDUC enquired, Whether the Government has received petitions from certain tanners and lumber merchants of the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, praying that an export duty be imposed on hemlock bark? What is the intention of the Government respecting such export duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have received petitions from tanners resident in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, praying for an export duty on hemlock bark. The Government have considered the matter, and have not felt justified in asking Parliament for the imposition of a duty.

### DUTY ON SPRUCE SAW LOGS.

Mr. BOLDUC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the export duty on spruce saw-logs exported to the United States?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention to ask for an increased duty on spruce logs.

### THE FISHING BOUNTY.

Mr. RICHEY, in the absence of Mr. FORTIN, enquired, Has the Government considered the question of augmenting the Fishery Bounty on fishing boats, and has it come to a decision in the matter?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government have decided to double the bounty to fishing boats, and to fishermen.

### NAVIGATION ON THE RIVER SYDENHAM.

Mr. HAWKINS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act, in accordance with the prayer of the petition of the Municipal Council of the village of Wallaceburg, to regulate the rate of speed at which steam vessels may be run through the said village on the River Sydenham; also to compel steam vessels using wood for fuel to place wire screens over their funnels or stacks to prevent sparks from flying therefrom, thereby endangering property on the various rivers and streams of the country?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any measure of that character during the present Session; but enquiries will be made during the Recess, in order to ascertain whether any necessity exists for the introduction of a Bill.

### OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE RICHIBUCTO RIVER.

Mr. GIROUARD (Kent) enquired, Whether, in accordance with notices, dated the 31st March, 1882, asking tenders for the removal of the obstruction to navigation caused by the wreck of the barque *Colonist* lying in the channel of the Richibucto River, at Kingston, Kent County, N. B., tenders have been received? If so, how many? Has any been accepted? If not, why?

Mr. BOWELL. Tenders were invited, and were received up to the 20th of April, 1882, for the removal of the wreck *Colonist*. Two tenders were received, both of which were considered to be too large in amount, and were not accepted by the Department.

### BARRACKS AT L'ILE AUX NOIS AND ST. JOHN.

Mr. BOURASSA enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates any appropriation during the present Session for the repair of the old barracks and other buildings now belonging to the Government at Isle aux Noix, and St. John's, County of St. John's, Province of Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. member, I may say there is a general vote for repairs for military buildings in the different places in the Province of Quebec. If any repairs are required at the points which he mentions, and if the vote permits of it, there is no doubt these repairs will be made.

### INSPECTION OF STEAMERS.

Mr. DAWSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring forward a further Act, providing for the inspection of steamers during the present Session?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the intention of the Government to bring forward a measure further to provide for the inspection of steamers during the present Session. The Steamboat Act of last year has but recently been put into operation, and should it be found necessary, after another year's experience, to amend that law, a Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. COLBY moved that the First Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament be concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain the different portions of the report?

Mr. COLBY. The amount recommended for the annual appropriation is \$10,000 a year, which is precisely the amount which the Government has put in the Estimates. There is a recommendation that for five years a special grant of \$2,000 a year be made and devoted exclusively to the purchase of books on North America. The Committee considered that as there are many valuable books of that kind almost entirely out of print, they should be procured before it is too late. I think it is recommended that these books should not be used for indiscriminate circulation like the ordinary books of the Library, but kept separately under lock and key, and that access to them should be given only to persons who desire to consult them as authorities. The only other recommendation of the Committee involving the expenditure of money, has reference to a very valuable book about to be published by the Clerk of the House, on the Rules, usages, and procedure of the Senate and House of Commons, a work in the preparation of which he has expended about ten years of his leisure time, and which appears to the Committee to meet an existing want. The Committee recommend that three hundred volumes of this work, at a cost of \$5 a volume, should be taken for the use of the members of both Houses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government generally acquiesce in the purport of this report, but we would rather that the House should not concur in it just now. The \$10,000 is, I think, provided in the Estimates. The other recommendations of \$1,500 for the clerk's book, and \$2,000 for works relating to North America, will, I think, be considered before we bring down the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84. The hon. gentleman will, I hope, not press the motion to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Finance Minister indicated that he was about to grant the \$2,000, so that that is settled anyway. But as there is one recommendation about which the Government has not decided, I hope the hon. gentleman will not object to accede to the request of the Government.

Mr. POPE. Part of those works on North America, such as are in manuscript, should be placed in charge of the Archivist.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question to be considered is the best mode of appropriating that vote, and that is the reason why I ask the hon. gentleman to allow the report to stand.

Mr. COLBY. I think the sense of the Committee was that ordinary manuscripts should form part of the Archives.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that I should be very sorry if any books which are not Archives should be taken away from the General Library and put in the Archive repository. I agree that the manuscripts should go there; and from what I have heard in the Library, I think there are some records there which should not go to the repository. But the vote is not designed for manuscripts at all, but for printed books, and thus printed books should be in the Library.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Copies of documents, archæological or historical, whether printed or in manuscript, should be kept in the Archives of Parliament; but works connected with the early history of Canada should be in the Library here.

Motion allowed to stand.

#### SIGNAL STATIONS AT NORTH CAPE AND EAST POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. BRECKEN, in moving for copies of all petitions, letters, and other correspondence between the Government and any other parties, relating to the erection of signal stations at the lighthouses at North Cape and East Point, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, and the construction of two

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

short lines of telegraph connecting the same with the telegraph system of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada, with a view to lessen the dangers of navigation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, said: I feel it is hardly necessary to offer any remarks in order to impress upon the House the importance of this proposal in regard to the fishing and navigation interests of Prince Edward Island. The extension of the telegraph system to East Point would involve the construction of about fifteen miles of line; while the extension to North Cape would not require more than ten or twelve miles. I suppose twenty-five miles of telegraph line would accomplish what the fishermen and vessel owners of the Island and the adjoining Provinces on the mainland are so anxious to obtain. When we consider how easily the improvement might be brought about, it is matter for surprise that it was not carried out some time ago. The special importance of establishing stations at those two points is obvious. All vessels for Miramichi, Richibucto and Buctouche, on the west side of Northumberland Strait, pass close to North Cape, and it would be a great advantage to ship-owners if they could be informed of the arrival of vessels there. Again, all vessels from the St. Lawrence for ports in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, to the Straits of Canso to the United States, and the West Indies, pass near those points. Last autumn one of Her Majesty's ships, the *Phoenix*, was wrecked scarcely a mile from East Point, and, although a few miles of telegraph line would have enabled the captain to have communicated for help, he had to wait until the storm subsided before he was able to communicate with the Island. The vessel at present lies a wreck, and the captain has been suspended. This subject is also a matter of importance to our fishing interests, which are carried on very extensively at these points, both of which are among the best fishing stations in the neighborhood; and the construction of such a line as I have asked for, would enable the fishermen to communicate with their owners, and other parties interested in the trade, as to where the fish are to be caught, and also with respect to bait and other matters connected with the supply and price of fish, and a daily fishery bulletin could be arranged. I believe I am correct in saying that the telegraph company would carry out the work at the same cost as has been charged in other parts of the Dominion. I believe it would not cost the Exchequer more than \$100 a mile for twenty-five miles, and the keepers of the lighthouses would be able to operate the instruments and to work the signals, and would be willing to do this, if allowed an extra salary of, say \$50 a year. Of course, it would be understood that all tolls charged would go into the pockets of the telegraph company. I know there is a question about the monopoly of telegraphs in the Island, but I hope that matter will not be allowed to stand in the way. I hope that this question of relieving distressed and shipwrecked mariners, and of protecting the fishing and shipping interest, will receive the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and that he will see the necessity of immediately carrying out this much required work when it can be done at such a very trifling cost.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The petitions and other papers in relation to the establishment of these signal stations will be brought down. The hon. gentleman sees a difficulty should the Government be determined to go on with those works. As the Anglo-American Company have certain special rights, they say, in the Island, the matter would have to be approached with caution. At all events the papers will be brought down, and the petitions will be considered.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely wish to bear my testimony to the necessity of the works referred to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Brecken). I refer particularly to the lights and signals along the shore of Prince Edward Island, more particularly in the Strait of Northumberland. I have



had several applications on this question, among others, from owners of colliers plying between Pictou and Montreal, and also from residents in my own county. I can assure the House there is much need of further outlay of public money in order to provide two or three more lights along Northumberland Strait, in the general interest of the trade of the country. The trade of Pictou has, during the last few years, increased to a very great extent, and the policy of Protection has led to the use of the coal of that port to a greater extent than formerly, and it has to compete with the coal of the United States. It is of the utmost importance that the class of vessels now used, screw steamers, should be able to run night and day, as this makes a very great difference in the cost of coal delivered, and affects the policy of Government and Parliament in relation to that particular branch of industry; and I am not going to make any further remarks to confirm the statement of my hon. friend from Queen's as to the great necessity there is for a further outlay to place lights along the shores of the Strait of Northumberland.

Motion agreed to.

#### STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. BRECKEN moved that the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the question of steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland in winter and summer, be concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. It cannot be well adopted, as it involves the expenditure of money, and as this is so it can only be done by recommendation from the Crown, and on the responsibility of the Government. The report, however, is a very valuable one, and it calls the attention of the Government to all the facts connected with the communication by water between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The Government are quite sensible of their obligation towards Prince Edward Island, and to carry out the Terms of the Union between Prince Edward Island and the smaller districts of the Dominion, not only constructively but literally and in a liberal spirit. The Government will consider this matter; but the hon. gentleman will see, and has seen, of course, that the report not only recommends that there should be a line of steamers communicating between the Island and the mainland, but it recommends two, and in fact three lines, between the two points. Now, that involves a very considerable sum of money; and the Government will take all these facts into consideration, and come to some decision on it, which, I hope will be satisfactory to both the Island and the mainland. The Government are endeavoring to carry out, and believe they are in spirit carrying out, the arrangement between the two contracting parties. They hope that, ere long, there will be a good line established, crossing, perhaps, between the two railway points, Capes Traverse and Tormentine, which will fully, and ought fully, to carry out the Terms of the Union, so far as the forces of nature are not opposed to the carrying out of those terms. We cannot fight against nature, or against physical impossibilities. The other recommendations, as to keeping up thoroughly independent communication, and more than one, provided for by the arrangements, will be considered as a matter of expedience and of justice to the Island, and as a matter appertaining as well to the general development of that part of the Dominion.

Mr. BRECKEN. I see that the objection is, of course, a correct one, and I will leave the report to the tender mercies of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. I have already placed my views before the House on this matter, and I shall not repeat them on this occasion; but I listened to the Prime Minister very anxiously to see whether it was the intention of the Govern-

ment during the present Session, to put any sum in the Estimates to enable them to carry out one portion, at least, of the report of the Committee, so far as it refers to the necessity of constructing a railway to Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, and to build piers, and eventually have a ferry across that portion where the two points come very closely together, there being only a few miles between them. This must necessarily take years to accomplish, and if the Government carry it out, this will require a considerable sum of money; so that this year we could not, of course, ask for any grant to cover the entire expenditure. But the hon. gentlemen know that there is a perfect unanimity of opinion—not only among the Island members, but also among the members from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, who are familiar with the question in which this Committee entirely concur—that as regards summer communication, a very great defect exists, which can be supplied by a small grant from the Government. Now, as to the summer, we have no complaint to make regarding the existing steamers which do capitally until late in the fall; but this Committee, as I anticipated, report, and all are agreed, that there should be a screw steamer, and that the company which has the contract in charge should have an additional subsidy granted to it, to enable it to put on a screw steamer which would keep the harbors of Summerside and Charlottetown open about three weeks longer. I do not know any boon that the Government could confer on the Island greater than this, of keeping communication open three weeks later in the fall and earlier in the spring, for the exportation of our produce. The Committee say that, after examining a number of witnesses, they have come to the conclusion that suitable screw boats could continue crossing about three week later in the fall, and commence running two or three weeks earlier in the spring. I believe, and every practical man believes, that this could be done; and I sincerely hope and trust, that in view of this report and the evidence which the Committee collected, and the statements made by the different members representing the Island on both sides of politics, this Session will not be allowed to pass without some sum being placed in the Estimates for the purpose of carrying out this recommendation; and that this very year the contract which the present company have of carrying the mails and passengers between the Island and the mainland will be changed by increasing the subsidy by a sum which will enable the company to put on this boat. I have had a communication from the president of this company within the last day or two, informing me that the company has purchased, in England, an iron screw steamer for this purpose. I believe that, relying on the statements made by hon. gentlemen speaking from the Government benches, that they had a sincere desire to carry out the Terms of the Union, the company has purchased this steamer, which they are going to put on the route; and I sincerely hope and trust that their enterprise will meet with some response from the Government. I know that the boat has been purchased, and that it is coming out; and, unless the Government refuses to give any larger subsidy, the people will have the benefit of it this fall. There is another part of the report to which I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister. When I spoke before, I spoke with some little knowledge of the subject, which I had from an examination of the *Northern Light*, and from what I picked up from the surveyor of the ship and others who have examined her, and this enables me to state that this boat cannot continue for many winters to do the work; in point of fact, it is doubtful whether, owing to her worn-out condition, instructions were not sent down this winter to the captain to be particularly careful as to how he used her. I believe so, and I find that the Committee reports that the *Northern Light* may not be able to do the work another year, and that a new steamboat must be put on the route with her, or to take her place. Now,

I would like—as the Prime Minister states that the Government are sincerely desirous to carry out the Terms of Union—that he will see his way clear to put a sum in the Estimates now for the construction of a steamboat to take her place. If they do not do so, and next winter comes round, we may absolutely have no communication between the Island and the mainland at all, except by open boats. I have private letters in my possession, which I am perfectly willing to give to the Government—and the Committee's report states the same thing—declaring that the *Northern Light* is not fit to run next year, and that unless something be done to put a new boat on, we will be then absolutely without any communication whatever; therefore, on these two points, outside of and beyond whatever the hon. Minister may do with reference to the Capes Traverse and Tormentine routes, I hope that the hon. gentleman will see his way clear to put a sum in the Estimates, providing a screw steamer to keep the ports of Charlottetown and Summerside open for three or four weeks later, and a steamboat to take the place of the *Northern Light*; and if this is not done, there will be just cause of complaint on the part of the people of the Island.

Mr. HACKETT. I just desire to correct a slight error made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) in his reference to the *Northern Light*. We examined two gentlemen who were on the *Northern Light* as witnesses, and one gentleman who is at present employed in one of the Departments at Ottawa. Captain McInery's evidence went to show that the *Northern Light* was in good condition, and that she was, in fact, as capable of performing her work now as at any time since she has been on the route. Captain Finlayson, the pilot, said that the *Northern Light* was considerably strained, and that she was rapidly becoming unfit for the service. He did not think she would be suitable for the service for a much longer time than two years. The hon. gentleman has fallen into a slight error as to the recommendations made in the report of the Committee. We did not say that the *Northern Light* would not be fit for service next year, but we recommended that another boat should be provided. It is of great importance that this communication should be kept up, and I trust that whenever the Government find that the *Northern Light* is unfit for the service they will provide another boat. With regard to the summer service, after a great deal of trouble, and the examination of several witnesses, we came to the conclusion that the summer boats were also unfit for the requirements of the trade, and we recommended that further boats should be provided, one of which should be a screw boat. I am glad to find, however, that the Prince Edward Island Steam Navigation Company has already provided a screw boat, and I think that the company has given fair satisfaction. I dare say that the Government will see their way clear to give them a subsidy sufficient to warrant them in keeping three boats for the summer service. As a natural consequence of building the railway, and the erection of the piers, a ferry should be established there, and the Committee came to the conclusion, from the evidence which was brought before them, that that would be the better plan to adopt. It may require a considerable expenditure of money, but I am glad to find that the Island railway from Cape Traverse, and the branch line, will be completed on this side, so that during the time this is going on the Government will be able to consider the matter; and when they come to make the expenditure they will be able to make it intelligently, and so as to meet the requirements of the people of the Island. I do not think it is necessary for us again to fully discuss the matter, as the Committee went to a great deal of trouble, and though the enquiry involved some expense, I think the result of their labors will be such as to warrant the expenditure. If their suggestions are carried out the Terms of the Union will be fulfilled so far as steam navigation is concerned. As Chairman of the Committee, I may

Mr. DAVIES.

be allowed to say that I feel thankful to hon. gentlemen from the other Provinces, as well as to those from the Island, for the active services they rendered in the Committee. I am satisfied that these services will be appreciated by the people of Prince Edward Island.

Motion withdrawn.

#### RELATIONS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND AMOS ROWE.

Mr. WOODWORTH moved for all correspondence and instructions between and from any member of the Government from and to one Amos Rowe, assumed proprietor of the *Winnipeg Times* newspaper, having reference to the course the said *Winnipeg Times* newspaper, or the said Amos Rowe, should pursue in the last General Local Election for the Province of Manitoba, and also the course the said Amos Rowe should pursue in reference to the Tariff, and the charges he should prefer in his newspaper against the hon. Edgar Dewdney, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. WOODWORTH. My reason for asking for the correspondence was, that the gentleman owning the *Winnipeg Times*, or who is assumed to own it, made certain statements publicly which were incorporated in that newspaper as his own utterances in regard to his attitude towards the Government; and as all matters of a governmental nature can be made subject of enquiry in this Parliament, I thought it my duty to place upon the paper this notice of motion asking that these instructions, verbal or otherwise, should be laid before Parliament. I will just refer for a moment or two to the utterance itself. It is a strange utterance coming from a newspaper man, and, of course, he would not make it without being authorized to make it. Being a very strong party man, and a strong supporter of the Government, as may have been seen during the last few weeks, at a mass meeting in Winnipeg to select candidates for the Local Legislature, Mr. Rowe is reported in his own newspaper of November last as using the following language:—

"The *Times* was the organ in this Province of the Dominion Government, and was supported by that Government in its defence of the hon. Mr. Norquay. Yes, he would go further, and say that it had been advised by the Dominion Government to pursue the policy it had adopted."

Well, that was a very bold statement for a newspaper man to make, and it could not have been made by any sensible newspaper man without his having been, thereto, authorized. He must have known the importance of what he was stating, and the result of the statement was that it was taken up by the press all over the country. But it is a very strange thing that some of the hon. members of this House have been quoting this same newspaper during our debates in Parliament this Session with the view of showing, from their stand-point, that the Government of the country was not a proper Government. But the *Times* went further, and it made a personal attack on the hon. Minister of Finance. It sneeringly alluded to the Province from which he came. On the 23rd November, Mr. Rowe made the bold statement that he was a sort of head centre for the Government at Winnipeg, and on April the 9th last, we read, in this same Government organ, that:

"Sir Leonard's laugh was ill-timed. This is probably a more serious business than he imagines. Nature, a more potent ruler than any New Brunswick statesman, has placed nearly a thousand miles of rock between us and Ontario."

Now, these articles have been quoted by the Opposition members of the House, and legitimately so, to show that this great Government newspaper has been uttering sentiments which bore them out in the declarations they made here. It is most extraordinary; I do not understand it. I am not in the secret of the Ministry; I am merely an Independent

member of this House, and I cannot understand why this correspondence should have taken place, making this man and his newspaper the medium of communication between the Government and the people of the North-West. Whom he will, he sets up; whom he will, he puts down. He attacks the hon. Finance Minister—personally attacks him. Not content with attacking the policy of the Government in a great many respects, this newspaper attacks the hon. Edgar Dewdney, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, whom it declares, in the most positive terms, to be guilty of malfeasance in office, to be guilty of a misuse of his gubernatorial powers, in order to promote his own personal aggrandisement. Surely, this is one of the most extraordinary things that has ever happened. I doubt if any hon. member in this House remembers, in the history of Parliament, any other case of a newspaper proprietor stating that it was the Government organ for a certain section of this country, and that he was advised as to what course he should pursue in regard to political matters, and yet attacking the Government of the day and the Governors whom they had appointed, and whom the hon. First Minister ably and eloquently defended. I gave notice of this motion the other day, and I find that this newspaper came out and attacked me again. I had said nothing, and I have said nothing now, that is not legitimate and proper. I have not said anything that could possibly hurt any person's feelings; but it seems to me that this paper occupies an anomalous position, and it ought to be explained. For instance, I see the hon. Minister of Customs smiling and laughing with his usual urbanity and complacency, but rumor says that he is connected with this newspaper. It is most extraordinary. I do not wish the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. First Minister to think that I am throwing a firebrand, that I am going to send any foxes with tails of fire through the corn to burn up the sheaves and shocks. I do not believe it, but it is said that the hon. Minister of Customs is responsible for sending this man out there to take charge of this paper. We all know how our members have been received by him. For instance, a most gross attack was made upon the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) for a matter of which he was perfectly innocent, and for which he declared he was innocent. Then the paper attacked him again. A more loyal supporter of the Government, and a more loyal and able member of this House, and a more patriotic and industrious Canadian, I do not know. He goes out to the North-West, and he says nothing, and he does nothing that is worthy of condemnation or of unfavorable comment, and this paper attacks him. Yet this man says that it is a Government organ. I am not speaking in a party sense, but as an Independent member of the House. I care nothing for his attacks upon me, for he could not possibly hurt me. No member of the Parliament of Canada can be affected permanently by a false, lying article in a newspaper, if he is not guilty of the charges made. He cannot, in the long run, be hurt; but these charges must redound upon the paper or the individual making them. But they are very unpleasant at the time. I ask that this correspondence between this man and the Government be placed before the House, so that we may know what we are doing. I dare say that the Opposition members are as curious to know what sort of correspondence this can be, and what sort of editorials this man was to write. It is for the Government to explain how they came to send instructions to this man to do what he has been doing, and to have all the power and patronage of the Government in the North-West, with the vast emoluments he has to confer; and it is in the interest, not of the Government, but of Parliament, to know whether this man is bereft of reason, or whether he has good reason to do what he is doing. If he has good reason, it is the first time in the history of Canadian politics that a case like this has occurred; and I think it is due to Parliament that the Government

should state whether this man has those powers, or whether he is treading upon the credulity of persons, or giving way to his own imaginations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is this: That there is no correspondence, and there were no instructions "between and from any hon. member of the Government from and to one Amos Rowe"—which, I think, from the way the hon. gentleman has brought the matter up, should be pronounced *Row*—"assumed proprietor of the *Winnipeg Times* newspaper, or the said Amos Rowe should pursue in the last General Local Election for the Province of Manitoba, and also the course the said Amos Rowe should pursue in reference to the Tariff, and the charges he should prefer in his newspaper against the hon. Edgar Dewdney, Lieutenant-Governor of the North West Territories." There is no such correspondence, and, therefore, I am sorry to say that we cannot comply with the hon. gentleman's very natural request. This Government, I fancy, like other Governments, are exceedingly glad to have the support of the newspaper press. If the newspapers support the Government, we thank them for it; if they go against us, we are sorry for it. But no Government worthy of the name of a Government can submit to have any organ, and no newspaper worthy of the name of a newspaper can submit to be called a servile organ of any Government. The moment that is understood and known that moment that newspaper is valueless. The general political character of a newspaper, is, of course, known; while it supports one party or the other, it assumes a position of independence with regard to all parties. But we must respect the independence of the press, and the press must respect the independence of the Government. There is no correspondence of any kind. I understand from my hon. friend's speech—I was not aware of it before—that they had been attacking him. Well, I think my hon. friend can afford to dispose of that attack when he knows he is in such good company as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West and the hon. Minister of Finance; and the very fact that the hon. Minister of Finance is attacked, as well as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, shows that certainly it is not an organ having any authority to speak on any subject any more than any *Conservative* newspaper has that authority, or supposed authority, from the Government. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is at all afraid or suspicious of any attack, open or covert, from the hon. Minister of Customs. I fancy they understand each other thoroughly, and will have a good healthy laugh at the speech of my hon. friend in making this motion. They will have a hearty laugh over it, and if they were not both teetotalers they might, perhaps, have a quiet glass of grog over it. There is no correspondence of this kind that I am aware of, or correspondence of any kind. Mr. Amos Rowe and the *Winnipeg Times* acts on its own responsibility, liable for its own statements, and the Government respect the independence of all papers, *Conservative* as well as others; and unless they tread very hard on our toes, we do not actually cut off newspapers from anything like Government patronage, because they choose to be independent and occasionally to disapprove of any course or act of the Government. It would be unworthy of any Government to do so, and would reduce the press to what it is, and has been in some countries—thank God not in England, or Canada—the mere servile slave or tool of the Government or party for the time being.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is just as well that I should give the same declaration publicly to the statement made by my hon. friend, that I gave to him in a private letter, and if he desired to be as fair as I think he ought to be, he should have stated that when the *Winnipeg Times* was attacking him, that he wrote to me, and I gave him the most positive declaration that I had nothing to do with the *Winnipeg*

*Times*, directly or indirectly; further, that I had written to Mr. Amos Rowe informing him of the complaint that had been made, that he had been using my name as having an interest in the *Winnipeg Times*, and asking him if he had made such a statement, and if so, what authority he had for making it. The reply I received from Mr. Rowe, I also forwarded to my hon. friend from —

Mr. WOODWORTH. Somewhere.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, from somewhere. That letter which gave the most distinct and positive denial that he had made no such statement. After that, I think it was scarcely fair on the part of my hon. friend to have introduced my name, simply because I happened to smile, as every other hon. member did, while he was speaking. I think it is very difficult not to smile when my hon. friend speaks, unless hon. members are a good deal more serious than hon. members generally are. I take this opportunity publicly to give the most emphatic denial to any rumor that may have been put in circulation, either by the proprietor of that paper or any one else, that I had any connection, directly or indirectly, inferentially or any other way, with that paper, outside of the desire to see in all sections of the country party papers, supporting the general policy of the Government of which I have the honor to be a member, succeed. Beyond that I have no interest in the matter one way or the other.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Just one word in reply to the hon. Minister of Customs. As the member for "somewhere" —

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member should not take me up in that way. I could not, at the moment, remember the name of his constituency,

Mr. WOODWORTH. You used that word.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not use that expression offensively. I tried to remember the hon. gentleman's county, and he said "somewhere," and I repeated it. I apologise.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think that is the better course, because the hon. gentleman did say "somewhere." I assented to somewhere for I knew it myself. I know this much, that generally that member for "somewhere" has a pretty good recollection of what has taken place within his hearing at least. The hon. Minister of Customs is very unhappy in his laying down of political ethics. He says he wrote me a private letter, and that that should have been sufficient without my mentioning what I did in reference to him. What did I mention? I mentioned that rumor said he was interested in that paper. Could a private letter from him be taken as a public contradiction of that rumor? Could I run round with a private letter and tell the people he had written me a private letter, and show that private letter? No. That is not political, and there is nothing improper or unmanly in the course I took. I gave the hon. Minister the very opportunity which he has seized, and he has ably taken advantage of it—that was to give to Parliament and the country, through the *Hansard*, a public refutation of that rumor. True, I did write him a letter—a very strong letter—from *Winnipeg* when this paper was attacking me—and attacking me as it has since—without the slightest scintilla of truth in its attacks. The *Toronto Mail* the other day—and the *Mail*, I take it, is to the Conservative party what the *Globe* is to the Reform party—took that paper to task, and showed that in its attacks it was totally astray; showed that there was not a scintilla of truth in its statements, but that they were entirely erroneous. I shall not speak further on this matter. I am prepared at all times to defend myself, and I have, both in the country and in Parliament, defended myself—how effectually I will leave it to my opponents to judge. But I repeat that I have treated the hon. Minister of Customs most fairly in this matter in giving him the opportunity which he ought to have been, and I think he was, anxious

Mr. BOWELL.

to obtain, namely, to give a denial to these rumors; and I certainly could not do this with a private letter, though the private letter was satisfactory.

Mr. BOWELL. The letter was not marked "private," and, if necessary, I am prepared to bring down all the correspondence.

Mr. WOODWORTH. When an hon. Minister of the Crown rises in his place for so small a matter as an answer, he should be prepared to take the responsibility of the language he has used. When he told the House solemnly this was a private letter I took him to give the full import to the word "private," and he cannot possibly, under cover of the popular sense of the word "private," get rid of the true English meaning. I have not the letter here. He chose to refer to it; I would not refer to it, for I had no right to do so. It was a letter between two persons, one a supporter of the Government, the other a Minister of the Crown. I had no right to refer to it. The hon. Minister of Customs chose to refer to it as a private letter, and, therefore, it does not lie in his mouth to say that letter was public. I take the explanation as fully as he gave it. I do not think it conduces to the harmony of our debates, nor to the popularity of any Minister, that he should cut and pare his words, or give the slightest change of meaning to any reply that he may make to any Independent member of the House. He stands in so high an altitude that he can afford to be generous. As an hon. Minister of the Crown, he is bound to respect members on both sides, especially an Independent member like myself, who does not rouble the House with many motions, and who, unaccustomed to this sort of thing, and almost frightened at the appearance of a motion in his name on the notice paper, rises to make it in fear and trembling. The hon. gentleman says he smiles when I speak. I am glad I make him smile, and I think hon. members who have occasion often to visit his office and do not, during these visits, find that smile on his countenance, will be delighted to see that I have made him smile and shown him in a brighter light. I hope when the hon. gentleman rises to answer a member of this House, that he will use only the language he intends to use, and construe it properly, as I construe it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As there is no correspondence, I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There is no Rowe; no Government organ; no Parliament; no attack; no row;—there is nothing.

Motion withdrawn.

#### PREMIUMS OF INSURANCE.

Mr. LAURIER, in moving for a statement of the total amounts of premiums of insurance against fire collected, and of losses paid, during each of the years 1880, 1881 and 1882, in each of the following cities: Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Halifax and St. John, N.B., by the several insurance companies authorized to do business in this country, said: I hope there will be no objection to granting these papers, and that the papers will be brought down at an early date. The reason I make this application is, that there are complaints made by the citizens of Quebec concerning the high rate of premium charged by the companies that do business there, under the pretence that the city is not sufficiently protected against fire. The city has done its best recently to improve, and is improving, its system of protection against fire, and it is presumed these papers will show that, in proportion to the premiums received, the losses paid there are not greater than those paid in other cities.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not quite sure we have the data in the Insurance Department from which to make

this return, and we may have to send to the companies for the information required. Of course, we have the great statement of losses. If we have the details we will bring down the return at once, if not we will obtain the returns from the insurance companies.

Motion agreed to.

### OAK ON WALPOLE ISLAND.

Mr. LISTER, in moving for a copy of all correspondence between the Government and one A. Dingman, or any other person or persons, relating to the sale of the oak timber growing on Walpole Island to one Tennant, a copy of the contract of sale, a copy of any offer or offers that may have been made by any person or persons other than said Tennant, to purchase the said oak; a copy of the instructions given by the Government to the Local Indian Agent and to the said Dingman, or either of them, concerning such sale, together with all petitions or letters received by the Government from Indians on the Island, or others, before or since such sale, touching the same, said: Before this motion is put, I desire to make a few observations concerning it. Walpole Island is an Indian reservation situated at the mouth of Lake St. Clair at the foot of the River St. Clair. Upon that Island is growing a very large quantity of valuable oak timber. I understand that on the 27th of June last, that oak, sixteen inches and upwards, was all sold to a man named Tennant for the sum of \$10,000. Previous to that date two council meetings of the Indians had been held on the Island for the purpose of considering an offer made by this man for the oak. His first offer was \$7,500. This offer was rejected; another meeting was called, and he increased his offer to \$10,000, that offer was also rejected; and a third meeting was called specially for the purpose of reconsidering his offer. I may say that, although other offers have been made upon the timber which would have been more advantageous to the Indians, the offer of Mr. Tennant was the only offer submitted to the Indians for their acceptance. I stated, a moment ago, that the first offer made by Mr. Tennant was for \$7,500; that was increased to \$10,000, at which price he purchased it. The first time the matter was before the Indians \$10,000 had been offered by a man named Little, but his offer was not submitted to the Indians, and was withheld by the official representing the Government. At the second meeting of the Indians, Little made an offer of \$11,000 for the timber. A special meeting was called for the purpose of considering Tennant's offer. Previous to that meeting being held, Mr. Little had prepared the following offer, which he had circulated among the Indians of the Island in print:

"OFFER FOR TIMBER.

"WALLACEBURG, 27th January, 1883.

"To the Indian Agent and Council of the Walpole Island Reservation:

"GENTLEMEN,—I, Hiram Little, of the village of Wallaceburg, in the county of Kent, and Province of Ontario, Merchant, hereby make the following offer for all the standing white oak timber above 16 inches in diameter, on Walpole Island and adjacent islands, comprising the Walpole Indian Reservation. That is to say, I will pay the sum of \$14,500 cash down for such timber, and I will give all the oak tops of such timber to the Indians, to be cut into cord wood, for which I hereby agree to pay 6s. per cord in the bush, and 12s. per cord on the bank, convenient for shipping. And, furthermore, I also agree to build a good dock, fifty feet long, with a warehouse thereon, 14 x 16, in water deep enough that vessels of the largest size may load at John Mokewenah's, the said dock to be completed on April 1st, 1883. And I agree to furnish good security for the building of the dock, and chopping and paying for cord wood, provided I am allowed five years time from March 1st, 1883, to remove the said timber to a place convenient for shipping.

"(Signed)

"HIRAM LITTLE."

That offer was handed to the Indian Agent when the sale was made, but it was not submitted to the Indians; and yet,

in the face of that offer, the Indians were called on to vote on Tennant's offer, or not at all, and the consequence was that Tennant's offer for \$10,000 was accepted by the Indians. The vote stood sixty-seven to fifty-three, a majority of fourteen in favor of the acceptance of Tennant's offer. On the 30th January a petition was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, signed by seventy-nine Indians, a majority of the Indians of the Island. The petition is as follows:—

(Copy).

"WALPOLE ISLAND, 30th January, 1883.

"L. VANKOUSNET, Esq.,  
"Superintendent of Indian Affairs,  
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We, the undersigned, beg to inform you, that we, the Indians of Walpole Island, held a Council to-day, the 30th of January, 1883, in the Council house.

"We understand that the said Council was to be held for the purpose of discussing an offer made by Hiram Little for the standing white oak timber above 16 inches in diameter, on Walpole and adjacent islands, which we considered was a good offer. The offer is \$14,500 cash down. Hiram Little also agrees to give the oak tops of such timber to the Indians, to be cut into cordwood, for which he agrees to pay 6s. per cord in the woods, and 12s. per cord on the bank, convenient for shipping; also, to build a good dock, fifty feet long, with a warehouse thereon, 14x16, in water deep enough that vessels of the largest size may load at John Mokewenah's, east side of the Island, the said dock to be completed on April 1st, 1883. And he further agrees to give or furnish good security for the building of the dock and chopping and paying for cordwood.

"When E. Watson, Esq., Indian Agent, came, and the Council met. Mr. Tennant brought his offer of \$10,000, and the tie timber standing on the islands which he still claims, before the Council Mr. Watson took this offer, and did not give any one else a chance, but the said Tennant.

"And we further say, the undersigned Pottawatamies of Walpole Island are not willing to accept the offer that the said Tennant gave for the said oak timber standing on our islands.

"The tie timber which the said Mr. Tennant proposes to give back with his offer of \$10,000 are not worth talking about, for he has got about all of them cut or cleared off.

"We would like to accept the offer of \$14,500 which Mr. Hiram Little offers, and we most earnestly beg you to give this our petition a due consideration.

"(Signed by 79 members of the band)."

Within two days after the meeting of the Indians, at which the sale was said to have taken place, the above petition, signed, as I have said, by seventy-nine Indians, was forwarded to the Department at Ottawa. No response was made to the petition, as I am informed; and on 23rd March, 1883, or two months after the first petition was presented, a letter was sent to the Department signed by over eighty Indians. That was dated March 28th, and addressed to the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs. The letter is as follows:—

"WALPOLE ISLAND, 28th March, 1883.

"SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD,  
"Supt.-Gen. Indian Affairs,  
"Ottawa, Canada.

"SIR,—A meeting was held in the Methodist Mission School House, where a number of the principal men of the Chippewa and Pottawatamie Bands of Indians, of Walpole Island, on the 28th day of March, 1883, where Councillor Joseph Isaac was chairman, for the purpose of again humbly calling your attention to our petition we sent to you, on the 30th day of January, 1883.

"We, the undersigned, do not wish to accept Mr. Tennant's offer of \$10,000, when we would lose \$4,500 in rejecting Mr. Hiram Little's offer of \$14,500. And we wish you to do what is just, and not let us lose the \$4,500. You have the matter to decide.

"As you are aware of the fact, Mr. Tennant's agent, Mr. Alex. McKilvey, has begun cutting white oak timber on Walpole Island, having received authority from you, in order that his men and teams might be kept employed. Mr. Tennant has only two teams of horses and one yoke of oxen, and three or four men, at the shanty; but when orders came for to commence cutting the timber, nearly every one of the Indians were employed cutting the timber, and about six teams—that is, other teams that were not employed at the shanty—were hired to haul timber to the banks of the river, and are employed at the present time.

"Mr. Tennant's shanty is not what it ought to be. The law forbids that anything that will intoxicate shall be given to any Indian. Mr. Tennant's men were known to have had whiskey at their shanty, and have given it to Indians that were employed at the shanty, and others. A party was held at the Council House not long ago, where some of his (Mr. Tennant's) men went with some intoxicants, and made a disturbance; in fact they spoiled the meeting. The meeting was held for a

benevolent object. This is one of the reasons why we do not wish to accept Mr. Tennant's offer.

"We have known Mr. Hiram Little for a good while. He is an honest man, and one that wants to treat the Indians right.

"We subscribe our names, accepting Mr. Hiram Little's offer of \$14,500

"We most earnestly and humbly beg you to give this our humble petition a due consideration.

"(Signed by 79 members of the band)."

On March 15th, a letter was written to the Department, by one of the Indians, protesting against the sale that had been made. An answer, dated March 21st, was received, as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 21st March, 1863.

"Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 15th instant, I beg to inform you that Mr. Tennant received authority from the Department to go on cutting white oak timber on Walpole Island, in order that his teams and men might be kept employed; but he is not to remove any of the timber from the reserve, until it has been decided whether or not his offer of \$10,000 is to be accepted.

"So soon, therefore, as the Superintendent-General gives his decision in the matter, Mr. Superintendent Watson will be requested to inform the Indians thereof, and in the meantime Mr. Tennant may go on cutting the timber.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"ROB. SINCLAIR,

"For Deputy of the Supt.-Genl. of Indian Affairs.

"Mr. JOHN CHAMBERLAIN, Walpole Island,

"Wallaceburg, P. O., Ont."

That is the only response which the Indians were able to elicit from the Department as to its intention respecting this timber. Mr. Tennant went immediately into possession, and placed men on the Island, and commenced cutting this valuable timber, which is worth at least \$20,000; and the only security the Indians have, is, that according to the Department's letter, the lumber is not to be removed until the matter has been decided by the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs. Now, Sir, I desire to say here, that I do not believe it is just to the Indians, and in their interest, that this timber should be sold by private sale in the way in which it appears to have been done. The Government of the country are the masters of the Indians of this country, who are not accorded any rights which the other inhabitants of this country enjoy. They are not permitted to make contracts. They are not permitted to sell land, or to lease or to sell timber. Everything that appertains to their property must be transacted through the Indian Office at Ottawa; and it is incumbent on the Department to see that the fullest justice is done to the Indians of the country; and if it be true, that in the face of an offer of \$14,500, one of \$10,000 only was accepted by the Government, then I say that a flagrant wrong has been done to the Indians on this reservation. I hope that this is not true, and that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Department has seen fit to cancel any obligation, because it appears, according to a letter sent to the Department, that the offer was under consideration, but had not been concluded. No binding obligation on the Department existed, and if such be the case, Mr. Tennant bought it in that way; and until the Department has sanctioned the purchase, he has no more right to it than any person else, although it appears that the Government, to a certain extent, have recognized his right, because they have permitted him to go on the Island and cut timber and to haul it on shore. Under these circumstances, it will be difficult to understand, if the Government refuses to carry out the arrangement, how they can put Mr. Tennant *in statu quo*. As I stated a moment ago, the Indians are wards of the Government, and the Government I have, no doubt, will feel, that it is their duty to see that the Indians are fairly and properly dealt with, that their property when sold, brings the highest price, and that the responsibility of the Government is as great in every extent as that of a guardian would be for the property of his ward. I understand, that Mr. Tennant visited Ottawa two or three times previous to the sale. It is rumored, in the village of Wallaceburg, he stated that he saw the right

Mr. LARNA.

hon. head of the Government about the matter, and the directions were sent to the Indian Agent to carry out some bargain. Beyond contradiction at all events the offer of Hiram Little was not submitted to the Indians, although it was there, and they could not vote on it at all. People may ask, why the hon. gentleman should be so favorable to Mr. Tennant. I may say that Mr. Tennant, formerly, was a Reformer, and is the gentleman who opposed the hon. Christopher Fraser at Brockville. He left his party, and, perhaps, for his political apostacy he expected to get something in the shape of this timber on the Island. At all events he is a Reformer, who left his party for the purpose of opposing Mr. Fraser, and this investigation may throw some light on the reason why he opposed Mr. Fraser at the last Election. I bring the matter before the hon. gentleman in the hope that no bargain has been concluded, in the hope that if the timber is to be sold it will be put up at public auction, and that the fullest justice will be done these Indians. If anything less than that is done, I feel satisfied in saying that the people of this country will not approve of what the Government has done in this matter, because if there is one thing above another which they are sensitive about, it is that the Indians of this country, who have surrendered almost everything they have, shall be fully and properly protected by the Government, their guardians in every sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has stated his case in favor of these poor, unfortunate Indians, with all that strong desire which must actuate the mind of every philanthropist, to protect the red man of the forest against any possible injury, or injustice done him by the whites; but I am not at all sure that the hon. gentleman did not, before he had finished his speech, show, perhaps, that there was something else besides philanthropy that induced him to make that motion. He says he hears that Mr. Tennant, the gentleman who is said to be the favored man by the Department, was formerly a Reformer, and that he ran against Mr. Fraser at Brockville, and, therefore, he insinuates that in consequence of his running against Mr. Fraser, he was unduly favored. Now, it occurs to me that a person who is suspicious of other people's honesty must be a little lacking in what constitutes an honest mind. I venture to say that if Mr. Tennant, instead of running against Mr. Fraser, had continued a devoted fellower to Mr. Fraser, and supported him and the party, in which the hon. gentleman is a distinguished, or rather a new member, this motion would not have been made.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). He never got the timber.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will have a little talk about that matter; and I shall take care that the papers are brought down as soon as they can be copied. I shall not give even the excuse which I am obliged to give in that respect to other matters—that the pressure of business has prevented them being brought down; but I will have them brought down at once, and set the officers at once to copy these papers, so that the House shall be charged with the matter immediately. With respect to the timber on Walpole Island, this Indian timber, it belongs to the Indians, who dispose of their own timber after their fashion, and the Government, which is their guardian, and especially the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, which office I hold at this moment, is bound to protect the Indians against their own acts; but still, whenever the Indians take a course which is reasonable, the Government, of course, allow them the opportunity, as they have the right, of dealing with their own property. Now, the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Tennant made a certain offer. Those matters did not even come before me. They are managed by the local agent, Mr. Watson, who is, perhaps, known to some gentlemen on the other side; but Mr. Watson is certainly not known to me personally, though I believe that he is the reverse of being a poli-

tical friend. As I understand the matter—it came to me after the preliminary question to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, was concluded—an offer was made for this timber on Walpole Island by Mr. Tennant, a lumberman who lives at Brockville; he undertaking to leave the undergrowth of small timber for future growth, uncut; and he afterwards increased his first offer. This is one of those cases in which there is a struggle between enterprising lumbermen—between Mr. Tennant and Mr. Little. The latter, however, did not appear on the stage at all, as I understand it. Mr. Tennant made an offer to the Indians, and Mr. Watson, the agent, summoned a council. He offered \$7,000, as the hon. gentleman says, and then, I think, he subsequently offered a larger sum, \$10,000. A council was summoned, and the Indians agreed to sell this timber for the \$10,000. Mr. Little, anxious to overbid his competitor, his rival, Mr. Tennant, put in another offer, without agreeing to reserve the smaller timber. The Indians were informed at this meeting of Mr. Little's offer. A council was summoned, and you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, can well understand that when a council is summoned for a particular purpose, that particular purpose only can be put to the Indians. They must get full notice of what the subject is for which they are summoned. They were summoned to say whether they would accept this offer; but afterwards it had to come to the Superintendent-General, and it had to come to me. Mr. Watson, without any consent, without any communication with the Department here, or with Mr. Vankoughnet—I never interfere in these practical matters unless they are brought before me as matters of appeal—submitted for the Indians the question: "Will you accept Mr. Tennant's offer?" At the same time they were informed of Mr. Little's offer; and notwithstanding that they had Mr. Little's offer before them, they thought that Mr. Tennant's offer was the best one, and in solemn council they accepted Mr. Tennant's offer, because they thought they would rather get the money for the larger description of timber, saving for themselves the young trees, rather than give Mr. Little what his offer meant, namely, to get the whole of the timber for \$14,500. The Indians accepted Mr. Tennant's offer, and therefore the matter went on in the usual way. Nobody knew anything about it, and Mr. Tennant sent up his cattle to get out his timber. Then it came to the notice of the Government—it came before me, that it was alleged by Mr. Little that Mr. Tennant had bribed some of the chiefs to vote to give the timber to him rather than to Mr. Little. Although the proposition to the Indians was: "Will you accept Mr. Tennant's offer or not," still the reasons why they should not accept Mr. Tennant's offer were before them in Mr. Little's proposition. It is quite true that Mr. Tennant came and pressed his case; but, on the other hand, affidavits were produced that Mr. Little had been bribing the Indians right and left, and it was quite clear that it was simply a fight between two white lumberers who should get the timber. In consequence of having these contradictory statements before me, I sent a special inspector up to report upon the facts, and I have lately got his report. In the meantime, there was a solemn vote of the Indians for the sale of the timber, and Mr. Tennant had got his cattle there. It was winter time, and there was no means of taking away or stealing the timber, and instructions were given that he might use his teams to get out the timber as it could not be taken away. But that matter is now under my consideration, and I will not promise to have it decided until after the House rises. I have submitted the papers and the whole of the affidavits on both sides to the Minister of Justice. The Government desire to do what is right with regard to the Indians. The hon. gentleman ventures to insinuate that Mr. Tennant got certain rights because he was going to be a candidate as an old recalcitrant Reformer. But there are some such men who do not require

contracts to leave the Reform party. The insinuation is that Mr. Tennant got special rights, but he got no such rights. I sent Mr. Dingman, our agent, there to report upon the matter. I have his report, and I find it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. I am afraid that both sides have not been considering the rights of the red man, but have been considering only how each could get the best of the other. I refused to decide in favor of Mr. Tennant, although Mr. Watson, who is a very good Reformer, and a very honest man, has reported in his favor, and has reported that on the whole the Indians thought Mr. Tennant's offer a better one than Mr. Little's. Mr. Tennant, under the old contract—for this is an extension of the contract—owns all the small trees, and in consideration of his getting the contract for the heavier timber, he agreed to give up the contract by which he could have swept away all the young trees. The Indians thought that that was the better contract of the two—they thought that it was better to have the \$10,000 in hand and to preserve the timber. Whether they are right or wrong I cannot say. I shall sit as a Judge upon that matter; I have got the opinion and the report of Mr. Watson, and I shall bring them down, when the House will see how unjust and how unfair the insinuations of the hon. gentleman are.

Mr. LISTER. I may say, in the first place, that I congratulate the right hon. gentleman on the accession he has got to his party in getting Mr. Tennant, and I trust that gentleman will never wander back into the Liberal fold again. If the right hon. gentleman will read Mr. Little's offer he will find that in every respect it far exceeds the offer made by Mr. Tennant. The Indians would receive an advantage of \$4,500 over Mr. Tennant's offer, and in every respect his offer was more advantageous to the Indians than the other. I suppose the inspector whom the hon. gentleman sent up to report on the facts and to adjudicate upon the right of the Indians is Mr. Dingman. If that be the case I can only say that I am very sorry for the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And I can only say that Mr. Dingman is an honest man than you are.

Mr. LISTER. I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether Mr. Little's offer was subjected to a vote, because my instructions are that it was not, and that the Indians were told that they could only vote on Mr. Tennant's offer. I am also informed that if the Indians had had the opportunity of voting upon Mr. Little's offer they would have supported it. They may have tried to bribe the Indians, or they may not, but in any case the rights of the Indians should be protected, and what the rights of the Indians are it is the duty of the Government to ascertain. If it appears by the evidence that the Indians have been deprived of the sum of \$4,500 by awarding this contract to Mr. Tennant, then a wrong has been done to them which the Government should rectify, and which I believe the hon. First Minister will try to rectify if possible. Some people say he will not, but I have more faith in the right hon. gentleman than to believe that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to say, in the first place, that the original contract was given by the late Government—the Mackenzie Government—to Mr. Tennant. It was given, perhaps, at a too low rate. The smaller timber, the whole timber, was sold, and, in the meantime, Mr. Little could not make a sale, and Mr. Tennant did; because if Mr. Little had got the contract for the timber instead of Mr. Tennant, he could not get the smaller timber, that belonged to Mr. Tennant under the contract given to him by the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. LISTER. The small timber on the Island had been skinned long ago, and it was not necessary to sell the large timber.

Mr. TAYLOR. I merely wish to correct the impression left on the House that Mr. Tennant is a resident of Brock-

ville. Such is not the case, he is a resident of South Leeds, a township which gave him a majority against me in the last election of 117. The statement has been made that Mr. Tennant had left the Reform party. To controvert that statement I wish to read one section of a copy of his address, in which he says:

"As a life long Reformer my views upon the public issues of the day are well known to the majority of the electors. If elected I will give an honest legislation a cordial support. Should the convention which assembles on Saturday select a candidate from the county I pledge myself to resign my candidature, and in the event of the Liberal-Conservatives bringing out a candidate I will also resign, but with Mr. Fraser as the only nominee I shall remain in the field until the last vote is polled."

Now that township gave 117 majority against me, and gave forty only against Mr. Fraser. So I hope the hon. gentleman's convictions will grow, and if he has left the Reform party he will help me probably in the next election.

Motion agreed to.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

Motions for the following Returns were severally agreed to:—

Correspondence between the Provincial Agricultural and Industrial Society of Manitoba, the Board of Agriculture of Manitoba and the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture and any other Department of the Government, on the subject of a grant of land in the city of Winnipeg for exhibition purposes.—(Mr. Scott.)

Copies of correspondence, if any, between the Mayor and Council of Winnipeg and the Government, in reference to a grant or lease of the land at Fort Osborne to the city, for Park purposes.—(Mr. Scott.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, accounts and other papers relating to any claim made by D. B. Woodworth and others, for compensation for gravel, said to have been taken from claimants land for use on the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway; together with a copy of the evidence respecting such claim taken before the Board of Dominion Arbitrators, showing the amount claimed and the award, if any, made by said Arbitrators and what sums have been paid thereunder.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copies of all reports made by any Government Engineer, upon the present condition of the old barracks and other buildings now belonging to the Government, on Isle aux Noix, and at the town of St. Johns, county of St. Johns, Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

#### DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1874.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 85) to amend the Dominion Elections Act of 1874.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOLDUC proposed the following amendment to section 1:—

And such security shall be given by bonds of the person so suing, jointly and severally with some solvent and sufficient person to the satisfaction of the Judge of the court in which the action or information is brought; or by the deposit of the said sum in gold or Dominion notes with the said clerk, to be applied to or towards the payment of the costs of the defendant; if the case is dismissed with costs, the balance, if any, being returnable to the person so suing, and the whole sum deposited being returned to him if the case is decided in his favor.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

#### After Recess.

#### GRADUATES OF THE ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

On the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 33) to provide for the admission to the profession of Dominion Land Surveyors of Graduates of the Royal Military College, being read,  
Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. CASGRAIN. As I understand the hon. Minister if Militia is opposed to this measure, I do not intend to press of any further this Session. This Bill was not brought in by me on my own responsibility, and I have no personal interest in its subject-matter. My object in bringing in the measure was solely to benefit the institution. It would appear that there is so much competition in that line of education that all institutions desire to be on the same footing; therefore, if this Bill passed it would create some difficulty which I do not desire to raise. I shall ask leave of the House to withdraw the Bill; but before doing so I desire to repel an accusation which was made in the press last Session when I brought in a similar Bill. It was said that I had some personal interest in this matter. Now, I desire positively to state that I have not the least possible interest in this matter; and the circumstance that I have a son in that institution would not influence me to do anything which might be contrary to the public interest. This Bill was brought in by me at the suggestion of some person who had a direct interest in the school, and who thought it was best in the interests of this institution. That is all I have to say on the matter, and, with the permission of the House, I move to withdraw the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say that I have not the slightest doubt that my hon. friend was actuated by any other than Parliamentary motives, on introducing this Bill. It is a measure which strikes one at first as being a correct measure; but, on the whole, I think that the hon. gentleman has exercised a wise discretion in withdrawing it. It has caused a complete furore among the Dominion land surveyors, in the first place, and then I have received representations from almost every college institution, in both Ontario and Quebec, against it, stating that it was placing the alumni in a better position, and giving them greater opportunity of forwarding their position than is accorded to any other university or college, and they complain of the inequality of it; therefore, the Government think that they must either oppose this Bill or grant the same privilege to the graduates of all colleges. I am glad my hon. friend has withdrawn the Bill, having called the attention of the Government and the country to the measure. As to my hon. friend having a personal interest in it, I am quite sure he has not.

Bill withdrawn.

#### CLAIMS TO LANDS IN MANITOBA.

On the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 109) to amend the Act for the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy under the Act 33 Vic., chap. 3, being read,

Mr. ROYAL. I would respectfully call the attention of the right hon. head of the Government to the grievances that exist, and which this Bill seeks to remove. I hope the right hon. gentleman will see his way clear to take some means, either by administrative measure or otherwise, to allow those parties who are debarred from filing applications to get their patents to do so. I move for leave to withdraw the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a Private Bill, and ought, therefore, to have been proceeded with by petition. I have already had communication with the hon. gentleman on the matter, and it is one that the Government will undertake to consider with a desire of settling immediately all those claims. There are very few of them, and they ought to be settled, and will be settled very shortly.

Bill withdrawn.

#### ROADS AND ROAD ALLOWANCES IN MANITOBA.

Mr. ROYAL in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 110) to amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in Manitoba, said: This is an Act to enable the Government



to transfer certain powers under this Act to the Provincial Government of Manitoba in respect to certain road allowances. I suppose that the Land Bill will make some provision by which these grievances may be remedied, without, perhaps, requiring a special Bill on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend would move the second reading of the Bill now, and commit it for to-morrow, I will look into it in the meantime, and if I can I will allow the hon. gentleman to carry it into law.

Bill read the second time.

#### PENITENTIARIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting sums to be annually paid to the warden and the other officers and servants of any penitentiary established under the provisions of Bill (No. 111) respecting penitentiaries.

Resolution considered in Committee and reported.

#### CANADA CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 90) to amend the Canada Civil Service Act 1882.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I wish to call attention to the fifth sub-section. Attorneys, barristers, engineers, architects, actuaries, and land surveyors are exempt from examination; why is this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These gentlemen are employed in the service in the practice of their professions, and, therefore, an examination is not required, as they have already passed technical examination before their admission into the ranks of their professions.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think that this is nothing more than is due to their professional standing, and I have a suggestion which I think worthy of consideration to make, by which the labor of the examiners might be very much relieved. Other professions, whose examinations are higher than those of the Civil Service, might be well placed on the same footing. For instance, take the teaching profession. No person can hold a Provincial certificate in any of the Provinces without passing a more rigid examination than is required from Civil Service candidates, and would it not be an act of courtesy to this profession to also acknowledge their status. The examinations for almost any, even the lowest grade, are higher than those of the Civil Service; and as concerns the other grades, they are infinitely higher. The examiners by this means would be relieved of a great deal of labor, and I and any person acquainted with this profession would be able to guarantee that those holding certificates in this way, having passed those examinations, would be, from an educational standpoint at least, much better qualified than any person, who is barely able to pass the Civil Service examination. When I make this suggestion, the hon. gentleman will understand that I am speaking for in the neighborhood of 15,000 or 18,000 teachers in the Dominion of Canada. In Ontario we have 7,000, exclusive of high school teachers; in Quebec, 4,000 or 5,000; in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, over 3,000, making 15,000, while the remainder belong to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. It would be a mark of honor, shall I say—conferred upon this profession to allow these certificates to take rank; and this would be nothing more than what is similarly recognized in Ontario, where a person holding a certain grade of certificate is

admitted without examination into certain professions. An intermediate certificate from the high school is equivalent to passing the matriculation examination in medicine, and the College of Dental Surgeons makes a similar recognition. I make the same request with regard to the Civil Service; and I can safely make it, because these certificates guarantee much higher qualifications from an educational standpoint than those which are necessary to pass the Civil Service examinations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman must see that the exceptions here made are in favor of professional men who are employed in the practice of their professions, and, therefore, we are certain that they are qualified to fill these offices; but the same reason will not hold good for schoolmasters or professors, who, if they entered the Civil Service, would be employed in other capacities. If we were to exempt these parties, some, though not all of whom, are certainly learned, further extensions of the principle would be demanded. Of course, if all these persons had the qualifications of my hon. friend, perhaps we might make the exception, but I am sorry to say that this is not the case. I know that gentlemen admitted to certain learned professions experience very great difficulty even after they have passed their examinations, in passing the Civil Service examinations; and it is better after all, that the examinations should be somewhat severe in the beginning, in order that the impression may get abroad that these examinations are only held for fun and *pro forma*. It is, however, now well known to those outside, that the Civil Service examinations, though not too severe, are serious, and those who are admitted to the service have to show that they are qualified. I think my hon. friend will not insist upon the admission of these parties. I know some of them who have the qualifications, but I have others in my eye whose qualifications would not be sufficient.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am free to admit that the hon. members of that profession have not the technical qualifications which are required; but as I understand the design of the Bill is that no person is to be admitted into the service who does not possess a certain educational standing. I have here a list of the subjects required for the Civil Service examinations, and I find that they are fewer in number, and more limited, and that the questions are far easier than the examinations required for teachers. As the greater includes the less I should think that the hon. gentleman would be willing to admit a class who are possessed of perhaps two, or three, or four times the qualifications required by the Act, especially as the examiners would thereby be saved a large amount of time and trouble. I think the hon. Minister should graciously concede the point, in the interests, not only of the service, but of the teaching profession to whom it would offer an additional inducement to attain a high educational standard.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that if we concede this to the teachers, we would also have to concede it to many other classes—to graduates of our universities, colleges, &c. The exceptions would be so numerous that very few persons would remain to pass the examinations. Since, however, these persons are so able to pass the examinations I cannot see that any great hardship should be done, and even if it does give the examiners a little more trouble they are paid for it.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many of those who passed the examinations have since been admitted into the service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About sixty-six or sixty-seven I think. I will send the list across the floor, so that the hon. gentleman may see it.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). That information is very gratifying, but I hope there have been no violations of the Act. I am informed that the hon. Minister of Finance has placed in his Department a Toronto barrister who has not passed the examination. I think the success of this Civil Service Act will depend entirely upon its being carried out in good faith.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see by referring to the thirty-fourth clause of the Civil Service Act, that there are powers given to exempt persons from the examinations in certain cases, and if any such appointments have been made such as the hon. gentleman has referred to I am sure he will find, if he puts a question on the paper, that they have been made under that clause.

Mr. PLATT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why he has excluded the medical profession from the list of exemptions under that clause?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say that the Government are in such good health that we do not require the services of medical men as medical men. When they are required they enter the service like other persons; but if a medical man was required for a quarantine, for example, he would come in under the clause which provides that for special purposes examinations may not be exacted.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am going to request the hon. Minister to consider the case of the cadets of the Royal Military College, as I think they should be placed among that favored class. When the College was established it was held out as an inducement to enter it that vacancies might occur in the Civil Service which they would be qualified to fill, and these vacancies would be kept as a sort of special reserve. I do not want to give them any special favors, but they are a class of young men who are especially educated at the expense of the Government, and they have a technical education which would make them very useful to the Minister of Militia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman was not present a moment ago when the hon. First Minister, in replying to another hon. member, stated that we could not concede to that principle, for if we granted it to the cadets of the Royal Military College, we would have to concede it also to the young gentlemen who come out of our colleges and universities all over the country, and who receive in these institutions as high an education as the cadets receive at Kingston.

Mr. CARON. As the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) knows, the education which these cadets receive is so high that I am quite sure that they would not like to be exempted from the examinations which others have to undergo to enter the service.

Mr. BLAKE. Some discussion took place at an earlier stage of the Bill with regard to the appointment of certain classes of officers without examination and without reference to the rules for promotion. I am not disposed to quarrel with that provision, subject to certain limitations. In the earlier part of section thirty-three, the principle is laid down that when an examination is dispensed with, it must be for reasons assigned by the Deputy-Head; and it appears to me that in an Act of this description, in which we are laying it down as a general principle that appointments to promotions shall take place upon examinations and under certain rules, any exception which we introduce we should carefully endeavor to guard it against abuse; and I suggest this addition to the third sub-section:

"Where the public interest requires it, but appointments under this sub-section shall be made only on a report, giving reasons therefor, and such report shall be laid before Parliament within ten days after the commencement of the Session."

I think the rule in the bulk of these appointments should be upon promotion and examination. But as the hon. gentle-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

man says, preventive officers at small ports could not be expected to come up for examination. Still, I think the principle of the Act should be departed from only upon this precaution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These city postmasters are not numerous. There are perhaps only twelve or fourteen cities in the Dominion, and the hon. gentleman knows that as a rule these city postmasterships are not given to the ordinary run of officers, but to persons who are not only qualified, but who have rendered service to their country; and I think the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that the same rule in that respect has been followed by all Governments. They are generally men of higher rank than those who are appointed to ordinary offices, and we apply the same rule to them that we do to the deputy-heads of Departments. I would also call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, in cases of special official or technical qualifications, we exempt from examination. Moreover, this clause is a permissive one, not an obligation, so that the Government may, if they have any doubts about a man's qualifications, subject him to examination the same as other officers. With regard to making a report to the House in the first ten days of the Session, the hon. gentleman will remember that by the Civil Service Act, we are bound to lay before Parliament in the beginning of the Session, a list of the appointments made during the year.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has taken the same course on this occasion that he did before—he has confined his attention to the case of postmasters. If it is the will of the House that the city postmasterships should be made political prizes, well and good; but the clause is far more extensive. It applies to all collectors and preventive officers in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, and my observations were directed principally to them. They stand in a different position in every way from the twelve or fourteen city postmasters. I think that when this clause is allowed not to apply to certain classes, there should be a special report. For instance, a preventive officer at a small salary, and in a remote port, could not be held to pass an examination. I think that when special circumstances exist which warrant a departure from the general provisions of the Act, the hon. Minister should make a report of those cases.

On section 11,

Mr. BLAKE. While I agree that the central duty of an officer is the observance of fidelity to the Government which is proposed to be imposed by this Act—though I am not a very great believer in promissory oaths of any kind—I think the words that are inserted in the schedule are open to some exception. I think if we give the Governor in Council power to say to John Jones: "I call upon you to take this oath," that it is of doubtful expediency, and that it ought either to apply to whole classes of officers, or else the whole service ought to take an oath in that form. I do not think it is right that the Governor in Council should be permitted to exact the oath of any particular officer as proposed in the schedule.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There may be an officer who is away, or who may have been forgotten, and of course there must be some provision by which he may be called upon to take the oath. The clause says these officers will have to take the oath, while if they do not take the oath some one must compel them to do their duty, and the Head of the Department would say to the sub-head: "Call upon Mr. So-and-So to go and take the oath of office before the Clerk of the Privy Council." I think that is a very proper thing.

Mr. BLAKE. The meaning of this clause is to require that the Clerk of the Privy Council, and all the officers of the Privy Council, shall take the additional oath, and then

to add that any other officer that the Governor in Council require shall take the additional oath.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For example, the Privy Council is the most confidential office, and the officers there will necessarily be called upon to take the oath—not that there is any additional reason now why they should be compelled to do so, because they are good officers and fulfil their duty well; they are discreet and do not violate the secrecy of the office. But this rule should apply all round. There may be a good reason, for example, why the confidential clerk of a Minister should be called upon to take the oath; for instance, the Secretary of the First Minister becomes cognizant of very important matters, important papers and despatches pass through his hands, and it is absolutely necessary that these things should not be divulged. The hon. Minister may call upon his clerk to take this special oath, and I think this clause is a very proper thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid it will not produce the good results the hon. gentleman expects. I believe that if you apply by this provision a separate standard, as it were, of obligation to some officers whom you call upon to take the oath, you almost say to others whom you do not call upon to take the oath that you do not consider them quite so bad as the others; that as the others are sworn to secrecy and these are not, those who are so sworn are not so trustworthy. I almost fear that this provision will do more harm than good. When you call upon a particular officer, and not upon a whole class, to take the oath, you almost imply there is some reason to suspect him. If the hon. gentleman thinks the oath is desirable I would suggest that it should be applied to all officers in that position.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend must remember that there are certain officers now who have always been called upon to take an oath of that kind. The Clerk of the Privy Council, the Assistant Clerk, and all the clerks of the Privy Council, take the oath. Nobody has complained of that. We propose now to continue the provision, and give some latitude to the Government. Should the Government find it desirable to extend the oath to the whole service it might do so.

Bill reported.

#### THE CUSTOMS ACT.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 34) to amend and consolidate the Act respecting Customs, said: The only change is the substitution of the word "whether" in one line, and striking out the word "may" in another; and in the provision limiting the time within which proceedings may be commenced against an officer for dereliction of duty, they add the words "or upon any officer of Customs."

Amendments concurred in.

#### THE POST OFFICE ACT, 1875.

Mr. CARLING, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 92) to amend the Post Office Act, 1875, said: The nature of the amendment is to prevent the post office being used for the circulation of letters or information concerning illegal lotteries. The necessity for the Bill has arisen on account of persons having established themselves in New Brunswick for the purpose of forwarding the interests of lotteries in the United States. Under the United States Postal Law they cannot circulate such information through the mails in the United States; but if they are mailed in Canada they are sent there.

Mr. BLAKE. And the only change is the addition of a provision as to lotteries in the existing Act.

Mr. CARLING. Yes. The following words are added in sub-section twenty-seven of section seventy-two:—

Or any letter or circular concerning an illegal lottery, so-called gift concert, or other similar enterprise offering prizes or concerning schemes devised and intended to deceive and defraud the public for the purpose of obtaining money under false pretences, shall be a misdemeanor.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed.

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 94) to amend an Act respecting the offices of Receiver General and Minister of Public Works, as to the powers of the Minister of Railways and Canals.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

#### GOVERNMENT WORKS ON RIVERS AND STREAMS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (April 19th) respecting the regulations and collection of tolls and dues for the use of Government works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber and lumber down rivers and streams.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister explain the object of the resolution?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Difficulty has arisen under the present law as it has been found impossible to collect the tolls. It has been established, in the case of the Merchants' Bank vs. The Queen, that after a mill owner has sawn timber into deals and other lumber and piled it in his yard, we cannot follow and identify the lumber as having been cut from particular logs, and are, therefore, unable in some cases to collect the dues. It is proposed to give authority to follow that timber in order to collect stumpage dues on the timber.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. It is not proposed then to alter the dues, but simply to render the collection more easy. What is the nature of the provision which it is proposed to introduce?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Clause three of the Bill makes provision to cover the case. Section four provides that if the lumber was manufactured before the dues are collected, and although it becomes mixed up with other manufactured lumber, the whole of the lumber shall be liable for the dues actually owing to the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that this shall take place no matter through how many hands the timber or lumber may have passed, or only is it while the lumber is in the hands of the person who is liable to the Government for the dues?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think it would apply after the timber passes out of the hands of the owner, who so owes the Government. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) who takes very great interest in these matters, has been communicated with by most of the lumber merchants to watch the clauses of this Bill; and one of the reasons why I suggested that we should take the second reading tomorrow, is in order to afford that hon. gentleman an opportunity of being present and discussing these clauses.

Resolution reported.

Mr. COSTIGAN introduced Bill (No. 126) to make further provision respecting the regulation and collection of

tolls on Government Timber Slides and other works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber, lumber and saw-logs.

Bill read the first time.

#### PENITENTIARIES LAWS' CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moving the second reading of Bill (No. 111) to amend and consolidate the Laws relating to Penitentiaries, said: I do not propose to discuss this matter to-night, as I have not quite read the brief, and would suggest the discussion be deferred.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection to that at all on this understanding, that if after discussion in Committee, I should ask the hon. gentleman to postpone the third reading until the day following, he will do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Bill read the second time.

#### HARBOR OF THREE RIVERS' HARBOR MASTER BILL.

Mr. BOWELL in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 121) respecting the Harbor Master of the Harbor of Three Rivers, said: It is simply intended to change the mode of appointment, and to confirm the appointment of the harbor master of Three Rivers, and to give the Commissioners power to appoint him in future, and to pay him by salary instead of by fees. It is also provided that nothing in this Act shall impair the power of the Governor in Council as to the appointment and removal of the said Commissioners. The appointment of harbor master was formerly made by the Governor in Council, this power is transferred to the Commissioners as is the case at other ports.

Mr. BLAKE. If I remember aright, it was only a very little while ago that we passed an Act touching the harbor of Three Rivers, and I suppose that this Bill alters the provisions of that Act.

Mr. BOWELL. We passed such a Bill last year, I think.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

183. *Canada Gazette* ..... \$4,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. Why this increase?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is an additional expense for notices, I presume.

Mr. BLAKE. But additional notices mean additional payments, do they not?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This amount has been sent in by the Queen's printer.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What is the revenue from the *Canada Gazette*? I have searched for it in the Public Accounts but cannot find it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will ascertain and let us know.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I notice that the *Ontario Gazette* nearly pays expenses, and I think the *Canada Gazette* should give a handsome revenue.

Mr. BLAKE. I always understood that advertisements were the life of publications of this sort; but the hon. gentleman says the more advertisements the more cost.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Perhaps the other expenses have increased in the same proportion.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

184. Miscellaneous printing ..... \$12,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why this increase?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I notice that the expenditure last year was \$11,204, which was \$1,204 more than the vote, so it was thought necessary to increase the appropriation.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think the hon. gentleman should tell us in what direction he expects to expend this large amount of money. Although we have not passed it, there is another item of \$60,000 for printing. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries I notice that there is an appropriation of \$1,500 for printing the report of the shipping of Canada. Then there is a similar vote for the Department of Railways, and I think there is another vote of the same kind under another head. Then we have here \$2,000 more for miscellaneous printing, or, in all, \$73,000 in the items which I have named for printing, some of it miscellaneous, and some of it, I suppose, Parliamentary. From information which is in the possession of the Public Accounts Committee, some of the miscellaneous printing would appear to be very miscellaneous indeed. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain why he proposes to increase this vote.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I find, under the head of miscellaneous printing in the Public Accounts, Henry Hartney, Parliamentary reports, \$13,875.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman propose to expend this vote in the same way as it was spent last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I presume so, as it is under this head. There is another item, as the hon. gentleman recollects, which is held in reserve.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Yes; \$60,000 for that item. I do not know that it is in order for me to refer to what took place in the Public Accounts Committee, as it has not reported, but I might say that it would be well for the Government to consider whether the printing bills might not be materially reduced by directing that the work so far as practicable should be done by the contractors for the Parliamentary printing. Under the head of Miscellaneous Printing, I find the sum of \$732 paid for printing and binding Budget Speech, and \$839 for printing and binding it in French. I offer no objection to the expenditure of the money, for that particular purpose, but I say that a smaller sum—perhaps less than half that amount—would give equal results if it were printed and published by the Parliamentary Printers. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not remember that when work of this kind is done outside it is not only liable to heavy charges under what are called confidential rates, but last year a considerable sum extra was paid for the translation of the Budget Speech. No doubt the Budget Speech was translated by the translators of the Debates in regular form, but I find an item of something like \$86 for translating that speech. This is a charge which could be obviated by allowing the contractor to run off the the Budget Speech from the same form as the Official Debates.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With reference to employing a translator of the House to do the extra work, it could not be expected that he would do that work under his salary, as it is outside of his regular business. With reference to this printing and translation I may say that, I believe, I am following the example of my illustrious predecessor. If there is anything wrong I think he will find that it was continued precisely in the same way.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The translation was not extra service, because he had to translate the speech for the Official Debates, and all he had to do was to hand over the printed sheet to the publisher of the *Ottawa Citizen*, and put

in his extra charge as if he had done extra work, which work he did not do.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood the hon. Finance Minister. What he said was that he was pursuing the same policy as his predecessor; and I think if he refers to the Public Accounts he will find that the Budget Speeches of the late hon. Finance Minister were not published by the Parliamentary printers, but by an independent printing office, and that there was a special and distinct charge for translation.

Mr. ROSS. I do not think so.

Mr. BOWELL. I know it is, because I examined the matter, and I pointed it out to the Committee on Public Accounts the last time this question was discussed; and I think, if the hon. gentleman will refer to the Public Accounts for 1875-76, he will find that there were two charges, one for printing the Budget Speech at outside offices, a certain amount for translation, and a certain amount for binding, and for gilt edges.

Mr. BLAKE. I saw the voucher in this case, and I observed that the Queen's Printer made a special memorandum, calling attention to the fact that the particular translator who charged, I think, \$72 for the translation, was the officer who translated for the *Hansard*, and so it was a double charge for the same service.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will enquire into that item. My attention had not been called to it.

Mr. ROSS. I would further call the hon. gentleman's attention to a similar item which occurred in the bill sent in for the printing of Sir Charles Tupper's speech on Railways. There is there a charge for translation also of \$74, \$1 a page, although the same individual had been paid \$2.50 a page for translating the same speech for the *Hansard*. In reply to the hon. Minister of Customs, I would say that there cannot have been a double charge for translating the Budget Speech in 1875, because at that time the speeches were printed in the language in which they were delivered; we had no official translator; and if the speech had to be translated, a special translator would have to be employed for the purpose. The charge in this case is that the translator is paid, not only for translating the speech in the Debates, but for this particular issue.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure whether it was in 1875 or in 1876.

Mr. ROSS. Well, the same may be said of 1876.

187. For the expenses of Government in the North-West Territories, including roads, bridges, ferries, and aid to schools ..... \$20,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The vote is only \$20,000 but we are taking a further vote in the Supplementary Estimates. I will state the details of this vote. The travelling expenses of Members of the Council are \$4,000, against \$2,000 in the previous year. With the increased population, the right to elect Members of the Council is extended; I believe there will be three, if not four, elective Members of the Council, in addition to those appointed under the Act. For public printing \$1,000 is asked, instead of \$600. The Committee will quite understand that with the development of the country, a larger amount of printing will be required. For stationery, telegrams, and postage, \$500 is asked, instead of \$400; for roads and bridges, \$7,000, instead of \$5,000; for aid to schools, \$4,000, instead of \$2,000; for election expenses, \$3,000, instead of \$1,000. The people are getting all the advantages of representative Government up there; they are going to have elections in several districts this year. For surveys under 43 Vic., chap. 55, \$2,000 is asked; for miscellaneous, including fuel and light for Government House, the Council Chamber and Offices, subscriptions to magazines, newspapers, &c, \$5,000, instead of

\$2,000; and an allowance of \$500 to provide a residence for the Clerk of the Council at the new seat of Government. Mr. Fortier, the Clerk, has been provided at Battleford with a house, and as his salary is small, it is proposed to continue this provision.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is time that this vote should be a little more systematized. It embraces a large number of miscellaneous items, and the hon. gentleman's experience of their general run should enable him to put the estimates in a different shape. He proposes to take \$4,000 instead of \$2,000 in connection with the meetings of the Council; but if I am rightly informed, there have been no meetings of the Council for two years. He proposes for schools, \$4,000 instead of \$2,000, and for the expenses of Government House, \$5,000. I should like to see a little more for schools and a little less for contingencies for Government House, for the Governor is not up there much after all. If the hon. gentleman had proposed a vote for his residence here, I could have understood it. It does seem to me that the division of the vote is a good deal like Falstaff's arrangement between the sack and the bread—too little people, too much Governor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But there is very little sack up there.

Mr. BLAKE. I know some one who ought to get the sack.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the Lieutenant-Governor being here. When he is here, he is here at my request and responsibility, and for the good of the service. He is a very good officer, one of the best, I believe, in our service. He has by his resistance to a certain amount of pressure, perhaps, obtained for himself the enviable distinction of being attacked, but I am satisfied—and I have had a long experience in the selection of men—that I never made a better selection of a better man or a better officer than I did in selecting Mr. Dewdney. He has been here arranging with the Government for the future government of that country, both white and red, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that a more efficient head-officer than Mr. Dewdney could not be found. Now, we will take up the different items that have been mentioned. First, travelling expenses of members of the Council, \$4,000, instead of \$2,000. The hon. gentleman says the Council has not met for some time. That is quite true. That country is in a transient state. The legislation, the by-laws, the ordinances, passed by the Council, which is, I may say, a Town Council, have been under consideration by the Department of Justice. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that Mr. Richardson, who is one of the stipendiary magistrates, is not an expensive man. He is a man of good administrative talent, and we have been consulting him about the ordinances and by-laws of the North-West. Only one man, I think, Mr. Clark, was elected to be a member of this Council. There are going to be three, perhaps four, but three members certainly during the present year, and it is thought better not to make any by-laws obligatory on that country until we had something of a popular element introduced into it. That popular element will be introduced by three this year, and perhaps more next year. Under an Act passed, not by this Government, but by the preceding Government—and a very good Act it was—as the population increased, the General Council will be supplemented by men elected to sit in it. However we are discussing now merely the question of expense and not the question of policy, and I shall merely read from the memo. placed in my hands by the Department. The increase of \$2,000 in the travelling expenses of the Council is explained by the larger number of members. In 1882 the Lieutenant-Governor's Council was composed of four members. For 1883-84 provision has to be made for nine members

at least—three stipendiary magistrates, *ex-officio* members of the Council, three appointed by the Crown and three elected. Five may possibly be elected instead of three, should the population warrant it. As to the item of printing, it has increased \$4,000. The expenditure under this head during the last twelve months exceeded by \$1,000 the vote of last year, and the amount now provided may be insufficient, but efforts will be made to keep the expenditure within that limit. In the postal service the payments for telegraphic communication are included, which makes an increase of \$400 or \$500. As regards roads and bridges the expenditure increases according as the country becomes settled, and if all the applications for aid towards the construction of bridges and highways were entertained, a much larger amount would have to be granted. As regards aid to schools, the expenditure during 1881-82 was \$2,204, and during the first six months of the current year \$1,250 have been paid. A larger number of schools have been opened, especially in the eastern part of the Territory, which will of course be entitled to help the same as those existing heretofore. As to election expenses, we ask an increase of \$2,000. Under the provisions of the North-West Territory Act of 1880, section 15, several portions of the Territory are now entitled to representation in the Council, and probably the expenses of elections will average \$600, or \$3,000 to cover the possible election of five instead of three. Statute 43 Vic., chap. 55, provides for highways and trails. In the General Act it is provided that the leading trail should be kept up, and therefore we have to encourage expenditure under this head. The expenses of Government House are of the lightest kind. The Lieutenant-Governor, who is the Indian Commissioner, is quite satisfied with such provision as can be made for him as Indian Commissioner, and a frame house, brought up from Ontario, will be quite sufficient for his purpose for a good many years, unless the country advances in such a degree that it will be necessary the Lieutenant-Governor should have a more important residence. A small allowance is made to the Clerk of the Council for rental, owing to his removal from Battleford to Regina, and consequent deprivation of the fine quarters he had at the other place.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these items the \$20,600, or do they include the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They embrace the additional ones. I think that it will be nearly doubled.

Mr. BLAKE. There will be about \$32,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so, about that.

188. For the expenses of Government in the District of Keewatin ..... \$5,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the same sum as was voted for this service for the current year. It is principally to be expended in the maintenance of insane persons from the district of Keewatin confined in the Manitoba Penitentiary. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba is *ex-officio* Lieutenant-Governor of the district, and the disbursements are made upon his requisition and upon his certificate that the services for which the charges are made have been properly performed. His Honor's private secretary is to receive an allowance per annum as secretary of the Governor of Keewatin.

190. To meet expenses connected with the consolidation of the Dominion Statutes..... \$6,000.00

In answer to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Cockburn was appointed a Commissioner to prepare all the preliminaries for a formal Commission. As the hon. gentleman knows it is almost impossible to effect a Commission unless there be preliminary work in the way of the analysis, indexing and

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

arrangement of the individual Statutes. Mr. Cockburn was appointed for that purpose, and I believe no one is more competent. As every one knows Mr. Cockburn's health is, unfortunately, broken down, and he was obliged to retire from Parliament and from political life where he held, as the hon. gentleman knows, a respectable and estimable position. But his illness was such that while it prevented him from sitting in Parliament, it did not in any way interfere with his efficiency to do legal work of this kind, and with him it is a labor of love. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Cockburn's mind is essentially a legal one, and I do not know a better man for the purpose of the consolidation of these whole Statutes than Mr. Cockburn. He is working at it, I have occasion to know, most assiduously, and he has had until the other day a most assiduous assistant as secretary in the person of Mr. Ferguson. I am sorry to say that Mr. Ferguson was obliged, a few days ago, to give up his position as secretary, because his business was so rapidly increasing that he found he could not devote all his time to this work. Mr. Cockburn, I am sorry to say, has been until the last few months under special medical treatment; he is, however, better. He has been at Montreal under the care of the best physicians, where he has still been engaged on this work; and he will be here in a few days and continue his work. I have no doubt my hon. friend opposite will agree with me that his temporary illness ought not to prevent one employing him still in this important work.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if the state of things be as the hon. gentleman says, I do not know that any objection can be taken. We all know the circumstances under which Mr. Cockburn left Parliament. The papers which were moved for and ordered last Session, and which were not brought down until this Session, reveal a peculiar state of things in connection with this matter. It appears that some time early in the year an appointment was made by the intervention of the hon. gentleman himself, as well, as I remember from the papers, by which Mr. Cockburn was to do certain preliminary work in connection with the consolidation of the Statutes. But he was to receive no remuneration; he was to receive a certain sum to pay his expenses, and he received, I think, one or two cheques for expenses, of, if I remember aright, \$750 apiece. Matters so went on until November, and then a report is made recommending that Mr. Cockburn be appointed as the Commissioner at a salary of \$4,000 a year, and that the appointment date back from the preceding month of July upon condition that he refunded the smaller sums he had received for disbursements, and an order is made accordingly and the balance is paid. It is quite clear to my mind what the object of the transaction in that form was. In the first place it was not convenient, I presume, for Mr. Cockburn to resign his seat in Parliament at the earlier period, and so an appointment was made under which he was to perform this duty without remuneration; but so soon as a convenient period arrived for his resignation it took place, nearly in November, and then the appointment is made and the salary is elevated, and he is placed in the position of being a salaried officer for somewhere about six months during which time he had been discharging the duty gratuitously. The announcement was made at the time that his resignation was in consequence of his ill-health, of his incapacity to perform the duties of a member of Parliament, but the Government had before that determined upon his appointment and created the position of Commissioner for him. The information I received was that during a very large portion of the time Mr. Cockburn has, through illness, been incapable of discharging the active duties of that Commission. The hon. gentleman says that has been the case for a few months last past only; but it is obvious that with respect to a gentleman who is in such an unfortunate state of health that it was rather to be expected such a difficulty would

arise, and the whole transaction looks to me, I must confess, rather as if the office were made for the man and that an arrangement was made by which Mr. Cockburn, who, unfortunately, was no longer capable of discharging the public duties for which he had been selected, should become a salaried officer in the hon. gentleman's employment. We have not seen very much fruit from this work, as yet; but of course it would be impossible, I admit, to lay on the Table of the House the full details. We have seen a report which indicates the general course of the transactions which have taken place; and as regards the work which has actually been done, we must wait for another year before we are able to form a judgment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not suppose the hon. gentleman would have objected to this item. It is quite true Mr. Cockburn was obliged to retire from Parliament, after having been a Minister and Speaker. He broke down altogether in consequence of his arduous duties as Speaker. The law at that time was that the Speaker was obliged to remain in the Chair—we have since relieved our Speakers of that onerous duty—but we had very laborious and long-drawn Sessions, and really his devotion to his duty was the cause of his contracting an illness, in consequence of which he was unable to remain in his place in the House for any time. His power for work is, however, as strong, and his desire to work is as great as formerly, and I think the hon. gentleman might have spared the Committee these remarks. I do not like to compare one thing with another, but if any hon. gentleman from Ontario will compare the cost of consolidating the Statutes of that Province with the expense incurred hitherto, and with the expenses which I believe there will be in future, in connection with consolidating the Statutes of the Dominion, it will be found that the latter work will be done for one-half the money, and quite as efficiently, and I believe more efficiently.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There will be very little work for the Commissioner to do if we continue to consolidate the Statutes as we have done during the last year or two. Last year, the Railway Acts were consolidated, and most of the time this Session we are spending in doing the work which the Commissioner was appointed to do. We are consolidating the Dominion Lands Acts, the Excise Acts, the Penitentiaries, the Superaunuation, all of which would be part of the duty of the Commissioner. If we continue this work of consolidation, what necessity exists for the Commissioner?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will do the work in one year instead of three years, as occurred in Ontario.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex.) In another year there will be nothing for the Commissioner to do, if we do as well next year as this.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we will dispense with his services next year.

Mr. CHARLTON. What progress has been made with the work of consolidation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A full report has been laid on the Table. During this Session very considerable progress has been made. I candidly tell the Committee that I am very much grieved, in view of my desire to have the work finished rapidly, that Mr. Ferguson has found it impossible to continue in his position, and I judge we will not easily get so efficient a Secretary. I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that we are doing everything we can to get a consolidation as quickly and as cheaply as possible, and are at the same time employing a deserving public servant.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not familiar with the mode by which the Ontario Statutes were consolidated, but I believe the work was performed by the Judges, and gratuitously. I think any expense in connection with consolidating the

Statutes was in the employment of some preliminary officer, Mr. Langton, I think, at the very modest salary of \$1,000 or \$1,200, and that the rest of the expense was for the necessary printing involved. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the work was performed by the Judges without remuneration; so I am afraid his comparison was a little unfortunate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may be wrong.

192. To compensate members of the North-West Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty.....\$2,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is a mistake that this item should appear under the head of Miscellaneous. It really is part of the expense of the Mounted Police, and should appear under that head.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and we will have the transfer made.

Mr. ORTON. I am very glad to observe that the Government have placed the sum in the Estimates for the purpose of compensating members of the Mounted Police who have received injuries while on service. I take this occasion to draw the attention of the Minister to a case that, no doubt, was brought to his notice, and which it seems to me is one of peculiar hardship. It is the case of Johnston, who was shot in the washroom in the barracks in the North-West by one of his comrades, leaving a widow and child. I understand it is not the policy of the Government to encourage married men to join the service, and there is no provision made for the remuneration of widows; but I certainly think in this case, where the man was shot by a member of the force, the Dominion Government should be, to a certain extent, held responsible for the occurrence. I trust the First Minister will do something for that young man's widow and family. In connection with the Mounted Police I certainly think there is not a body of men in the Dominion which deserves more consideration than that body. The services they have rendered to that country and are rendering, I consider, are invaluable. Their pay is certainly very small indeed, in comparison with the great service they render, not only in keeping the Indians in a peaceful condition, but also in maintaining the peace during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We also know that they have very arduous duties to perform in connection with the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Many of these men entered the service young and have spent the best days of their lives in it, although they receive very poor pay indeed. The Inspector, I understand, only receives \$1,000 a year. There are men in this force who have, as I have said, done immense service to their country, and still they are only in receipt of \$1,000 per annum, without any provision for retiring pensions, or anything of that kind. I certainly think that this country can afford to treat the only military body which has rendered every day valuable services to it, in a more handsome manner than is at present the case; for neither the men nor the officers are paid, in my opinion, in proportion to the valuable services which they render.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

193. For erection of Mounted Police Barracks..... \$80,000.00

Mr. CHARLTON. Where are these barracks to be erected?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The sum of \$30,000 applies to the close of the present year. This grant is being expended in the erection of barracks at Regina and Calgary; and \$60,000 will be required during the next fiscal year. The first is for the completion of the barracks at Calgary, and the second for the erection of new barracks at Fort McLeod, where the old building, being in an advanced state of decay, is liable to be washed away at any moment,

owing to Old Man's River having changed its course. It so happened that the Fort McLeod Barracks was built of logs in the early days of settlement there, and it is about to disappear, as the river has changed its course, and the force there is consequently in danger of being swept away, because houses are being swept away before their eyes. The buildings at present in use are unfit for occupation; and storehouses are to be erected at Maple Creek. These will be used during the summer to hold stores, which are being drawn to Fort Walsh for that post. If the hon. gentleman remembers the maps, Fort Walsh is directly very near the frontier, and was at one time the chief place where the Mounted Police were stationed; it was close to the frontier, and here the Indians mostly assembled, and here there was the most danger of disturbance. Now it has been found that Fort Walsh is the worst place we can have for a fort. The Indians, especially the loose Indians, those who do not adhere steadily to one point or another, and some bands—I will not mention the names of the chiefs, or of the men, who are creating the disturbance there, because these things are printed and get to the ears of the Indians by some means or other—assemble at this place; and we have been trying for the last three years, and I believe before that time, but, at all events, I can vouch for the last three years—to get the Indians away from the frontier. They are continually causing disturbances across the frontier; but they are, however, more sinned against than sinning. We are trespassed upon infinitely more by Indians from the south than our Indians trespass across the line. Still there are continual complaints from American traders; but these traders have their own purposes to serve in making complaints about our Indians. Of course these complaints go to Washington. The Government there know nothing about them, and send them to the British Ambassador, who sends them to us here; and we have to investigate into an infinity of charges about British Indians trespassing across the line, with the view by those people—not by the American Government—of claiming damages, or of creating necessity for the idea of keeping up a large regular American force, and scouts, and all the machinery requisite in the Western country, along our frontier. In order to prevent that for ever, we, by degrees, have been coaxing the Indians to leave the frontier and go across the Pacific Railway to the reservations in the north. Two or three times we thought that we had succeeded. We had succeeded once or twice, and the Indians had apparently settled down on the reserves last year, but more especially the year before, when a rumor—a false rumor as it proved—spread that the buffalo, which had disappeared, had recrossed our line. The Indians then left the reserves and went back to the United States. There were then all kinds of complaints about the stealing of horses—most of them unjust, and some true—by these Indians, who had invaded the United States territory. They found that all these rumors were false, and they came back without their horses, because the American Indians had taken their horses from them, and got back to Fort Walsh starving. A very considerable portion of the vote asked for last year, was extended to these Indians. We could not allow them to die. They came from the United States without horses, without clothes and without blankets—and there they were. We have to treat these Indians as children. It is not by getting angry with them; not by quarrelling with them, but by coaxing them that we can succeed in our object. They are now by slow degrees migrating to the north; and one or two, or three of the chiefs, the leading men having the most influence with these Indians, whose names I will not mention, and who have been the principal cause of the disturbances along the frontier, have at last come in from the settlement. We have kept them on starvation allowance. We have given them at the beginning of last winter one-quarter rations, but during the winter they could not stand this, and we gave them one half rations; still they

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

were on starvation allowance; but we have promised them very considerable advantages if they will cross the line and leave Fort Walsh, which has been, mind you, a place of assembly for them for very many years, for Indians stick to their own traditions. The last telegram I have received within the last few days, shows that there is going to be a regular movement of the Indians north of the Pacific Railway line on the reserves; and the moment that they leave Fort Walsh it is to be destroyed and razed to the ground, so that there will be no chance of their ever assembling there again with the hope of getting any food or succor from the Dominion Government. That is the position of matters just now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose that the policy of the Government will be to collect the Indians on the reserves and support them, supplementing whatever they may lack in supplying themselves with necessary food.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes; and it has been very successful. I am led to believe from the reports of our agents that this year, 1883, will be the test of all the expense that can be anticipated in this relation, and that after all the Indians are really taking to the soil.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the sum of \$30,000 this year, and the \$60,000 we are now asked to vote, will be sufficient to erect the barracks?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot well say. We will put up the barracks wherever we can get the logs. They will, of course, still be log barracks, which are good for a time, but decay rapidly. Of course we must have brick at the principal stations, but we do not propose to have brick until the price largely decreases. We have very good temporary barracks—some put together at Montreal, and some at Ottawa—and the North-West policemen say that they never were so comfortable before. They were sent up in frame and put together there, and though temporary they are really very comfortable.

Mr. BLAKE. \$90,000 seems a large sum to spend for barracks and I hope the expenditure will be as temporary as the right hon. gentleman says the barracks will be. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the Regina barracks are to be paid out of the new vote, or partly out of the old vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Partly out of the new, and partly out of the old.

Mr. BLAKE. And how much is to be paid at Calgary, and how much at Regina?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The barracks at Regina will be \$35,000, and those at Calgary and Fort McLeod about \$25,000 each.

Mr. BLAKE. And how many will they provide quarters for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be 150 at Regina, the headquarters; 100 at Calgary, and seventy-five at Fort McLeod.

Mr. CHARLTON. 325 in all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we have our stations. We have 500 men when the force is complete. It is short by some forty men, who will be recruited this spring.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do you erect palisades around these buildings?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I do not think so.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any truth in the reports we have heard that there is danger of Indian hostilities—that there is dissatisfaction among the Indians of the plains in



consequence of the progress of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and danger of an outbreak of hostilities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can tell the hon. gentleman, that our latest advices give the most satisfactory assurance that the Indians do not object to the progress of the railway. We were rather alarmed with regard to the Blackfeet Indians as we approached the Rocky Mountains, as to what they might think of a railway passing through that country. But so far we have had no exhibition of discontent, and the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as I can learn, have acted with great discretion. We have heard of one, and perhaps two, instances in which a navy or person employed on the road, did not treat the Indians with the consideration which they should have received, but those were the only cases, and they passed without any scalp being taken or any man wounded. This is really a most marvellous thing. It is one of those fortunate things upon which we feel like congratulating ourselves—that while during the construction of railways in the United States there was a very considerable amount of collision and loss of life between the red man and the white man, no such loss of life has yet occurred in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We cannot, of course, tell as to the future; the Indians are savages, and the imprudence of a single white man might at any moment cause an unexpected catastrophe; but hitherto there has been none, I am glad to say. I am also glad to bear testimony to the conduct of the North-West Mounted Police. The contractors who are building the road across the prairies, Messrs. Sheppard & Langdon, are experienced contractors, who have built hundreds of miles of railway in the United States, and they state that in consequence of the exclusion of intoxicating liquors from the men, and by the active steady exertions on the part of the Mounted Police, there has not been a single collision between the workmen and the Indians. There has not been a murder or a homicide, when I am almost afraid to say they annually lost men in this way when they were building railways in the United States.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether the Mounted Police have been supplied with the new repeating Winchester rifles? I was at the barracks at Qu'Appelle at the latter end of August and none of the force there were armed with these rifles. They were armed with the useless Snider rifles, while the Indians of the Piepot Band had the Winchester, and it would have been possible for the few Indians there with these arms to have cleaned out the whole force without any trouble. Another question I would like to ask is, whether the force is really mounted? At the time I am speaking of there were 100 so-called Mounted Police at Fort Qu'Appelle, mounted on twenty horses, so that either five men had to mount one horse, or one man had to mount the horse and the four men hang on by the tail.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the assistance of the hon. gentleman we propose to give a liberal vote to the North-West Mounted Police. But the hon. gentleman is quite right. The Mounted Police were supplied with Snider carbines; but we have been by degrees supplying them with Winchester rifles. Every year there has been an increasing number of Winchester rifles supplied to the force; three hundred rifles were delivered the other day. This is a very considerable expense, as the hon. gentleman knows, because each rifle costs at Winchester \$15, and to supply these to five hundred men means a considerable sum of money. I believe that there are about 360 or 370 horses, which, it is understood, is a sufficient force of horses, because a number of men are employed in every barrack in barrack duty. But I believe the force is as efficiently mounted as any cavalry regiment in Her Majesty's service.

Mr. CASEY. I think 360 horses to 500 men would not be considered sufficient for a cavalry regiment. There are, of course, a small number of men always employed in barrack duty; but the number not requiring horses is limited to cooks and similar persons, who do not need horses at any time. Every man in the force ought to have a horse, so that he could go out when required. The complaint is not that sufficient funds have not been voted for the Mounted Police, but that the funds have not resulted in giving them their supplies. The complaint last summer, when I was up in the country, was, that the contractors, who had agreed to furnish horses to the Mounted Police, had brought up a lot of scrubs from the United States, a large number of which were rejected by the officers as unfit for the service; and if that were true, they must have the most extraordinary collection ever seen, because the horses accepted were not equal, on the average, I think, to the ordinary Shagganappy pony of the plains.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let me read from Colonel Irvine's report:

"The total number of remounts taken on the strength of the force this year was one hundred and thirty-three. Eighty-nine supplied by the Stewart Ranch Company; forty purchased by the Department in Ontario and forwarded to Qu'Appelle, and four purchased in the Territory.

"Of the horses purchased from the Stewart Ranch Company, thirty were accepted in July, the selection having been made from a band of one hundred and fifty head.

"The small number accepted was owing to the fact that the band I speak of was too light for our work. Eighteen were afterwards accepted and taken over by Superintendent Crozier, acting under my authority.

"During my recent visit to Fort McLeod, in the month of October last, I accepted from a band driven in by the Company forty-one head.

"This last band was composed of the finest horses ever driven into the country, and the horses taken over by me were of a better class than any hitherto supplied the Force.

"The first small lots taken over by Superintendent Crozier and myself were not in all cases composed of the class of horses we required. But as we were then in urgent need of saddle horses, I accepted them."

Mr. CASEY. That is exactly what I said, I think the Government make a mistake in farming the supply of horses out to contractors. I think the proper course would be for one of the veterinary officers to go down to Ontario and advertise for horses, and he could have the pick of Ontario selected and bought within a fortnight after his arrival, and have them taken up at a vast saving. Excellent horses for the service can be got in Ontario for from \$125 to \$150, and I venture to say that they could be landed up there at a considerably smaller cost than the miserable scrubs the police have now got.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I forgot to read the latter clause of Colonel Irvine's report:

"I must not, however, omit to mention that when the second band was driven in by the contractors, they most willingly exchanged every horse to which objection was raised, replacing them by others in all respects up to the required standard."

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to arming the force, it is certainly a false idea to allow the Indians to be armed in a superior manner to the Mounted Police. It seems to me that there ought to be some restrictions to prevent the Indians from having these superior arms. The Government of the United States have lost a great deal of money, as a result of a similar mistake, and I think the Government should adopt stringent measures to prevent the Indians from having these Winchester rifles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. The Mounted Police should be armed with the Winchester rifle, and we should endeavor to prevent the Indians getting them or any warlike weapon that we can, and every means is taken with that end in view. The hon. gentleman will understand that with Indians flocking across the border where the traders will sell them arms, it is prac-

tically impossible to prevent the Indians getting the best weapons they can. The only limit is their means. The means of the Indians to purchase rifles with skins, I am glad to say, is diminishing annually. So long as they were mere nomads, we had no control over them. Now, the game has all gone; the buffalo has disappeared; the United States have established with us a cordon to prevent their passing from one country to the other, and the Indians must perforce betake themselves to the soil. And they are really getting on very well; it is wonderful what progress they have made.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it is difficult to prevent the Indians getting rifles. I recollect a year or two ago the hon. gentleman announced a policy of inducing the agents by negotiation to exchange the Winchester for Sniders. To what extent did that succeed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid it has not been very successful.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that there was an attempt made to decoy those unsophisticated children of the plains to go by railway the other day to the reserves, but that they got ditched on the way, whereupon they marched back with their wives and families to the end of the line, and at present insist on the superintendents providing them with oxen and carts, and decline to travel behind a locomotive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, the Indians were being carried by train and there was a railway accident. If it had been with whites we would have put up with great philosophy to some of the whites being killed; but no mortal man since this accident can get a red man, squaw, or papoose to travel by train, and we have to undertake the expense of sending them, by the old time-honored system of oxen and carts, to their reserve.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says it is impossible to prevent the Indians buying rifles in the States and bringing them in. The hon. Minister of Customs should see that every Indian who brings in a Winchester rifle on coming back from a buffalo hunt, should be made to pay the duty. This would be done in the case of a white settler.

194. To cover expenses in connection with the International Fishery Exhibition, London..... \$15,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The International Exhibition has expanded its borders so much that the vote of last year was insufficient. No doubt the hon. gentleman desires that the exhibition should be as creditable as possible, and we will have to pay for the fact of our showing what we are doing in the fishery line.

Mr. BLAKE. I must congratulate the hon. gentleman on the minuteness of this explanation of the expenditure of \$25,000 of public money. Does it include the expenses of the hon. Minister of Marine?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it does not.

Mr. BLAKE. That will be extra?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that will be extra.

195. On account of the expenditure in connection with the surveys of Lakes Superior and Huron..... \$5,000.00

Mr. BOWELL. This is a proposition for paying the expenses of the Imperial surveyor who, at the instance of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has been employed to make the survey in order to make a more perfect chart than exists of these lakes. Last year many reefs and rocks were discovered, not laid down on the chart. If we employed one of our own officers to explore the lakes in that particular, the Imperial Government would not recognize them nor mark the reefs on the charts. The assistance of the Naval Department at home was therefore invoked, and they decided to send an officer so that the work may be done under his immediate

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

supervision. This amount is not so much to cover the expenses of the officer, as the expense of the vessel and the survey generally.

Mr. DAVIES. What number of officials is there on the staff? I understood a naval officer who was stationed at Prince Edward Island, was here this winter, and had a consultation with the hon. Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; Capt. Maxwell, of the Royal Navy, who was stationed part of the year at Charlottetown was here, and had communication with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know the details, but will inform the hon. gentleman on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the extent of this proposed survey, how long will the operations last, and what is the idea of the total cost?

Mr. BOWELL. I will obtain the particulars and lay them before the House on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Work of this kind is of a most lasting character and may cost an enormous sum. I do not wish to be understood as objecting to the survey; but before Parliament gives an initial vote we ought to have some information of the character of the undertaking, and the time it will take.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's demand is quite reasonable. He will recognize the importance of this work no matter what the expense may be, as the traffic in the upper lakes is increasing every year, and for the safety of vessels and lives it is absolutely necessary we should have a correct chart, on which all reefs and rocks should be laid down.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree that some survey is important, but the talk of laying down all the reefs and rocks of Lakes Superior and Huron is something alarming. It is the reefs that may obstruct the fair ways in the channels, the points by which vessels pass that, I presume, will be noted. Of course to officers devoted to this class of work the importance grows in their eyes, and they are disposed to make a very extensive business of it, just as military men do of the army and naval men of the navy.

196. To purchase Reports, and Text-books for the Library, Department of Justice..... \$2,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I ventured, on a former occasion, to say this was a very doubtful item. There are, in the Department of Justice, a certain number of books of reference, and I do not understand how \$2,000 can be usefully expended there. It will not make a complete library, and it is more than is required for a supplement to the books that are in daily use. If an investigation is to take place into any particular legal matter, an officer will have to go down where the whole library is, and make it there. But to attempt to make an imperfect and defective library in one building, when having a good law library in the other, is really a waste of money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Justice explained to me the other day when this vote was under discussion, that about the only books he had in that Department were the Statutes, and he thought that they should have at hand a few other books of most frequent necessity. These books are very dear, and this small sum would only be adequate to purchase the most necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how complete the hon. gentleman's library is, but all that is required for such a library, circumstanced as we are with a complete library within convenient reach, are a few books of daily reference; some books, for instance, on the interpretation of Statutes are wanted all the time. There might be a text-book or two on Criminal Law with reference to certain questions that arise in the administration of the prerogative of Par-

liament. I venture to think that a very few hundred dollars would purchase all that is needed, added to what is there now. Then, there is another instance of what I think a very objectionable practice creeping into the mode of preparing the Estimates by the Government: that is, we are entering books in this vote which really belong to the Department of Justice, and ought to be put down in the expenditure for that Department. Heretofore the books required in that Department have been bought as per annual vote, but here they are buried amongst the miscellaneous and the Department of Justice have nothing to show for it. I think both the location of the vote and the amount of the vote are very objectionable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says. I am inclined to believe with him that there is no necessity for having a very large library in the Department of Justice, and that the officers of that Department can go across to the library, as other people do, and there consult the law books. If the hon. gentleman will allow this to pass, on Concurrence I will have that whole question looked into.

197. To pay one-half of the expense of publishing cases decided on the B. N. Act, 1867, collected and edited by John R. Cartwright, Esq.....\$1,150.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Finance, I cannot speak confidently about this item. Speaking from recollection only, I think that the cases on the British North America Act were collected by Mr. Cartwright, and it was agreed between Mr. Mowat and Sir Alex. Campbell that the expense should be shared between them.

Mr. BLAKE. I have seen the first volume of this book, and I think it is a very valuable compilation. I have made such enquiry as I could, and I cannot find it is for sale or procurable. How many copies is the hon. gentleman going to get? What is he going to do with them? Two or three people have written to me to know whether they can get the book. I do not see it advertised anywhere. I think it most valuable, and if I had been aware it was in publication, I should have submitted to the Bench of the Law Society to make some attempt to secure copies for the profession. At present I am afraid there has been but a small edition published, that that edition has been distributed, and that really the book is going to be of little general value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the book is a very valuable one; the collection is a good one, and the notes are well prepared and show the great care of the annotator. But as to the number issued and the distribution, I cannot tell the hon. gentleman just now.

Mr. BOWELL. Before we leave this class of items, I desire to put myself right in a little matter between myself and the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). I stated, that in 1875-76 there was a charge in the Public Accounts for translation of the Budget Speech, and my hon. friend replied that he knew it could not possibly be in 1875.

Mr. ROSS. The statement I made was, that there could not be a charge for the translation of the Debates and the Budget Speech both.

Mr. BOWELL. I hold in my hand the charge paid to the *Free Press*, in the Public Accounts for 1875, for printing and binding; and for translation into French of the Budget Speech \$86.25. I merely desire to let the House know that when I made that statement I was making a correct one. I dare say that my hon. friend will be able to put some other construction on it. In 1876, I find that there was paid for the same service, less translation, nearly \$1,200.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman has not explained the matter at all. What I said was, that last year there was a charge made for translating the Budget Speech twice, first for the Official Debates, second for the publication of the Budget Speech in separate form. The hon. gentleman has not shown there were two charges in 1875. If the hon. gentleman had shown that the translation of the Budget Speech was paid for first to an official translator—and that he could not show, for there was not one—and in the second place, it was paid for publication in the *Free Press*, then he would have made out his point.

Mr. BOWELL. I have proved from the Public Accounts what I said, and nothing more. I said there was a charge in the Public Accounts for translating the Budget Speech, which the hon. gentleman cannot deny.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman has brought up a point which no one ever disputed.

201. Weights and Measures and Gas..... \$73,100.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first increase is \$100, being increases of salaries of some of the officers. That does not, however, actually show what the increases are, because we did not expend the whole of last year's estimate. There is a small amount left which, with the \$100, will be distributed among two or three officers in the Department. \$1,900 is for salaries of Inspectors of Gas, whom we intend to appoint next year where gas inspection has not yet been established.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I notice there is very small increase in salaries of Inspectors, and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures. This is proper, because, judging from the Report of the Department, they deserve only small increases. Speaking for my own district, and I speak from a pretty good knowledge of what is being done now, and what was done formerly, I am able to say that all the weights and measures in Middlesex have not been inspected since 1878. The inspectors have drawn their salaries regularly, and yet the work has not yet been performed. I think the hon. Minister had better call the attention of the Officers of his Department to that neglect of duty and see to it, that the country obtains value for its money. An examination of the Annual Report will show great discrepancy between the fees collected and the salaries paid. Belleville collected \$544, and there was expended on salaries and contingencies \$2,372. At Hamilton the fees collected were \$5,425, while there was expended \$1,259. At Windsor the salaries paid were \$2,582, and the fees collected, \$983. At Sherbrooke the salaries were \$3,167, and the fees only \$318. At Charlottetown the salaries were \$1,395, the fees \$372. I mention these as instances where the work seems to have been very much neglected. I notice other places where the fees bear some proportion to the salaries and contingencies. We have invested \$70,000 on standards to enable the officers to do their work properly. A complete change was made in the officers in order to cheapen the service. The service has been cheapened to a certain extent. I believe the whole amount expended is not so great as formerly, but gross neglect prevails in the service. Does the hon. Minister know an officer by the euphonious name of Boggs, G. W., in the London Department? If so, is he still in the service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think, at one time, he was suspended. At the last Civil Service examination he wrote for a certificate and failed. Is it intended to keep him in the service, although he has failed to pass the examination?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is always quite clever with his questions, and occupies a prominent position by putting them. I am not sure that the officer referred to, being in the employ of the Government as a civil servant, was obliged to go up for examination or not. The hon. gentleman has sought to leave the impression in the

minds of the Committee that since the present Government have been in power the Weights and Measures Department has been very badly administered, that no work has been done, and that, in fact, the officers have been paid for doing nothing. In speaking of the discrepancy between collections at certain points and the salaries paid, the hon. gentleman has named Hamilton. There is a reason for that. In Hamilton there are one or two large factories from which the receipts are considerable, and that does not occur in the country districts. Let us make a comparison between 1878 and the present time. In 1878 there were ninety-six officers employed under this Act; at present there are sixty-seven. In 1878 the cost for salaries and contingencies was \$70,719, and the receipts were \$29,838, or a loss to the country of \$40,881. Let us take the work they did. If we take the number of weights, measures and balances, and everything in that line, we find that ninety-six officers, in 1878, examined 176,000, at the cost I have given, while we with sixty-seven officers, a smaller staff, which the hon. gentleman would have the House to believe are being paid for doing nothing, have during the past year examined 170,000, which is within a fraction of the amount of work employed by the ninety-six officers under the late Government. The deficit, as I showed before, was \$40,881, under the late Government, while under the present Government it has been \$29,000; and so I do not think that the hon. gentleman ought to complain very bitterly. I do certainly say, that as far as I can, I will do my best to see that the officers in the different districts attend closely to the discharge of their duties. The hon. gentleman complains of the London division. Well, I must confess, that in the working of the Department some difficulties will be found, as was the case when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power. It will take some time to perfect the system. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows, that in order to reduce the staff, which was found very cumbersome and expensive, an Order in Council was passed providing that no further officers should be appointed until the total number for the Dominion would be reduced to fifty, I think. Well, we could not discharge old officers in some places where they were not doing all that might be required, for if we did, the hon. gentleman would complain of it in the House; and we could not appoint additional men. Take the London division for instance: in the adjoining division, the officers are through their work; but they do not lie on their oars, they are working for their money and they are sent at once into the London division to assist in perfecting and completing the work there. As soon as the work is done in one division, we try to utilize these men in another division; and this is the policy which is pursued by the Department.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman has not answered my objections very satisfactorily, I think, after all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not expect to do that.

Mr. ROSS. The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, regarding the Weights and Measures Act, was that it was expensive and badly administered, a great loss occurring year after year; and they declared that if they were placed in power, they would reduce the expenditure and make the operation of the Act more successful, and as a matter of course, there would be then little or no loss to the country. That was what we expected from hon. gentlemen opposite; and yet the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is obliged to admit, to-night, that under his and his friend's administration, the revenue is still considerably less than the expenditure. Now, we hold him responsible for that deficit, that very serious deficit, and, as I said before, while we have this deficit, the Act is badly administered, and the work is not very well done. The hon. gentleman referred to Hamilton, where a large number of instruments were stamped. No doubt a very large number were stamped in Hamilton, and

Mr. COSTIGAN.

brought a large amount of collections, as I have already indicated; but did he explain why such small collections are made at other places? Take the Belleville district; does he explain the small collections at Belleville? What is the Inspector doing there? I see that J. A. Wilkinson is one of the Inspectors. He draws a salary as Inspector of Weights and Measures; but when an election is going on, he spends his time in election-serving; he did so at the elections in 1879.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is in favor of good measures.

Mr. ROSS. Yes; he is very useful to the Government. I think that Mr. Wilkinson was up in Muskoka, if I mistake not, at the last local election. I do not know where he has not been, and yet he is drawing his salary as Inspector of Weights and Measures. If this is the way in which the hon. gentleman is utilizing the officers of his Department, it is time that we should know about it. I pointed to a great deficit in that one place, as one instance; and perhaps the deficits in other places can be explained in a similar way, if the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to enquire. This is one instance I know of, and as to the case in my own county, where the weights and measures have not been inspected. Of course, the hon. gentleman gives the explanation that this is going to be done. They have been, for five years, going to do this sort of thing, and it is not done yet; how long is it to take to get around that one county? Perhaps this is the case with other counties; and when is this work going to be done? This is what I want to know.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The work is well under way now.

Mr. ROSS. I suppose that in five years it will be completed. We are paying money for this sort of thing, and the work is not done. The hon. gentleman has an officer on the staff who has not passed the examination.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who? Mr. Boggs?

Mr. ROSS. He has not passed, although he was obliged, like every other officer, I think, in the Inland Revenue Department, to submit to an examination. The hon. Minister knows that every officer in his Department is obliged to submit to an examination. He did so submit, but he failed to pass, and still he is employed by the Department. Now, I call attention to these cases, and perhaps I will get a further explanation regarding them at a later day. I now come to the expenditure on gas, which comes in very properly here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before we leave Weights and Measures I may save time by just mentioning that there would be no deficit at all if we charged the same fees for this work as were charged in 1878. While the country now only loses about half of what it lost under the late Administration, the fees have been reduced to an amount more than equal to the loss.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, with so many hypotheses and conjectures and proposals, in the course of a quarter of an hour, the hon. gentleman may prove that there is a surplus; but in the meantime, I just wish, before we proceed to the expenditure on gas, to ask a question arising out of his explanation. He stated that while the increase was rather more than \$100 in the vote, there was to be a charge to the extent of \$200 or \$300, or \$300 or \$400—will he say how much?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will be \$200 or \$300.

Mr. BLAKE. Only that?

Mr. CASEY. With regard to the case of Mr. Boggs and some others, I understood the hon. gentleman to say he found, on entering his Department, that some of the officers were not fit for their work, but he could not very well dismiss them because complaint would be made of it in this

House. Mr. Boggs, however, replaced a man who was dismissed, and with whose conduct no fault could be found. The latter had also passed his examination, had had several years' experience in the work, and was found to be competent. Mr. Boggs was put in this position at the instance of the hon. member for East Elgin; but how efficiently he performs the work I do not know, though if he gives much attention to it, he is certainly a man of great versatility, as he is doing a great many other things at the same time. He is running the market fees at this particular time; he keeps a greengrocer's establishment, and a market garden, and all that sort of thing; and he does a great many other things as well as the things for which he is paid by the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. No wonder he has not had time to pass his examination.

Mr. CASEY. Besides, I think he is a gentleman of such years, that it would be very difficult for him to learn anything new in that respect. I am glad that my hon. friend from West Middlesex corrected the First Minister as to the necessity of passing examinations. Under the old Weights and Measures Act there were examinations to pass, and no person could act as inspector without having passed such an examination as is required from other officers of the Inland Revenue Department. The officers of the actual Inland part of the service had always been looked upon as having to pass easy examinations; but it appeared that in the case of these new appointments under the Weights and Measures Act, they were to be retained in any case. It is a serious thing that men, in whose hands are placed the character, as well as the profits of individuals engaged in trade, should not have the education and intelligence sufficient to enable them to do their work intelligently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should think that if there is one matter more than another of which hon. gentlemen opposite should fight shy, it would be this matter of the weights and measures. If you look back as far as 1872 you will find that the Government passed this Act for the purpose of protecting the people against dishonest traders—against dishonest weights and measures. If anybody will look back to the *Hansard* of that day—if there was a *Hansard* at that time—he will find that the Opposition opposed that Bill. They tried to arouse the feelings of the small grocers and traders, the corner tavern keepers, the corner shebeens against the Bill; they inveighed against it as being an oppressive measure, and though it was a Bill intended to secure a correct weight and a just measure, they tried to make capital against us, and perhaps they did make capital against the Government of the day in that matter as in others which they worked against us at that time. But although they opposed this measure while we were in power, the moment they came into power they took advantage of the Act and wherever there was a possibility of a single measure being changed, or a single weight being adjusted, they appointed a man to look after the weights and measures. They expended \$50,000 of the hard money of the people by appointing persons as inspectors before the Act came into force; and before there was a possibility of any one of these officers being able to gauge a single quart mug, or weigh a single ounce measure. That was proved—it was admitted to the House. When we charged the Government of that day with this useless and corrupt waste of money, they said: We are only carrying out your measure. We said: The measure is a correct measure—a good measure, but it depends on whether it is well or badly administered, whether it shall be a good measure or a bad one. When we came in power again we took the measure which we had passed, and which hon. gentlemen had used and abused in this way; and what was the consequence? We reduced the number of employes by one-third, and we reduced the expenditure by one-half, and

still hon. gentlemen opposite attack my hon. friend with regard to this measure. That measure had been corruptly used by a corrupt Government for corrupt purposes, by taking every man they could find, who was unfit for anything else, and making him an Inspector of Weights and Measures; and we proved by the Public Accounts that they took the sum of \$50,000 out of the pockets of the people by the way in which they administered this Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Some of the gentlemen who were appointed, and who were afterwards summarily dismissed by the right hon. gentleman, will read with a good deal of pleasure the remark, that because they were unfit for anything else they were appointed Inspectors of Weights and Measures; especially those amongst the number who were admirers of that hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. When the last Government came into power they found that the Act which hon. gentlemen opposite left on the Statute-book was almost unworkable, but they had to work it the best way they could, though it was very hard to make anything out of the material which had been left them. The framework of that Act was objectionable, and for its defects hon. gentlemen opposite must be held responsible whatever they may say of its working. The hon. gentleman makes the point that some men were appointed Inspectors of Weights and Measures before the Act came into force; but does he suppose that the Reform Government would take the course of appointing officials to do this difficult and delicate work to-day and expect them to be ready to do the work to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was at least twelve months.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how many months they would require for training, but when hon. gentlemen opposite came in power did they take the earliest opportunity of repealing the Act? No, Sir; they only repealed it so far as to enable them to displace the existing Inspectors of Weights and Measures and put their own friends into the places thus vacated. The men he put in office were without the slightest experience, or training, or instruction—they had passed no examination, and without any qualification for the office they were appointed to inspect the weights and measures throughout the country. The fact is that they did not perform their duties, because they could not perform them, and all hon. gentlemen did was to turn out these men to make way for a lot of hungry supporters of their own as soon as they came into power. I say that it lies ill in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to call in question the use of patronage which was made by the late Government, because a more wholesale and unprecedented clearing out of party opponents to make way for a hungry horde of party supporters has never been seen in our Parliament history.

Mr. VAIL. The right hon. gentleman, in speaking of the fact that the late Government put this Act in force, neglected to state that his Government had expended \$70,000 for the purchase of standard weights and measures. It became a question with the late Government whether this \$70,000 was to be thrown away, or whether they should put the law in force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And spend \$50,000 more.

Mr. VAIL. After considering the matter for two or three years—and they took plenty of time to consider it—they thought it better to put the Act in force, under the circumstances, rather than throw away this \$70,000, and I have no hesitation in saying that there was not a man appointed who was not ready and competent to undergo his examination; and there is no reason why this Government, which is perhaps the most corrupt Government in the world, should have discharged one of these men, except for the express purpose of putting some friend in his place. They boast of a

reduced expenditure, and they have reduced it to some extent, but they collect a less amount than their predecessors in proportion to the amount expended; but if those men had been left in office, I believe there would have been no difference to-day between the revenue and the expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that because the late Government brought out from the Tower of London the standard of measure, and of weight, which they obtained as a favor at a cost of the enormous sum of \$70,000, therefore, in order to save that money, they appointed a squad of men at a cost of \$50,000 a year before anything could be done.

Mr. WILSON. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that Mr. Boggs is still in the service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Will he tell me how long ago Mr. Boggs was suspended from actual service?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will enquire and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. First Minister will certainly know that he has not been engaged in active service for over a year, and I am very much surprised to hear the hon. First Minister denounce the late Government for having appointed men without any duties to perform, while here is a man who has been under suspension and drawing his salary for over a year. I say it ill becomes any man to make an attack upon a party, when he himself is at the very same time acting in the manner which he complains of. I have no hesitation in saying that the other man was removed, and that this man was appointed in his place, for political purposes only. He is an active party politician. When an election takes place, he is on hand to further the interest of the present Government, and that is his only qualification for performing the duties of the office to which he has been appointed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have to admit to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Boggs is a political partisan, and that he is a Conservative. I will have to admit that he is a straightforward and honest man, which the hon. gentleman will not deny. I believe he performs his duties as well as the gentleman who preceded him and if he was a good Conservative, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the gentleman who preceded him was not as good a Conservative. I have known Mr. Boggs for many years, and I think that if he were offered the constituency of which the hon. gentleman is a distinguished member, he would command the support of the Conservative party, though he might not be strong enough to defeat the hon. gentleman. I have to admit all that; and I have to admit that Mr. Boggs is drawing \$500 a year; and yet the hon. gentleman says that we ought not to object to an annual expenditure of \$50,000, because Mr. Boggs could not pass his examination, and because some man has qualifications equal to his. I believe Mr. Boggs is able to perform his duties, and will carry out the Weights and Measures Act. I know he is an honest man, and a fit and capable man. Of course he has the one fault of being a Conservative. It is no fault in my eyes, or in the eyes of the Government, and we are not going to condemn him for that fault.

Mr. ORTON. I am rather surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite drawing the attention of the House to the Weights and Measures Act, for I think that there was no single measure introduced by the late Government which drew more discredit upon them than that Act, not because the measure was bad, but because of the want of administrative ability displayed by that Government in reference to that Act. They required nearly twice as many officials to carry out the provisions of the Act as the present Government. As far as I know, under the present Government, the Act

Mr. VAIL.

seems to have been administered to the advantage of all traders in the country, and I think the marked distinction exhibited between the two Governments as to that Act is highly creditable to the present Administration. The present Administration did not discharge every officer appointed by the late Government. I know that in the district in which I live a Reformer remained in office, notwithstanding the fact that many Conservatives desired to have their friends appointed.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to refer to the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Government. I might say, with reference to Mr. Boggs, that he is a very able man; he is fit for the position; but I would ask, if he is an able man, a clever man, and fit for the position, why is he left there to draw his salary without doing anything for it? I do not wish to say anything, either directly or indirectly, as to the man's honesty. So far as his popularity is concerned, I should just like to trot out just such a man in the constituency, and let the electors show how popular he is. It does seem rather absurd, that the hon. gentleman should applaud his great ability, when the man is a servant under his Administration, and incompetent to perform the duties for which he was appointed. I speak very light indeed of the selection of a man of that description, when he must be described as a very able and efficient officer—a man who cannot perform his ordinary duties. It shows a very poor selection on the part of the Government to appoint a man of that kind. As to his predecessor, I do not think there is any man who has been acquainted with him for a number of years, but will say he was a very competent and attentive officer, who devoted all his energies to his work. With respect to the challenge that the inspector should be a candidate at the next elections, I should be very grateful if my hon. friend would come down at the next elections, and advocate the interest of Mr. Boggs.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The boast is made that under the present arrangement the Weights and Measures Act is more economically administered than before. Let me make a few comparisons on this point. In 1876-77, under the late Administration, it cost \$2.25 to collect \$1; in 1877-78, it cost \$3. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1879, and on the 1st November, or thereabout, an order was issued discontinuing the service, practically suspending the inspectors. For the financial year, 1878, it cost \$6 to collect \$1; the expenses of the Department that year being \$84,004, and the receipts, \$13,685. In the next year when they had new officers fully equipped for the service, it cost \$4 to collect \$1, the expenses being \$60,566, and the receipts, \$15,372. The following year—the third year under this Government, it cost \$2.50 to collect \$1; or more was expended to collect \$1 of revenue under hon. gentlemen opposite, than during a single year of the four years of the late Administration. And there was the extraordinary expenditure of \$6 in one year, and \$4 in the second year to collect \$1. Hon. gentlemen opposite may, therefore, possess their souls in patience so far as the administration of that office is concerned. The hon. First Minister says that Act was passed in order that we might get a true weight and balance. Very true; but we do not know yet whether we have got that or not, for we do not know that the inspectors have done their work. Can the hon. gentleman show that the inspectors under the late Government were electioneering agents, entered into electioneering contests, as Mr. Wilkinson did in Belleville. The hon. gentleman opposite dismissed ninety-six officers, the number under the old Government, and assured the House they were going to carry on the business with a diminished number, 32. But they appointed sixty-seven, and now we are expending more money than before, while the work is not being properly done. The evidence is most conclusive that we are not getting as satisfactory work as before, while the cost of

collection is greater. The hon. member complains that some of the men appointed by us were for a time doing nothing; but if he will read the report of Mr. Brunel, the then Commissioner of Inland Revenue, he will see it was necessary that some men should receive a certain amount of instruction, and they were acquiring that information before beginning the work. An inspector was appointed to visit the various districts and give the men suitable instruction, as the calculations are complicated and the work requires a certain amount of training. If the hon. gentleman is so much alarmed about men being paid salaries for doing nothing, how can the hon. gentleman sanction the payment of \$2,000 every quarter or \$3,000 a year to the hon. John O'Connor? I would like to know what he does except draw his salary? What does the hon. gentleman say about the gentleman whose case was before us to-night, and who is drawing \$4,000 a year, though physically incapable of doing anything except take medicine, which I am sorry to see him oblige to take? If it was a fault for us when we employed men to do a certain work which required training, and paid them while they were being trained, can he explain why he is paying men their full indemnity for not doing any work and who do not require any training? Does he still retain the services of Mr. Egan?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, he is still on the staff.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I want to correct a mistake I made in reference to Mr. Boggs. It was Mr. Egan who was unable to pass and not Mr. Boggs. I had in my mind the fact that Mr. Boggs was suspended and thought he was the same gentleman who failed to pass his examination, but I find that he did pass and obtained a third class certificate. It was Mr. Egan who was unable to pass.

Mr. SPROULE. The amount of receipts under the inspection instituted by the late Government is no indication of the amount taken from the people. The inspector who passed around our district, kept a man at \$5 per day. He did not pretend to do this business of fixing scales, and consequently brought this man around with him. He collected money over and above the amount due to the Department for the correcting of weights and scales and went around on a drunk for several days, during which his man was paid \$5 a day. From small villages of 500 or 600 inhabitants he took away from \$125 to \$130, from the village of Flesherton he told me he expected to draw \$125. Yet there was a return made to the Department of very small receipts. It was not the amount of money collected for the Government, but the amount taken from the people that should be considered, and of this we have no return. Parties who had scales that were not allowed could sell them to other parties, to farmers and others, that were using them every day to weigh some kind of produce brought into the villages. Now, this came under my own observation. I saw scales sold, and yet some parties were charged for fixing these small scales, over and above the price of inspection. I paid \$2.50 for fixing small scales, and then the inspector turned round and paid his man \$5 a day. People had nothing for their money. In a village of my county, he said it would cost \$10 or \$20 for inspecting and fixing a scale, when the scale was bought for somewhere about twice that amount of money a short time before that. There was a price put upon these things, and if you did not pay it, you had to sell the scales, or loose what you had paid for them. This was the way the inspection was carried on all through the country. An examination of the returns will show that not more than one-tenth of the amount of money taken out of the people went back to the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Before this debate is closed, I desire to say a word or two; and if the hon. gentlemen who have spoken would act upon the principle of the hon. member

for North Norfolk, when questions of comparison are discussed, declaring that he did not care who did the wrong it ought to be condemned, it would be much more to their credit. I understood the hon. member for Digby to say, that before the Government of 1875 went out of office, they purchased standards to the amount of \$75,000, and that those standards were to be used as soon as the officers were appointed. My hon. friend from West Middlesex told the House a few minutes ago that when these officers were appointed, there were no standards in the possession of the Government with which these people could be instructed.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman is not quoting me correctly. I said these people required some time to educate themselves in the use of these standards in order to do their work properly.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what you said additionally.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman is bound to take my word.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course I take your word. Hon. gentlemen should agree between themselves before they make statements. Now, what are the facts? The facts are that, if these standards were in the possession of the Government—

Mr. VAIL. I did not say in the possession of the Government. I said they were contracted for, and, in fact, purchased; that some were ordered in England, and some were on the way here.

Mr. BOWELL. The facts are simply these: that the hon. gentlemen appointed officers from Algoma in the West down to the Labrador coast, some of whom never had any instructions, and never did any work; they received their salary, in certain localities, and they had nothing to do. I find, in the table laid before the House last year, that a Mr. Grenier, appointed at Labrador, had received \$1,806; that it was 1,319 days from the time he was appointed until he was removed, but he never had any standards sent to him, and never did any work. In Restigouche, New Brunswick, I find a Mr. Blanchard drew \$1,819.39, but he never had any instructions and never did any work; yet my hon. friend tells us that the inspectors went all over this country and instructed these officers what to do. Nearly all the appointments that were made, of this particular class of officers, were in office from six months to a year, and some as long a time as I have pointed out from their appointment till their dismissal, and they never did a single thing; they never were furnished with any instruments with which either to inspect or test weights and measures. Yet these gentlemen attempt to defend an action of that kind, on the ground that it was necessary to appoint the men in order to teach them what to do, before, as they admitted themselves, they had instruments with which to instruct them. The hon. member for West Middlesex was equally disingenuous in the comparisons he made, as he, too, often is when he addresses this House. Why had he not—I will not say honesty, perhaps that would not be Parliamentary—but does he not know that the Government which preceded the present one passed an Order in Council reducing the fees about one-half to be received from parties whose weights and measures were inspected? Now, if the comparison that he made that it cost \$3 to collect \$1 under his Administration, was correct, and they reduced the fees one-half, then it should cost \$6 to collect \$1 under the Government that succeeded him. But what is the fact? From his own figures—I have not them before me, and speak from recollection—he shows that it cost now about \$2 to collect \$1. If it cost \$2 to collect \$1 under the present system, and the fees reduced one-half, and \$ to collect \$1 under the old system, then it costs \$1 less to collect the fees now, and the people are taxed just one-half what they were previously. The hon. gentleman told

the House—and I would like to have it go to the country—that the same amount of fees were collected now that were collected when it cost their Government \$3 to collect \$1. I leave it to the House to say whether statements of that kind, with the facts before them, are either fair or honest on the part of hon. gentlemen. It is to my personal knowledge that the officer in the city of Belleville is one of the most efficient on the staff; and if the amount collected is not relatively as large as it should be, from appearances, to the amounts collected elsewhere, we must understand that he is at the head of the branch of that district, consequently his salary is larger and the disproportion would be greater. I know further than that, that if the Government that went out of office in 1873 did order these standards, while their successors were in office, they purchased a large number of standards that are now lying in the cellars of the Eastern Block, and were when the present Government came into power—\$37,399.49 worth of useless standards purchased by the hon. gentleman's Government, and there they lay. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the expenditure of that Department for 1876-77, he will find that the equipment that year was \$22,000; contingencies, \$23,382; salaries, \$55,025—for this year alone over \$100,400 to work the cumbersome machine they had on hand. It is surprising that we find hon. gentlemen getting up in the House and defending the appointment of these officers, from Labrador to Algoma; and keeping them in office from six months to two years, without ever attempting to teach them anything, and if they did, they never furnished them with instruments with which they could perform any of their work. Hon. gentlemen opposite were ready to cheer the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), when he pointed out the difference in the cost of collecting when the fees were twice as high as they are now, why did they not cheer when the facts contained in the public records, and which every person who reads them can know, were pointed out. I recommend the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) to spend an hour in investigating the matter, and I feel quite certain he will not again rise with the same amount of indignation and talk about this Government being the most corrupt Government that ever existed. It will be well for him when he makes that charge to point out where the corruption is. A mere piece of declamation that any person, or any Government, is the most corrupt, without possessing any evidence to sustain the charge, or attempt to sustain it, is not such a course of action as should be pursued by an ex-Minister of War. I know he is a fighting character, and always ready to throw his large proportions into the breach, but it would be just as well, when he does, so that he should have some ammunition with which to sustain him in any such onslaught in future.

Mr. FAIRBANK. One fact has been omitted during this discussion. A comparison has been made between the work of the officers who executed this law in its earlier stages and those who executed it at a later period. The fact to which I desire to draw attention, and which has been so far omitted, is this: When the officers first came to perform their duties they had something to do. Anyone who is practically acquainted with weights and measures knows that when the officers first entered on their duties weights were largely out of proper condition, many being too light and many too heavy. The work of adjusting the weights was considerable. Those that were too heavy had to be drilled and those too light had to be filled. This work in some large establishments now occupies only a few minutes, whereas in the first instance it occupied hours, and in some cases days; so a comparison between the work then and now is altogether unjust towards those who first did the work. They may have been very incompetent and fit for nothing else, as has been said; but at the same time they did their work,

Mr. BOWELL.

and their successors have very little to do except to reverify what has been done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The remarks of the hon. gentleman are pertinent to the subject, and therefore it is a pleasure to have heard them. But there is a matter of considerable importance now before the Committee, involving a question of veracity. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) stated that while the expenditure under this Act had increased, the revenue had largely decreased. He quoted the expenditure and the decreased revenue. Now, I would like to ask that hon. gentleman whether he knew or did not know that the Government of which he was a supporter had reduced the rate of fees by one-half. Did he know it or not?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Did I know what?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did the hon. gentleman know or did he not know that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had reduced the charges under the Weights and Measures Act?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I cannot see what that has to do with the argument.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman did not know. He, a leading member of his party, did not know that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had reduced the charges by one-half. He did not know that. Does anybody believe he did not know it? Everybody knows he knew it. Everybody knows the hon. gentleman's ability, that he follows closely the legislation and administration of the day; and yet he says he does not know anything about it. The hon. gentleman rose and said there was only half the revenue, or much less revenue collected under this Act than under the late Administration. It is accounted for by the fact that the tariff of fees was reduced by one-half. If the hon. gentleman did not know it, it showed his ignorance; if he did know it, it showed his disingenuousness and want of candor. I leave him to choose either horn of the dilemma, that of being grossly ignorant or of being guilty of want of candor in making the charge that while the expenditure has increased, the revenue has decreased. This is a matter of very considerable importance, because it affects the standing and reputation of the hon. gentleman, and it affects the confidence which this House will place in statements made by the hon. gentleman hereafter. When the hon. gentleman rises in his place and makes an attack on the Government and charges the Department of Inland Revenue with maladministration, because it had not collected so much as had been collected under a tariff which was quite as large, I think the hon. gentleman is bound to get out of this difficulty, because if he does not it will be felt—I state here distinctly in my place—that the hon. gentleman has made a charge which, while it does not, in any way affect the administration of this Department, affects greatly the confidence this House will have hereafter in the hon. gentleman's statements.

Mr. VAIL. In reply to the hon. Minister of Customs, I would say that the hon. gentleman declared that the late Government expended a certain amount in the purchase of weights and measures which are now in a department in the Eastern Block.

Mr. BOWELL. They are useless.

Mr. VAIL. That may be the case or not. If the Mackenzie Government purchased them, the present Government have allowed them to remain unused, and are therefore liable to censure. In respect to a reduction of fees, I do not know whether the Mackenzie Government reduced them or not before they went out of power. I think it is very likely they did so; and if I am not mistaken they reduced them before, and intended to reduce them still further, because they did not want them to be a tax on the country.



If the present Government found the reduction made was too great, and that the amount of fees collected was too small, why did they not increase them? The hon. gentleman has stated that the ex-Minister of War is rather disposed to find fault. I make a point not to attack unless I am attacked. I cannot be acting very wrongly in following the First Minister, who used strong terms. The leader of the Government stated that the Mackenzie Government was corrupt, and that they were actuated by corrupt motives; and I do not think the First Minister, whatever the hon. Minister of Customs may think, will hold that I am acting wrongly in returning the compliment. I think I have a perfect right to do so; and I think it will be acknowledged on both sides of the House that, when a shot is thrown, we have a perfect right to return it, at all events. I do not wish to complain of the present Government in this matter; we have spent a good deal of time over this question, which is important. It is one in which the public is very deeply interested, and I think, that while it is important that all weights and measures should be inspected, I do not hesitate to say that Inspectors of Weights and Measures should be very cautious as to how they proceed with their work, not putting the country to more expense than is actually necessary, or to more trouble in connection with these matters than is actually necessary. I am not prepared to say that the Inspectors in Nova Scotia have all done their duty to the fullest extent; I have no doubt that if enquired into, many of them have been rather remiss in the performance of their duties; but, at the same time, I do not intend to find fault with this; but we on this side of the House must not be charged with dereliction of duty, and be found fault with if we return the compliment.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. the First Minister has tried to fasten on me the charge that I have been misleading the House. I defy the hon. gentleman to substantiate that position. Let us look at the position of affairs? This is an Act which was first put in operation in the year 1876-77. On the Tariff, which was originally passed, as I remember the facts, in that year, \$50,000 of revenue was collected. It was found that this revenue pressed heavily on the people, from whom it was collected. The rates were considered high, and in the following year a reduction was made, and during that year a revenue of about \$30,000 was collected.

Mr. BOWELL. What year was that?

Mr. ROSS. 1877-78. Under the high tariff first adopted, when the Bill was passed, it cost \$2.25 to collect each \$1 of revenue. Under the amended tariff, with a reduction of about  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., as I remember it—and if I am wrong I can set it right on Concurrence—it cost \$3 to collect each \$1. That was the last year that we administered the law in full. The following year, under the same tariff, if I remember aright—and if I am wrong the hon. gentleman ought to put me right, for he ought to know something—according to my information, it cost \$6 to collect each \$1. There is the charge; and how have I been misleading the House? If, by some little lapse of memory, I misled the House the hon. gentleman will surely give me credit in that I was prepared to put the House right again. Five minutes had not passed before the speech made by the hon. gentleman, when here, in my place, I retracted the statement which I then knew was wrong. Can the hon. gentleman furnish better proof of my honesty and candor? I knew that I had misled the House the moment I put my hand on the return which I had marked with the view of using it in this House, and I corrected the return as far as Mr. Boggs was concerned. I fastened the complaint on the proper person, Mr. Egan, and with that fact in the possession of the hon. gentleman, he was fair enough, he was candid enough, he was manly enough, to try and fasten the charge on me that I was disingenuous, and misleading the House. Sir, the record of the hon. gentleman himself is

too well known, and his political career is too vulnerable to justify him in making such a charge against any hon. member. I will not make reprisals at this moment, but I say the facts which I have given to the House and the figures in my possession, which I have received at this moment, substantiate the very position that I have taken. The hon. gentleman has not yet proved that I misled the House. He merely asked the question. He queried the matter, and supposed it. He proffered a supposition, which he expected would damage the member for West Middlesex. Sir, I can assure the hon. gentleman, that in no instance have I ever attempted to mislead this House; but suppose that I had fallen short in a point of information, has not the hon. gentleman been short of information frequently? How many trips does the hon. gentleman make from his chair to his departmental subordinates, in order to get information regarding his office. He, the First Minister, he, the highest salaried officer in the Government and in this House; he, with thirty or thirty-five years experience in this House, must trot forward and backward in order to get assistance regarding the simplest matters of detail, which every third class clerk should know, and would be expected to know; and he is the hon. gentleman who charges me with ignorance, he who asks for votes during the same evening, promising to bring down to the House on Concurrence, information regarding matters, which come under his cognizance and notice every day; and yet he, forsooth, must pose as a man who knows everything, while member in this House, who is plodding, as he has to do, week after week during the three short months of this Session, must be sat down upon, forsooth, by the hon. gentleman, who I expected, would be more chivalrous, especially in view of his knowledge and experience of members of Parliament. I tell the hon. gentleman that I have substantiated my position, and every statement which I made I verily believe to be true; and if the hon. gentleman finds it is not true, let him state it on Concurrence, and we will accept the evidence, but let him produce his proof, for we will not accept the hon. gentleman's mere assertions for proof.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us have this out with the hon. gentleman; I want to know whether he admits that he made a mistake or not? The hon. gentleman, in the first place, says he may have made a mistake, and that he showed his candor by admitting that he was wrong about Mr. Boggs; and then he says he is right. Is he right or wrong?

Mr. ROSS. In what?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In making the statement he did.

Mr. ROSS. I believe I am right in making the statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Did the hon. gentleman know, or not, about the reduction in the tariff?

Mr. ROSS. I certainly knew about the reduction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And when?

Mr. ROSS. And when what?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And when?

Mr. ROSS. I am not in the witness-box, being examined by the hon. gentleman; and I will not be put in the witness box by the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman will not be put in the witness-box; and I will not put him in the witness-box. We will not commit him for contempt for not answering the question, because nobody is bound to criminate himself—that is a principle of law; but the hon. gentleman has, I think, in the estimation of this House, and when this is published, will have, in the estimation of the country, criminated himself. The hon. gentleman has done so. He says, I was not very chivalrous in pinning down

the hon. gentleman and in fastening him down in his making a disingenuous statement against the Administration of which I am the leader. I had a right to defend my Administration; and I had a right to show that when the hon. gentleman tried to draw a comparison to the advantage of the late Administration and to the disadvantage of the present Government, that the hon. gentleman was wrong, and that he either knew he was wrong, in which case he was disingenuous, or that he was ignorant, culpably ignorant; and I leave the hon. gentleman to say on which horn of the dilemma he should be transfixed—certainly he is impaled on one or the other. You perhaps remember, Mr. Chairman—I do not know whether you are a play-going man—in one of the most charming plays written by the celebrated Richard Sheridan, "The Rivals," Fag-a-Fag was the servant, and in one of the acts he says, when he is caught, or rather pinned somewhat like the hon. gentleman, "Well, I do not mind telling a lie for a friend, but it hurts my conscience to be found out." And that is pretty much, so far as parliamentary comparisons go, the position of the hon. gentleman. I have no hesitation to repeat that, on Concurrence, we will be able to show distinctly the fact of the disingenuousness of the hon. gentleman or of his gross ignorance.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Well, if the hon. gentleman is so very anxious to place himself in the witness-box, will he tell me himself when the reduction was made? in what year was it? and perhaps I may verify my figures with his on Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask my subordinates to give me information. It is true that I am anxious to make faithful and candid and true statements to the House, and therefore I go to the proper source to get that information. The hon. gentleman, however, trusts to his memory, or rather, in this case, to his imagination.

Mr. ROSS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; rather to his imagination. I have to go to the proper authority to get my information. I go to the permanent officers of the Department, who are the depositories of all the facts in their Department, as permanent officers must be; and I believe that I submit correct statements to this House. The hon. gentleman, not having the advantage of having subordinates, and having a vivid imagination, makes his statement, and, so far as I can learn, the alterations were made in 1877.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). That sustains my contention exactly. In the year 1876-77 the collections were \$50,000, or \$1 collected for every \$2.25 expended. The next year, which was the year 1877-78, the fees have cost \$3, and the collections were \$1; while the revenue next year, the hon. gentleman's first full year, cost \$6 to collect. So that it appears that with the assistance of the hon. gentleman's evidence, which I am glad to get, my own recollection is confirmed, and with the assistance of his subordinates who supply him with the information, I am able to pin him on the dilemma on one horn or other of which he thought he had fixed me—a dilemma which, if it existed at all, existed only in his own imagination. I might make a remark as to what the right hon. gentleman has said about Brinsley Sheridan's play, and to the remark of Fag-a-Fag that he did not tell a lie, but it made him very uncomfortable. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman may have some recollection of an hon. member making some statement in this House with regard to his hands, and afterwards making certain statements on oath which did not quite accord with that statement. Perhaps it did not hurt him, but the opinion of the House and the country was that it was not quite the proper thing to do.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House has kindly called attention to some statement  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

he made with regard to Mr. Boggs, whose name has so frequently been mentioned in the House to-night. I am glad the hon. gentleman was candid enough to admit that he was mistaken with regard to Mr. Boggs, but I am afraid that he made an equal error with regard to Mr. Egan. I have no doubt that the same spirit of candor which prompted him to correct his former error with regard to Mr. Boggs, will prompt him to rise and say that he did not intend to make any remarks derogatory of the character of Mr. Egan, whom, I believe, to be a respectable gentleman, a well educated man, and a most competent officer. He states that a gentleman who was formerly in the employ of the Department was canvassing for his party, and was in fact a sort of politician while he was under pay of the Government. I think that, on reflection, the hon. gentleman will have to correct that remark.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He resigned his office, and had not been an officer of the Department for some months before that time.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is he an officer now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). He is not employed in the Department?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think the debate for the last hour has largely been the result of a misapprehension. Before the debate assumed the tone which I am sorry to say it has assumed, the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) stated that he would come to gas.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). We have come to it now.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am glad to be able to wake up hon. gentlemen opposite, who seemed to have been partly asleep. The hon. member stated that he would now come to the question of gas. The hon. gentleman then made a statement, and persisted in it, which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has just shown to be a misstatement, with regard to Mr. Egan. This has all arisen from the perverse disposition of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), in not taking the advice of so old and able a Parliamentarian as the First Minister. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), though he had the excuse of suffering under the effects of a severe rasping, did not set as good an example as I think the hon. gentleman in his calmer moments would like to set to this House, when, with uplifted hands and a great deal of excitement, he tried to reflect on the First Minister for consulting his subordinates. The hon. gentleman knows that no man in this House has his information on every point so financially correct as the hon. First Minister, and though he may, as the hon. gentleman says in his classic and elegant way, trot back and forth to his deputy, I should think that his anxiety to give exact information on every point should be considered a subject of credit to him rather than of blame. In point of accuracy the hon. member for West Middlesex is quite different from the hon. First Minister. He has no subordinates, so he does not have to trot back and forth; but I think, when he invited debate on this subject, he should have informed himself, by, if necessary, trotting back and forth to the library and getting a knowledge of facts of which he seems to be ignorant. It is due to himself; it is due to the position he occupies; and it is due to his colleagues in the House that a member occupying his position should verify every statement he makes, and that he should be accurate in every scintilla of evidence. Nor should he, as he has done to-night, lose his temper and give way to the ebullition which the hon. members have witnessed. The hon. gentleman denied the statement that the men who were

appointed by the late Government were political partisans. I can only speak from my own knowledge, and I can say of one man in my county who was appointed by the late Government, that political work was his only business—that he was constantly engaged in electioneering, and that when the elections came in 1878 he drove all over the county, and was the loudest-mouthed politician there. A great many statements have been made here which are perfectly irrelevant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; it belongs there. A great many matters have been introduced which are irrelevant. For instance; the hon. member for West Middlesex introduced the names of the hon. John O'Connor and the hon. Mr. Cockburn, an ex-Speaker of this House; and he repeated twice that these men were physically unable to do their duties. It was owing to his sticking to the gas affair that the hon. member for West Middlesex introduced these irrelevant matters. If the hon. First Minister had thought for a moment, he might have seen that the hon. member for West Middlesex started on this track merely for the purpose of cultivating the art of debate. The hon. First Minister must have known that he was quite as far astray, as when he said Xerxes was the man who drove the tide back. I do not think the hon. First Minister should come down on a man when he acknowledges that he did not intend to debate this question within the rules of debate, but to gas a little. This reminds me of the story of a man who fiddled with all his might to a deaf man; after he gets through with all his tunes, he looks to the deaf man and says: "How do you like it?" The deaf man says: "When you are done tuning up, won't you play us a tune?" After they have got through these inaccurate descriptions, and the facts they have not given—perhaps the hon. members of the Opposition will give us a tune upon these estimates, and debate them as they ought to be debated. I hope the *Hansard* will not be lumbered up with this. I do not want my speech to be in the *Hansard*. I do not think it tends to the credit of Parliament for these speeches to be made and placed on record; but if they are put in *Hansard* as they have been delivered here, I want no better punishment inflicted upon some hon. members who have spoken on the opposite side of the House; and let everybody read them, and judge these hon. gentlemen by them. But I think the debates in Committee, if conducted as hon. members opposite have conducted them to-night, had better not be placed in the *Hansard* but passed into oblivion, so that no record will remain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not the least idea that the hon. gentleman speaks the utterances of his heart, when he says that he desires that his utterances should not appear in *Hansard*. I think we have heard him twice to-day, and among all the hon. members whom I have seen rise, to speak to the question before the Chair, he was the farthest from approaching it in the slightest degree. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the Inspectors of Weights and Measures are in all cases the Inspectors of Gas?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not in all cases. The custom of the Department is, where an inspection of gas is established not to appoint a Gas Inspector, if an Excise officer is already there. The duty is assigned to the Excise officer, and a certain allowance is made to him for that duty in addition to his salary.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). After the candid and courteous advice of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), there can but little be said. The hon. gentleman, with his exceedingly pleasant way of putting things, his pleasant fireside stories and amusing illustrations, reminds me of Artemus Ward's account of his monkey, which he described as an "amusing little cuss," and a playful attraction to his "wax figger" show. The hon. gentleman gets up in the most

amusing way, as I fancy Artemus Ward's monkey did—or was it a monkey? Perhaps the hon. gentleman, who is more learned than I, can tell to what species he belongs—but in any case the hon. gentleman is quite as amusing a feature in this House.

Mr. HESSON. I call the hon. gentleman to order. He called this House a crowd.

Mr. ROSS. I should be corrected. My early education was neglected, I admit. Before I was called to order, I was talking of the hon. member for King's, but I do not wish to pursue the subject further, though it is very tempting; the hon. member smiles so sweetly when he speaks, is so child-like and bland, his heart is so warm and his sympathies so generous, his language so correct and grammatical, and, above all, his parliamentary experience, which gives him a right to lecture younger members—like myself, for instance—is so extensive, that this rare combination of qualities, seldom found in one individual, makes him, in my eyes, a very pleasant subject for discourse. But, however agreeable the theme, time is limited, and I must proceed to more commonplace details. I wish to ask the hon. Minister a question or two in regard to the inspection of gas. I notice the fees are small and the expenses very considerable—\$12,000. The hon. gentleman should consider whether he could not make this part of the service nearer self-sustaining. Ottawa should contribute something in the shape of fees for the inspection of gas. Why not make all the cities where gas is consumed pay more?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would not say anything on this matter were it not for the attack made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) on the late inspector of Weights and Measures there, Mr. Campbell, who was appointed when the measure first came into force. Mr. Campbell is a highly-educated man, a gentleman who stands high in the esteem and regard of the people of that county, and who, by his ability and the agreeable manner in which he enforced an act disagreeable in its nature, and imperfect and unpopular at the outset, gained the respect of all with whom he transacted business. I never yet heard any individual make a single charge against Mr. Campbell, and it will be heard with surprise and indignation in East Grey that the representative of that county made so foul, coarse and unfounded a charge against him. As an instance of the esteem in which Mr. Campbell is held I may mention that on his leaving for Manitoba, he was tendered a public banquet, which was attended by not only the leading people of Grey, but by many of those of Bruce county, who were anxious to pay him a tribute of their respect. The course followed by the hon. member for East Grey is unworthy of any man. It was cowardly on the part of the hon. gentleman to rise in this House and assail a gentleman whose character is as much beyond his as day is beyond night; and I could not allow a charge to be made against Mr. Campbell without rising in my place and vindicating his character. Now, it was stated that Mr. Campbell hired a man and paid him \$5 a day. What are the facts in connection with the matter? When Mr. Campbell undertook the work of inspection in South Grey, he found the scales in a very defective state. Why, the hon. member for East Grey admitted that his scale was in such a state that it required \$2.50 to repair it. Mr. Campbell was not obliged to take a competent smith to repair these scales and have them set in order before he adjusted them, but, in order to accommodate the people, he took with him a competent person to put the scales in order, and afterwards Mr. Campbell adjusted them, and these scales have not had to be adjusted since. The officer who has been appointed since has found nothing to do. I have nothing to say against him, but I am told that he does not much else than to draw his fees. When Mr. Campbell employed this person to go with him, the Government did not pay his fees, but the people were willing, in order to have a competent

man to repair their scales, to pay him for his work. Now, it will be heard with very peculiar feelings by the people that the hon. member for East Grey has made this charge against Mr. Campbell.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. member state what were the charges?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will not repeat them.

An hon. MEMBER. You said he got drunk.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You said other things in connection with him, and it was unworthy of you to make a statement of that kind to this House; it was ungentlemanly in you to make this statement. Mr. Campbell was one of the most efficient and most capable officers in the whole Inland Revenue service. I have this from the very highest authority, and that he should be charged with neglecting his duty is something that I was surprised to hear, and it is very cowardly in any member of this House to get up after the lapse of two or three years and make so gross a charge against an officer whose character was as much higher than that of the hon. member for East Grey as it is possible to be. I say this, and I know the value of what I am saying; I say that in the esteem and respect of the people of East Grey and of South Grey, Mr. Campbell's character is far better and purer than that of the hon. member for East Grey. After Mr. Campbell had discharged the duties so well, and was then dismissed without a single charge being made against him, and now after the lapse of years, a member in this House is found so cowardly as to rise in his place and make a charge against that gentleman, I say I will never sit still and see such a cowardly transaction perpetrated in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I think if there is any one thing less than another I am entitled to be called, it is cowardly. I think the hon. gentleman knows it to his sorrow before to-day. I have been on platforms with him all over the country, and have had occasions, repeatedly, to analyze his statements, and many of his assertions—not to his credit, I can assure him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point or order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will the hon. gentleman please sit down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. My point of order is this: He says he has met me on many platforms. I deny it; he never met me on a platform in his life but once.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he not meet me one night when Mr. Fahey was candidate in South Grey? Did he not meet me in the Orange Hall, Markdale?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I never met him in my life but once.

Mr. SPROULE. Did we not meet only last June at Markdale on a platform?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not meet you at all. You ran away.

Mr. SPROULE. We met on the platform on many occasions. Now, I have scarcely ever spoken in this House when the hon. member for South Grey was present, that he did not get up immediately after and read me a lecture on what I should do in order to fulfil my duty. I want that hon. gentleman to understand that I do not look to him for any information as to what is my duty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Nor to any other source.

Mr. SPROULE. I shall endeavor to do what I believe to be my duty as the representative of a riding which is, I think, as important as his own. With reference to what has been said about my character, I can only say that those are the best judges to compare our characters

Mr. LANDERKIN.

to whom we are both known. The hon. member says that I stated the Inspector of Weights and Measures got drunk. I can only say that I helped him out of my own shop over to his hotel, and I had almost to carry him there. More than that, I know another gentleman who assisted him across the country, and yet at the same time his man was drawing \$5 a day. The hon. gentleman complains because I said Mr. Campbell was not able to do his work, and consequently had to hire a man. I can only tell him that Mr. Campbell came to me, and I went and got a man to work for him, because Mr. Campbell knew nothing about fixing scales, and I was perfectly right in saying that there was a much larger amount of money taken out of the people by those men who were said to be competent to do the work, than ever went into the Treasury for the Government. I am ready to make these charges every day, and I can substantiate them. As to Mr. Campbell's private character, I have nothing to say. I consider him a very agreeable person. I found him a very agreeable person when I was going round with him, but I knew that he had his man with him to do the work, and I knew he took money out of the people to pay him. At present, if a man's scale is not right, he can take it to a mechanic and get it fixed, and pay for it himself; if he gets it fixed for \$1, he saves the balance, whereas he formerly had to pay from \$2.50 upwards for the same work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. One word in explanation. Mr. Campbell in order to fix the scales—I am quite sure from what I know of Mr. Campbell that he allowed these persons to get their scales fixed wherever they pleased, and that he only took this person with him because it was more convenient for the people to have a man come to their own doors. This was surely a great convenience to persons who lived at a distance from villages, to have mechanics capable of repairing their scales.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member is entirely wrong, because, in my own village where there are six blacksmiths, he hired a man. He took this man to Thornbury, Meaford and other places, and refused to let parties take their scales to mechanics and have them fixed, but said: "I have a mechanic and I have the right to do the work and charge the parties."

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe Mr. Campbell was willing, in all cases, to allow the people to select their own men.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am not trespassing, I think, on the Committee by comparison. The hon. member for West Middlesex has spoken sixteen or eighteen times; he has been up very often and seems bound to have the last word. I am quite willing that he should have the last word, but not that he should sit in his seat and leave the House under the impression, which prevails in his own mind only, that he has said some very clever and smart things, and that he should go to his room self-satisfied and self-approved. It is a bad thing and I do not intend to allow him to do it, and I intend to take that pleasure from him unless he has a pachyderm's hide. I had no thought, on entering this House, of saying a word in opposition to anything which the hon. member for West Middlesex stated when he was making one of his set speeches, because he had a reputation, as I thought, for accuracy and plausibility of statement at least, and he was one of those mild-tempered and good men of the House, one of those really good, cold-water, Christian men. I do not insinuate, because their heads are always level, not flat—the water level I mean—and are eminently respectable; but the hon. gentleman started to-night evidently with a set speech and had papers before him. I listened with a great deal of respect and interest, but he departed in a short time from the line I have always seen him adopt, and he assumed another one, and the moment he got off his base I found that the calm, cool,

tone was but a veneer, and that under that exterior there lay the hidden character, that he could be as coarse as an old fish-woman, that the Billingsgate employed by them could not be more coarse than the language he could use. I do not intend to be unparliamentary as he was, but I do say that this mantle of respectability, forsooth, has been stripped from his back—by whom? By the hon. member for West Middlesex himself; and he stands here in the character of a mere bitter, coarse scold. He was very respectable for a while and represented Uriah Heap before he was found out by David Copperfield; and then, as he shaking his fist said: "I always hated you, Copperfield," so the hon. gentleman shook his fist at the hon. First Minister. Before he sat down he was humble and wanted to be nothing—and you remember Uriah Heap stuck his finger nails into his flesh. The hon. member has showed himself in his true character. He chose early in the morning, not when the galleries are filled with the elite of Ottawa, for then he would be respectable, and thought he would make a night of it and be himself, and he has succeeded. I gave him a single story with no harm in it. What did he do? He got up here and attempted to be facetious. It was like a man who sat down on the door-step and tried to look pleasant. He looked at my attenuated form and I felt insignificant before the towering presence of the great physical form before me; and he said: "It reminds me of Artemus Ward, who had a little monkey, and he was an amusing little cuss." He looked at me and I looked back at him; a small man was in the presence of a great intellectual and physical giant. He looked very much like a character that I saw in Barnum's when I was there. What was it? Looking at his photograph you would swear that it was the bearded woman. Take his photograph—I am paying back the hon. gentleman in his own coin, and I gave him notice that I would do so—and take a photograph of the bearded woman, and tell me the difference. Yet this hon. gentleman said I was an amusing little cuss. Just think of it. He attempted to say what he should not have said. I think it was Sterne who said: "Never laugh at a man who attempts anything with a wooden leg, unless the man attempts to dance a hornpipe." I had no intention of saying anything back to the hon. member of an unpleasant character, or of a nature to hurt his feelings in the slightest degree; and I do not know, that I hurt them now. But no more than he should fly, should he attempt to dance a hornpipe, and enter into a row with a respectable cold-water Christian man. I hope he will always keep that character. I hope, that this night does not drive him to drink, and in order to keep his courage up, pour spirits down, nor should he attempt a rôle for which nature did not make him. He was out of his element. He was off his base; and no man was ever more completely drunk from intoxicating liquor, than he was completely drunk this night from the bowling over that he got from the First Minister and the Minister of Customs. He made a perfect exhibition of himself, because it was not a set speech. I will not tell him now the rôle he played, but it was not the rôle of calm respectability, which he usually possesses.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you.

Mr. WOODWORTH. "Thank you;" he shall have it. He told me that I was not very grammatical, but I was quite as grammatical as he. I was historical, and I was quite as correct in my instances of history as that great School Inspector of the great Province of Ontario. I have just as much right to go on with the debate in this way, as the hon. gentleman had, in half-a-dozen other things, to show how nice a School Inspector he was. He has as much right—

Mr. ROSS. Go on.

Mr. WOODWORTH. He saved me the trouble, and Nature saved me the rest.

Mr. ROSS. We are discussing gas.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No; you are not discussing gas; but you sit there the personification of it. I am discussing gas; that hon. gentleman undertook to speak about my large Parliamentary experience. Well, I have just as much as he has at all events. I think that possibly my Parliamentary experience is nearly as large as his, clever as he thinks he is; and perhaps I know something about Parliamentary proceedings, and even as much as he does. It is impossible that one small head can know all he professes to know. Why, he is lecturing half his time, somewhere or other, at some tea-meeting; and how in the world, had he the versatile talents of Lord Brougham, could he know something more about Parliamentary science than the youngest member of this House. He cannot. Nature has rendered such a thing impracticable. He could not do it. It is impossible. Therefore, I argue that he cannot know much about Parliamentary experience when he is giving up his time to little tea-meetings, and to little finical things which he so much delights in. It is, however, perfectly proper that he should amuse himself with the idea; but he should not attempt a rôle which he cannot carry out. Let me give him a piece of advice. Of course, being a School Inspector, he will know where it is to be found, and where it comes from. Let him think of it, and when he attempts again, in this House, even at so late an hour as this, to play the buffoon, as he did to-night—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. WOODWORTH. Mark you, I had an example on the other side of the House, and I did not interrupt, and let this go side by side, as an answer, into *Hansard* and history, and let the children see the history which he did make, go to the schools, and show how the hon. member for Middlesex conducted himself one evening towards the close of the Session. Let him take this picture home with him to rest, instead of the self-satisfied air which I saw on him a while ago:

"With all his conscience and one eye askew  
So false he partly took himself for true,  
Whose pious talk, when most his heart was dry,  
Made wet the crafty crow's foot round his eye.  
Nor deeds of gift, but gifts of grace he forged,  
And, snake-like, slimed his victim ere he gorged,  
Who never took God's name except for gain,  
So never took that useful name in vain.  
Made him his cat's paw, and the cross his tool,  
And Christ the bait to trap his dupe and fool.  
Tho' oft at Bible meetings, o'er the rest  
Arising, did his holy, oily best,  
Dropping the too rough H. in hell and heaven,  
To spread the word by which himself had thriven."

How does the hon. gentleman like that?

Mr. ROSS. Encore.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No doubt; you are not in school. The hon. member has not now got pupils in school.

Mr. ROSS. Encore; say it slowly.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I intend to say it deliberately, and I will tell him this much. The hon. gentleman has evidently been in the theatres, to judge from the story which he told here to-night; and I say, that the character fits him, as he appeared when he occupied the floor of this House to-night in delivering himself of the worst mass of medley and contradictions that ever characterized a member of Parliament in the world. I can tell the hon. gentleman something else. The hon. gentleman was ably abetted by his cold water friend from South Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do not call me friend.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am sure I did not call the hon. gentleman Grey, I did not make him Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. God forbid that I should have such a friend.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will tell the hon. gentleman he will find the character which he has played here to-night will not conduce to his fame, and hereafter when the children are inspected, and their education and morals are complete, and when they look back at the record which he has made here to-night they will not thank the hon. gentleman for his exhibition. I regret exceedingly that the tone of the debate, unnecessarily as it seems to me, has drifted in this way. I do not think that there was any cause for it. Possibly I may be in fault a little. But I do think the hon. gentleman who has arrogated to himself so much knowledge and so much Parliamentary practice, will find himself much to blame, and I advise him in future cases not to provoke discussions which do not conduce either to the harmony or to the welfare of this House.

Mr. BOWELL. When I spoke a few moments ago I said the hon. member for West Middlesex had misled the House by the manner in which he had given the figures, or rather the comparisons which he presented to the Committee in reference to this expenditure; and that an investigation would result in showing that he did not tell all the truth in connection with this matter, that is, he did not tell all the facts. I find that in that statement I was correct, for I now have the figures before me, which I did not have at that moment, and the Committee will see at once how unfair was the statement which that hon. gentleman made to the Committee in the first instance. In 1876-77 the total expenditure in connection with the Weights and Measures was \$100,409; and the collections that year were \$51,657. In 1878 the expenditure was \$81,992, and the collections were \$29,683. During a portion of that year the law applied, which had been passed reducing the fees to be collected, and the tariff of fees had been reduced from 11 per cent. to 66 per cent. by 40 Vic., chap. 15; and on subsequent inspection, only 25 cts. were charged instead of the whole fees. Then came the following year of 1878-79 a portion of which hon. gentlemen were responsible just as much as the succeeding Government. That year all the collections were made under the reduced fees—that is from 11 per cent. to 66 per cent. and a portion of the other year.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The same as in 1878.

Mr. BOWELL. A portion of 1878 was full fees, and the balance half fees. In 1878-79 the total collections were only \$13,222 against an expenditure of \$72,054. At that time the fees had been reduced in the proportions to which I have called attention, and in addition to that the second inspection was only 25 cts. in case the scales were found to be correct. This fully accounts for the reduction in the amount in the collections of that year. There had been no change in the law by the present Government, nor had there been Inspectors of Weights and Measures appointed up to that time, consequently the law was administered as it stood on the Statute-book when the present Government came into power with precisely the same officers as the late Government. In 1879-80 the expenditure was \$47,518; the collections, \$17,080. That was under the new law passed by the present Administration, and the next year the expenditure was \$59,995, and collections \$34,584. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the inspection under the present law was made only once in two years instead of annually, which fully accounted for the reduction in the amount of fees collected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would also account for the fewer number of collectors.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and there were fewer collectors, and consequently they did not cost so much as in 1876-77, 1877-78 and 1878-79. With these facts before the Committee, they will justify the remarks I have made that when Mr. WOODWORTH.

hon. gentlemen stated that under their administration of the law it only cost so much per dollar to collect, while under our administration it cost so much more. The House will justify me in saying that the hon. gentleman did not make a fair statement in connection with this matter. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) said that the present Administration found certain instruments in the Department and did not use them, and this he called culpable on the part of the Government. The hon. gentleman forgot to state that they were useless.

Mr. VAIL. But you said that they were still there.

Mr. BOWELL. But they are useless; they have been there all the time.

Mr. VAIL. They are part of the instruments purchased by the other Government.

Mr. BOWELL. No; they are instruments purchased in 1876-77 under the Administration of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman speaks of the Government as being corrupt, and while I do not complain of that I think he should have given some basis for his statement. I said before and I repeat now, that I do not think the hon. gentleman is one of those who should bandy the term corruption in connection with any Government. When the hon. gentleman made an inglorious retreat from this House, and when he met with a still greater defeat in his constituency, I will not say that he was guilty of corruption, but he took advantage of his position, and directly contrary to the Independence of Parliament Act acted in a manner to bring seven or eight of his admirers and followers, and two of his own Cabinet, of whom he was one, under the Act and were unseated. It does not, therefore, lie in his mouth to accuse others of corruption.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I believe the hon. gentleman said that \$37,000 of the instruments were lying in the cellar unused.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not state exactly the amount. What I stated was that there were lying in the building, weights and measures, scales and other articles, comparatively useless, which had cost \$37,940; and that they were there when we came into office, and a portion of them were there still.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood him to say that a portion were purchased by the late Government, and that they are there yet. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with being disingenuous, but I think when he reads such lectures to hon. members on this side he should be a little more careful of his own statement. The hon. gentleman has entirely changed his statement, and though I impute no motives to him, still we have learned by a simple enquiry the fact that his first statement was not correct at all, and that it had to be considerably modified. We know further that the hon. gentleman was possessed of the information at the time which enabled him to modify the statement.

Mr. VAIL. With regard to these instruments, the hon. gentleman will remember that they were purchased under the direction and by the authority of a scientific gentleman, who was deputy-head of the Department, Mr. Brunel, and I do not think that the Government should be held responsible for them. I am not at all surprised that he holds himself responsible to some extent to answer the questions asked from this side of the House. I think I must reply to what the hon. gentleman said with reference to myself personally. He said I was obliged to resign my position in consequence of charges made against me, that I lost my election, and all that. I do not know what that had to do with the matter. There was no charge brought against me to cause me to resign. I did it voluntarily; and when I resigned there were thirty-three members

in this House who were in a worse position than I was, and who did not resign. If I am not mistaken, the hon. Minister of Customs received more for public printing than I did, but he had not the manliness to resign, and no enquiry was made into his case, so he retained his seat. That is the difference between him and myself. I lost my election; but I won five elections out of six, with large majorities, which few other men in this House have done.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and (at 2:20 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 8th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*,—That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance a sum or sums not exceeding in the whole \$100,000 to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners, towards the completion of the Lévis Graving Dock, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, in addition to, and on like terms as to sinking fund, as the sum of \$500,000, the advance of which is authorized by the Act 38 Vic., chap. 56.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*,—That in order to assist the Quebec Harbor Commissioners in the improvement of the Harbor of Quebec, it is expedient to amend the Act 36 Vic., chap. 62, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Acts to provide for the management and improvement of the Harbor of Quebec," and the Act 43 Vic., chap. 17, intituled: "An Act to authorize the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to complete their tidal dock, so as to provide that the rate of interest payable by the said Harbor Commissioners to the Receiver-General, upon the sums raised under the said recited Acts, shall be 4 per centum per annum, instead of 5, as therein specified.

Motion agreed to.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have never been in the habit of boring the House with criticisms on myself that appear in the newspapers. During the ten or eleven years I have been in Parliament this is the first occasion in which I have called the attention of the House to anything of that kind. I, of course, have not escaped criticism, and criticism that has very often been characterized by unfairness, and often by maliciousness, and mendacity; but I do not think it has ever done me any harm. On the contrary, the result, as far as I am concerned, has been beneficial. For the first time in my life, I, however, feel called upon to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in a newspaper. I do this because the article is not only false, but it is calculated to place me in a false position before my constituents, and before the country, and for that reason I refer to that article to-day. It appears in the *Mail* of yesterday, in the "Sessional Notes," and it relates to the

indemnity question. The portion of the article to which I refer is as follows:—

"The *Globe's* Ottawa correspondent has a good deal to say about the increase of the indemnity to members, and says, among other things, that the Government party caucus on Friday, was held for the discussion of the indemnity question. He says, further, that the Government supporters are solid in favor of increasing the annual indemnity to \$1,500. On previous occasions the Opposition organ has attributed the indemnity increase agitation to the Conservatives. This is not a true statement. Whether the indemnity ought to be increased or not, is a question on which various opinions may be properly entertained. There is a good deal to say *pro* and *con*; but whether public sentiment ought to be in favor of, or against the increase of the indemnity, as a matter of fact the Opposition are responsible for the agitation. It may be affirmed that Mr. Charlton is the father of the original scheme, which, as elaborated by him and a few others of the Grits, included the continuance of the franking privilege during Recess. The Opposition have, it is understood, all agreed to ask the Government for an increase of the indemnity, except Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie, both of whom have promised to support the movement. How many of the Government side have agreed to support the agitation I do not know."

And further on:

"It is not often that the Opposition have so much right on their side as they have in this indemnity matter, which they have taken up so warmly, and really seeing how often they are foiled in their movements, one cannot but have a certain degree of sympathy with them on this occasion. The Government watch the public Treasury carefully, and while prepared, with the hearty concurrence of the people, to spend millions on our great national undertakings, and thousands to supply the country from end to end with public buildings, they practice close economy in most of their expenditures. It is, of course, difficult for the Government to resist the Opposition, if supported in this pet expenditure of theirs by a majority of the House; but the country may be sure that the increase will not be granted unless a very strong case in favor of it is presented. No doubt Messrs. Ross, Charlton, Paterson, of Brant, Somerville, of Brant, and others of the Opposition, who have the matter in hand will elaborate a powerful argument in support of the position they have assumed. In the meantime, the *Globe* has had a hint from the Opposition that in its attack upon this increase, it has been a little too previous."

Well, Sir, in reference to that article—I speak in behalf of myself and myself alone—I have to say in regard to the charge that I originated this scheme, that it is false, and the writer ought to have known it was false, because he had no proof to the contrary. With regard to the assertion that I advocate the scheme, that is not only false, but it is maliciously false, and the writer must have known it to be so because he had no proof that I had advocated the scheme. If he had enquired into the matter he would have ascertained that the contrary was the case, and, consequently, I declare that assertion was maliciously false. I do not favor, as the correspondent says, an increase of the indemnity; on the contrary, I have been opposed to it—I am opposed to it. I have taken a prominent part in opposition to the movement as can be testified to, I believe, by every member of the Reform party in this House; and I think I may venture to say that I am the only member of the Opposition who has declared his intention of dividing the House on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Others can speak for themselves. I am glad to find there are others who are disposed to divide the House on this question. This correspondent, who, having first proceeded basely, maliciously and slanderously, to place myself and my friends in the position of having originated this scheme, of having advocated this scheme, then goes on to argue in favor of it. I have nothing more to say except to brand the article as false and slanderous, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I suppose, since this correspondent was kind enough to mention me, I ought, also, speaking for myself, repudiate all connection with this matter. I see he says:

"No doubt Messrs. Ross, Charlton, Paterson, of Brant, Somerville, of Brant, and others of the Opposition who have the matter in hand, will elaborate a powerful argument in support of the position they have assumed."

I can say that I have had nothing to do with that. I never signed, and never was asked to sign, a petition for it; had no connection with the matter from beginning to end. How the correspondent of the *Mail*, or any other person, could associate me with this matter, I cannot understand. The statement is untrue *in toto*, so far as I am concerned. I just wish to say, in these few words, that if correspondents would attend to other matters than the private affairs of members, they would be quite as usefully employed.

Mr. RYKERT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain why it is that the *Globe* charged the Ministerial members with having subscribed towards the Ontario Elections, and then having originated this scheme in order to recoup themselves.

Mr. ROSS. I am speaking for myself. The *Globe* can explain its own charges, and can speak for itself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Like my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I have sat in the House, I think, about eleven years, and during that time allusions have been occasionally made to myself in the press of both parties, and sometimes not very complimentary; but I can recognize the fact that, perhaps, they may see defects and blemishes in me that they are not so able to detect in themselves. Expressions of that kind, of course, we are quite prepared to meet with. I could also afford to let the expressions in the article that has just been read in your hearing pass, too, were it not that I fear that, perhaps, the correspondent who so far forgot himself as to pen what is absolutely and utterly without foundation, might attribute silence on my part as an endorsement of the statement made, without a shadow or particle of foundation for it. I desire to state to you, Mr. Speaker, very calmly—for it is not a very pleasant thing to have to denounce any article as being false in its nature, because that carries with it the imputation that the gentleman who penned it has done an unworthy deed—but I wish to say, in all calmness, that when that article states that the members of the Opposition are all pledged to this scheme, or words to that effect—and I, being a member of the Opposition, am included in the category—that the statement, so far as I am concerned, is absolutely, utterly, and totally, without foundation or shadow of truth. When, further down, he states my intention, along with “Messrs. Ross, Charlton, and Somerville, of Brant,” of advocating the scheme, I have again to give to it the same emphatic contradiction. There is not in the statement one single particle of truth. It is made entirely out of whole cloth. I would have passed it by, only I cannot understand why such a statement should find its way there, unless there was a certain amount of malice in the writer’s mind—why against myself I do not know; but he must have been actuated by that principle, and with a view, if possible, of damaging me in the eyes of my constituents. I am sorry to have troubled the House on such a matter, for the first time in eleven years. I do not know that it is necessary now. My word, when I went home among my constituents, would have been sufficient; but the matter having been mentioned by others, I have not remained silent for the reason I have alleged.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). My name having been mentioned in connection with this matter, I think it is my duty to make a statement in regard to my position. I would simply join with those who have already spoken, in denying the statement of the *Mail*, that I intended to ask the Government for an increase of the indemnity. I have no hesitation in declaring that statement to be utterly foundationless. And then, further on, when he says:

“The question would bear investigation, and if a good case is presented the people will not begrudge the members the increase the Opposition have banded themselves together to press upon their opponents.”

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

This I also pronounce to be utterly untrue; and, further, when he says:

“No doubt Messrs. Ross, Charlton, Paterson, of Brant, Somerville, of Brant, and others of the Opposition, who have the matter in hand, will elaborate a powerful argument in support of the position they have assumed.”

That I also declare to be an utter and wilful fabrication—a malicious fabrication; there is not a particle of truth in it. I may say that my position on the matter has been clearly and well defined and understood by those with whom I associate in this House. Ever since the question has been talked about I have been an uncompromising opponent to the scheme for a further increase of the indemnity. That has been well understood by those with whom I have had any conversation on the subject. I would just say that I have always, from the position I occupy as a member of the press, felt that we ought to have a high regard for that profession. I believe the members of the press, as a rule—the editors of newspapers, and the reporters who are engaged in this House—are men of high moral position, men who are incapable, as a rule, of doing an injustice to a political opponent; men who, as a rule, are incapable of sitting down and wilfully and maliciously penning what they know to be utterly false and foundationless. But there is no rule without an exception, and the exception in this case is the black sheep who wears spectacles, and who has strayed into the *Mail’s* flock. I say, furthermore, and I say it with perfect deliberation, that this man who deliberately sat down and penned that statement and sent it up for publication in the *Toronto Mail*, is a disgrace to the newspaper profession in the Dominion of Canada, and to the gallery of the House of Commons.

Mr. FOSTER. I waited until the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) followed the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as he very often does; but I forgot for a moment that the third had not followed, and so I clashed a little with my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Paterson). I did not know it was the custom when newspaper writers had said anything against you which you did not like, or which was not true, to rise in the House and enter your protest against it. If all the members did that, there would be a great deal of protesting. I, myself, have a little bit of reputation to keep, and I remember, not long since, seeing an item in a newspaper in which it was stated that, although I had been a life-long temperance man, and possessed strong temperance principles, I had gone back on them, and was not now in favor of Sunday closing. But I did not think it was necessary to rise in my place, and say that the newspaper reporter was malicious. I do not believe that; I think he was only hard up for an item, and this struck his imagination, and he put it in. Again, it has been stated, in a newspaper on the opposite side of politics to myself, that I allied myself with a deputation of maltsters, and went to try and prevail on the hon. Finance Minister to give more favorable terms to them. I think that is quite a libel on my character as a temperance man. I thought, however, with regard to the former, that it was done, not maliciously, but benevolently, and that the hon. gentleman who formerly occupied a seat in this House, and who has now gone into the better and nobler work of newspaper editing, did it from a benevolent desire, and not for a malicious purpose. I am glad to understand now that there is one hon. member on the opposite side of the House who has publicly expressed himself as being determined to divide the House on the question of increased indemnity; and that he is the only one on that side of the House. I have a grievance on the indemnity question myself, because it was stated very explicitly in the *Globe* that at Friday’s caucus all the Government supporters had supported the suggestion for an increase of indemnity, and I am generally known as a Government



supporter. I do not, however, say the reporter wrote this maliciously, but, again, that he was hard up for an item, and thought this would do as well as anything else.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to correct the impression left on the minds of hon. members by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that he was the only hon. gentleman who was opposed to an increase of indemnity, and expressed his intention to divide the House upon it. I had not consulted with him; but my opinion was, that an increase of indemnity was inadvisable, and I resolved that I would divide the House. I am not alone in holding that opinion, and it is within my knowledge that a number of hon. members intended to take the same course as the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. ALLISON. As an individual, I am not at all surprised that those hon. members of the Opposition who were singled out in the article referred to should have taken the earliest possible opportunity to put themselves right on this question under discussion. I think that if they had taken any other course they would not have done justice to themselves. But while I fully believe this, I think there is a good deal of importance to be attached to the remark which was made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), that the newspaper press of both parties is equally to blame; and, perhaps, hon. members opposite would do well to remember that it was the organ of the Reform party in Toronto which first commenced the war, and the attack was made in a more objectionable manner, except that individuals were not singled out, than was that contained in the article in the *Toronto Mail*. For this reason, it not only made a charge against the supporters of the Government with being in favor of an increased indemnity, but it charged them with supporting this proposal for corrupt purposes, stating that the hon. Premier was going to give them an opportunity to recoup themselves for subscriptions given in aid of the party for the Local Elections. I think it well that this should be borne in mind. When the article first came under my notice, I drew the attention of some Reform members to it, these members being in favor of an increase in the indemnity, and they entirely agreed with me in this opinion, that whoever were the originators, and, up to that time, the promoters of an increase in the indemnity, those hon. members were not supporters of the Government from the Province of Ontario. I think it well, also, to bear this in mind. There is no disguising the fact that this movement, if it can be called a movement, or this discussion, if it be only a discussion, was commenced by both sides of the House; and if I were on a witness stand, and were called upon to testify, I could not say whether, according to the relative strength of parties, there were more in favor of it on one side than on the other side of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. ALLISON. I think I have had as good an opportunity as the hon. member of conversing with members on both sides of the House on the subject, and such is my opinion. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to his own opinion, but I think I know what I am talking about, and I am in the judgment of the House. It is a notorious fact that many hon. members on both sides are decidedly in favor the proposal, that others are indifferent, and that others are hostile to the movement; and any newspaper, in connection with any party, which makes statements contrary to those I am making, as far as my observation and the testimony of others go, does so either in ignorance of the facts, or in wilful misstatement of the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would not have risen to occupy the time of the House, but for the fact that the article referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that

the party on this side of the House, the Reform party, was an unit in favor of an increased indemnity. I have to say that this question never was mentioned to me, but that I expressed myself most pointedly and explicitly in opposition to the movement; and I can say, further, that this question was mentioned to me by parties on the Conservative as well as on the Reform side of the House. I will venture to go this far: I say that the first time I ever heard Mr. Charlton express his views on this question, he declared, in the most pointed manner that he possibly could, he would oppose it to the bitter end, and if no other member would divide the House on it he would do this himself; and I think that this is the idea which he intended to convey when he spoke a few moments ago. I say, as far as I am concerned, that I have always expressed myself in that way, and I repeat those sentiments. I believe that the country is paying more for legislation at the hands of this House, and in the Local Legislature, than it really should, and that this expense is as large as the country should be called upon to submit to; for that reason I am opposed to the scheme. With regard to the article which appeared in the *Mail*, I am not going so far as the hon. member for Brant, and declare that this was a malicious act on the part of the writer; but I would say this, which I believe to be the case, that he has been grossly hoaxed by some person on the Conservative side of the House in order to shift the responsibility of the movement in connection with the matter on the shoulders of their opponents; and now that gentleman has to bear the burden and responsibility, which, I believe, rests on other shoulders. This I consider to be the fact with respect to this official. I simply wanted to make these few remarks, and also to say this: I know that many members on the Reform side of the House take as strong ground on this question as I do myself.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think that this discussion is undoubtedly irregular; but we are a company, supposed to be, of gentlemen, and I think it important, therefore, that in a matter of this kind, those who have been taking a very active part in connection with this subject should have something to say on it. The statements we have heard from gentlemen on the other side are so entirely different from the statements made by those hon. gentlemen who are generally supposed, in matters between parties, to speak for hon. gentlemen on the other side, that I think one of the whips of the Reform party, the hon. member for Shelburne, should at least explain how it is that so many gentlemen on that side now protest that they are opposed to it, and would divide the House upon it, while he himself ventured to say to persons on this side, he believed that, with the exception of three gentlemen on that side, all were in favor of the increase in the indemnity. We are here as a party of gentlemen, and it is not fair that gentlemen on that side—I can speak on this matter as far as I myself am concerned, having refused to have anything to do with it, and have always been opposed to it, as my friends know—and that prominent gentlemen on that side, who are supposed to speak for their party in matters of this kind, should be permitted to make statements of this kind, to get up one after another as they are doing to-day, and to leave the impression on the public mind that this movement originated on our side of the House, and that their side are all opposed to it; and we should be given the reason why that hon. gentleman supposed that they were practically all in favor of it. As to the hon. gentleman who spoke first, all I can say is this: If he was prepared to divide the House on the question of the increase in the indemnity of any kind, I am very much astonished at that statement. I need not say anything more, for I dare say that the hon. gentleman knows why I am astonished.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). As far as I am concerned this is a little confessional, and we are each making our confession. I remember very distinctly the last round robin which was got up to increase the indemnity from \$600 to \$1,000. A large number of the members of the House would not sign this round robin; but I remember distinctly—for I made enquiry about it—that these members were the first to take the increased indemnity and go home; and I believe, to-day, the parties who get up and say they do not want the increase want it worse than the parties who have had the honesty to admit that they want it. I like honesty. There was not, out of a House of 200 members during the Parliament when the other increase took place, one single member that did not take it; and now these parties want to get up and say to the country: "We did not want the increase; we want to make a little political capital out of it." So honest, so generous, and so kind hearted are they; and then they get up and say: "We told you not to ask for it;" but if obtained they would be the first to go to the accountant and say: "We want the increased indemnity," and, putting it in their pockets, they would go home. I do not like hypocrisy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was, unfortunately, out of the House when this discussion commenced; but I am told that reference has been made, on the floor of the House, and I see also in the press, to a late meeting of the Conservative party, known as a caucus. We had a caucus, the only one we had this Session, the other day. I was there from the beginning to the end of it, and there was not one single word, or expression, or allusion, in the most remote degree, made with respect to the indemnity of members. Quite different subjects were discussed; but not one single member present made one remark respecting the indemnity of members.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving the third reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend The Civil Service Act, 1882, said: When this measure was previously under consideration, the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested an addition to the third sub-section of the thirty-fourth section, providing that a report should be made on each case, giving the reasons for each appointment. I am sorry that I cannot agree to this suggestion, and I will explain why. I stated, yesterday, when the hon. gentleman suggested that the names of the persons appointed under the third section should be laid before the House within the ten or fifteen first days of the Session, that this was useless, because, by the Civil Service Act, we are bound to lay before the House a list of the parties appointed under this law; and, under the circumstances, this prevented such a provision being necessary. The other provision is also unnecessary, for when an appointment is made, it is done by Order in Council which is there to show the necessity or usefulness of the appointment, and it will be with the others laid before Parliament, in the list of the names of the new appointments made during the year; and if any member then wishes to obtain any explanation respecting any appointment, it will be open to him to ask the reason why it took place. Therefore, I do not see that there would be any necessity to pass a special proviso for that purpose. If these appointments were to be made secretly, if they were not to be known in Parliament, it would be different; but it is stated in the Bill exactly how these appointments were to be made. Further, if an hon. gentleman should wish, at any time, to have the reasons why one, or two, or three of these men have been appointed, it will be open to him to ask the information, and the information, of course, will be forthcoming. Under

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

these circumstances, I am sorry I cannot accept the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall not discuss this question at any length; but I may say that I think it a most important thing that the general rule of the Civil Service Act by which the highest prizes of the service are open to the members of the service, and the general rule of examination and promotion, should apply in these cases as well as in others. My own opinion is that it would be a great encouragement to the service if it were found that first-class men in its ranks could occasionally find themselves at the top of the service, even in the branches which are excepted in the Bill. The hon. gentleman remarks that the city postmasterships, and city collectorships, are few in number, and that their importance will furnish certain checks, by directing public attention to the appointments, does not apply to the numerous collectors and preventive officers all over the Dominion. There are officers which are as numerous, though, perhaps, not so important in one sense, and not so liable to attract public attention to the appointment, and, therefore, in respect of them the responsibility of the Minister is not acted upon with so lively a sense of that active responsibility as in the other cases. As I said, however, I do not intend entering into the discussion of this matter; but in order to put my views on record, I move the following amendment thereto, that the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend the same by adding to sub-section 3 of 34, in section 6, the following words:—

Where the public interests require, but appointments made under this sub-section other than those of City Postmasters and City Collectors shall be made only on Report, giving the reasons therefor.

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

78. Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at St. John.....\$171,750 00

Mr. WELDON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain this vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We asked a vote last year for the purpose of providing freight accommodation at St. John, and now it is proposed to provide a suitable passenger station in the same city. The vote is made up in this way: \$150,000 for a passenger station; 450 tons of rails and fastenings, \$20,250; spikes and track laying, \$1,500; all in connection with the new passenger station.

Mr. WELDON. Where is it proposed to put the new passenger station?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On Mill street.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated enough rails to lay a track for nearly five miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is none provided for, except what is required to carry out the arrangement which we began last year.

Mr. BLAKE. What will the freight and passenger station cost together, when complete?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be the amount I have mentioned, and the amount voted last year; and there will be a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to provide for the excess of expenditure last year.

Mr. BLAKE. That will be about \$360,000 in all?

79. Intercolonial Railway—Halifax Extension ..... \$12,500.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The special object of this vote is to provide coal shoots for the purpose of loading coal into ships with the greatest possible facility, and also for a hoisting machine calculated to lift thirty tons; the former will cost \$5,000, and the latter \$7,500.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the cost of the elevator, and the other items in connection with the Halifax extension?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total expenditure at the Halifax extension, exclusive of this small amount, has been \$1,210,361.21. That is the total which has been expended since the year 1872-73. In 1880-81, the amount expended was \$33,684; in 1881-82, \$173,109, and down to the 1st of February, 1883, \$174,139. These expenditures include everything in connection with the Halifax extension, including the purchase of the water side property, the carrying of the track down to it, the wharves, piers, elevator, &c.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the cost of the wharf and elevator?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The cost, I believe, was \$113,373.

Mr. BLAKE. When was it completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite recently.

Mr. BLAKE. How many cargoes of grain have been shipped there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We were not able to get it completed in time to ship an extensive quantity of grain. In the first place, the contract was not completed at the time at which the contractor engaged to have it completed. Then the difficulty of handling traffic from the West, in consequence of the heavy snow, and the enormous volume of traffic on the Grand Trunk Railway, made it impossible to get large trains of cars sent forward with promptness. The elevator is admirably adapted for the purpose, and I have no doubt we shall do a large amount of shipping through it during the next season; and I am satisfied that this would have been the case this season had we got the elevator completed at an early day.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what rates were arranged for over the Intercolonial Railway, and over the Grand Trunk?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Grand Trunk Railway, in order to offer every facility in its power, made, in the first instance, an exceptionally low rate for grain—something like one-tenth of a cent per ton a mile; that is a through rate over the whole line from Chicago to Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion of that was assigned to the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An equal rate per mile. From whatever point the traffic came we estimated the amount, and divided it according to the mileage rate from the point of starting to Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. Was that same rate given by the Grand Trunk Railway, no matter what the point of starting was?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Was this a permanent arrangement, or an experimental arrangement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to say that it was a permanent arrangement—it was experimental; and the object was to try it under the most favorable circumstances, with the view of seeing how far it was practicable.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it for car loads or train loads?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For train loads. It embraced everything.

80. Intercolonial Railway—Rolling Stock ..... \$268,650.00

Mr. BLAKE. More rolling stock. It always goes rolling on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and always will so long as the traffic goes rolling up.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain how this sum is made up?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It includes fifteen locomotives, \$14,000; two first-class cars, \$5,500; two second-class cars, \$3,500; two baggage cars, \$2,500; two vans, \$1,000; twenty box cars at \$700 each; twenty flat cars at \$450 each, and twenty at \$540 each; and two snow ploughs, \$1,200. These are required in consequence of the greatly increased traffic. To give the Committee some little idea of the increased volume of traffic, I may state that the number of tons of freight carried increased from 561,924 tons in 1879-80 to 838,956 tons in 1881-82. I may say that the increased amount of rolling stock purchased and charged to capital account does not exceed the proportion furnished previously upon capital account in relation to the volume of the traffic.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for further rolling stock, \$400,000. With this vote we have an addition of rolling stock since last year of nearly \$700,000, or \$1,000 a mile. I presume the other rolling stock is kept up out of the revenue. How does the account stand for rolling stock?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The amount of rolling stock, exclusive of the amounts now asked, for the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway, up to the 30th June, 1882, is \$4,616,760, or, including these two votes, about \$6,000 a mile for 840 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the stock in existence thoroughly kept up?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I am able to say, with the confidence any one can have in efficient and reliable officers, that all the rolling stock furnished and charged to capital account from the commencement of the present time is kept in a thorough state of efficiency at the cost of revenue.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is any part of the new stock chargeable to revenue account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are constantly building new cars at the cost of revenue to supply cars that become broken up. It is only in the new rolling stock, necessitated by the increase of traffic, that the amount is charged to capital account.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman furnish a return of the rolling stock chargeable to revenue and that chargeable to capital, since 1878? I remember a discussion arose between the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for East York as to the propriety of charging rolling stock to capital at all, the hon. member for East York maintaining that after the road was completed all additional supply should be charged to revenue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is utterly impossible to pursue this course in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, for the simple reason that we had a deficit of \$500,000 a year, and could not in any case furnish the rolling stock out of revenue. I submitted evidence from the leading lines of railway to show that the course followed by the Intercolonial Railway is the same that they followed. I will bring down the information required.

Mr. ROSS. I am not finding fault with the policy, but simply wish to ascertain the proportion charged to capital and revenue each year. If less be charged to revenue one year than another, the ordinary expenditure will vary, a correct result will not be arrived at.

Mr. BLAKE. While the railway does not give a profit, a vote for new rolling stock must be on capital account; but it should be established that every article of the rolling stock we have bought originally on capital account should be kept up at the expense of revenue. If it is not and cannot be kept thoroughly maintained out of the income for the road for the year, the result is that a deficit is produced in the working, and it appears on the account. An attempt to eke out the deficiency at the expense of capital account would be a dishonest procedure; but as long as we can be satisfied that the rolling stock is kept in an effective condition on the revenue account, then, of course, we know that justice in one sense is being done. When the road has been established and is doing a large and profitable business and making a great deal of money, it is a matter, in the discretion of the directors or managers, if they want any more rolling stock, whether they pay for it out of the income of the year, or whether they will propose an additional charge to capital. That is open to the hon. gentleman. He is in that position. He has not got the income, and he proposes to the House to increase the rolling stock. He has got to take a vote, and it is essential that he should have that sharp line drawn that to the income account are charged all repairs that are necessary and everything that is necessary to keep the road in a state of efficiency; but that if he has not got an income out of which he can increase the rolling stock, then he should charge the increased rolling stock to capital; but the moment we have a surplus income we should increase the rolling stock out of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I entirely concur with the hon. gentleman in his view, and I would regard it as an act of sheer dishonesty on the part of the officials of the road if they adopted any such mode of maintaining the existing rolling stock under the guise of a charge to capital account. So far as I am able to investigate it, no such thing has been done, and I have the most perfect confidence that the maintenance of the road is fairly and honestly kept up.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I did not, for a moment, mean to say that such was not the case.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before proceeding further with this matter, I would like to set myself right, as well as others in the House, with regard to an answer given by the hon. Minister of Railways as to the rate charged over the Intercolonial per ton a mile. I understood him to say it was one-tenth of a cent a ton per mile. I would like to know if that is the rate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say to my hon. friend that that only applies to these grain cargoes. That is not the ordinary cost of carriage on the Intercolonial Railway, but that was the rate given by the Grand Trunk Railway for the grain cargoes that were engaged to be sent forward when we expected to have the elevator ready to ship the grain.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say that it is hardly fair to the people of this country, whose money built the road, to carry freight at one-tenth of a cent per ton a mile. That will not pay anything like the expenses. Of course, I do not wish to raise a dispute on this question now; but I think it is very strange that a road that has cost the country so much money, and that has been run at a loss, I believe, within the last year—I think, it is singular that it should be permitted to carry the produce of the Western States, shipped from Chicago at such a decided loss as one-tenth of a cent per ton a mile implies. I do not think it is using our own people fairly, the people who built the road, and are paying interest on the money invested in its construction. It is a gross injustice to the people. I can only say—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that we will not carry a pound, or a bushel of American grain, if we can get it in Ontario. We would prefer very much to take it

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

from Ontario, because it would be a much shorter distance. When we wished to ship grain at Halifax, and applied to the Grand Trunk Railway for a rate, I think my hon. friend should hardly expect me to say that they were not charging enough for carriage over the Grand Trunk Railway. The price over the Grand Trunk Railway, and the price of carriage by the Intercolonial Railway, are precisely the same. The rate is made for cargoes coming forward from the West, it is made by the Grand Trunk Railway between Chicago and Halifax. We applied for them to give us the lowest possible rate—all our efforts with the Grand Trunk Railway are to get low rates. I have never had occasion to check their disposition to make the rate too low, up to the present time, certainly. I appreciate the point the hon. gentleman has made, that it would not be a proper rate for the road as a rule. But there are two questions to be considered. One is, that most of the shipment is grain. The rest is general produce, and things that bear a much higher rate. You sometimes carry a portion of your cargo at an extremely low rate, relying on the balance of your cargo to make it up. But as I have said before, I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway was anxious to give us, for the purpose of seeing what could be done, the very lowest rate it possibly could.

Mr. DALY. I am surprised that a voice should be heard in this House complaining of the lowness of the rates charged by the Grand Trunk Railway, and by consequence the low rates of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the people down by the sea cannot fail to know that it is of great consequence for us to obtain low rates so as to encourage inter-provincial trade; and a proposition coming from the Grand Trunk Railway to carry freight at the low rate which the hon. Minister of Railways has mentioned, is to me a source of the greatest gratification, and I regret extremely that any hon. member of this House should complain of the lowness of the rate. We should look at the Intercolonial Railway, not merely as a Government work, but as a work which helped to bring Nova Scotia into the Confederation; and if freight is occasionally carried over that road at lower rates than would be charged by private companies, we must put it down to the fact that the road is intended to be a public highway, which the people of Canada have agreed to construct, and which confers a benefit, not alone upon Nova Scotia, but upon the West. I believe that the universal sentiment of this House is, with perhaps few exceptions, of which we have just heard an instance, that the lower the rates, within reasonable bounds, charged by the Intercolonial Railway, the more pleased will the general public be, and the more trade will be developed, and that is the purpose for which the Intercolonial is intended. Therefore, I am glad to hear from the hon. Minister that this very low rate has been granted by the Intercolonial Railway and by the Grand Trunk Railway; and I may also call to mind that it is in the interest of Ontario to encourage the development of its trade with the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman understood me to say that I complained of the lowness of the rate from a Canadian point of view, he is mistaken; I spoke of the rate from an American point of view. What I said was, that I did not think it was in the interests of the people of this country that the money they had invested in the construction of this road should be used to carry the surplus produce of the Western States at a rate that was ruinous to the road, and I hold that point still. I have no objections that the road should be used for the carriage of the surplus produce of the Dominion of Canada at a very low rate, and I should be glad if the Grand Trunk Railway would be so liberal towards the country as to carry our produce at such a rate. But I say it is wrong that a road, constructed by our own people, and for our own benefit, should be used to carry

freights from the Western States at such a low rate—that it is virtually ruinous to the road. Now we practice the principles of Protection—at least hon. gentlemen opposite do—with regard to the United States, and I think they should adopt it with regard to this matter also. I have no desire to interfere with any rate so long as it is in the interests of the Provinces, but I am opposed to allowing it to be used with respect to the surplus products of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will be greatly relieved to know that this grain did not come from the United States, but from Stratford; and I do not think it will lower the value of the grain in Stratford or any other part of Ontario for shippers to be able, during the period of the year when the St. Lawrence is blocked with ice, to get grain shipped to an open Canadian port at a very low rate. Every farmer in Ontario, and every person owning a bushel of grain, are greatly interested in having a low rate obtained, because it increases the value and improves the market for their produce.

Mr. BLAKE. If the same rate prevails over the Intercolonial as over the Grand Trunk I am quite content, because the Grand Trunk is run presumably on commercial principles; and if that rate on the whole, directly or indirectly, pays the Grand Trunk, it should pay our own road. The rate is a surprisingly low one; and I was not astonished to hear the hon. Minister state that it was only an experimental one, and there was no guarantee on the part of the Grand Trunk to continue it. I shall rejoice very much if grain can be carried successfully for one-tenth of a cent per bushel per mile.

81. Intercolonial Railway—St. Charles Branch and Ferry between Lévis and Quebec ..... \$13,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Committee is aware that it was proposed to establish a ferry between Lévis and Quebec, and that after some considerable discussion this Government agreed to share with the Quebec Government the expense. At that time the railway in Quebec was owned by the Provincial Government, and we agreed, as I have said, to share with the Quebec Government the cost of the establishment and maintenance of that ferry, and to a division equally of the profits or losses. We agreed that that should apply either to the Government of Quebec, or to the proprietors of the railway. Since that time the railway has passed out of the hands of the Government of Quebec, as the Committee are aware, and no steps have been subsequently taken to carry out the agreement to which the Government are committed for the establishment of the ferry. The St. Charles Branch to Lévis will shortly be completed, and will be open for traffic this summer, and no doubt it will be found very considerably to facilitate traffic on the Intercolonial. We shall bring the passengers through to the Grand Trunk station at Lévis, instead of having long and tiresome delays at the Chaudière Junction.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the present proprietors of the North Shore have taken no steps to meet the action of the Government with respect to the ferry?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have not.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister state what the entire cost of the branch will be, and whether this vote includes any portion for the expenses of the ferry. And if so, what amount, and what proportion of the whole?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount, I think, will be required for the branch and the works at Point Lévis in addition to the amount agreed to be provided.

Mr. BLAKE. That is \$656,000 altogether?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is nothing for the ferry in this item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; it will take this amount in addition to the amounts voted last year, to complete the branch.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the ferry is to be abandoned?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I do not say that; but from the appearance of the place when I recently had an opportunity of seeing it, pretty late in the season, it did not look hopeful, to say the least of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The subject to which the hon. Minister has called the attention of the Committee is one of some importance to the Maritime Provinces. This project which the Government recommended to the House was very acceptable to the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion, from the fact that it proposed to give a connection between the Intercolonial Railway, which runs to Halifax, and the roads running west on the North Shore. From an agreement laid before a Committee very recently we learned that this road had been transferred by the Quebec Government to a private company. I understand, from the hon. Minister of Railways, that no steps have been taken by the Quebec Government, or by this private company, to comply with the agreement entered into by the Dominion Government and the Quebec Government for maintaining the ferry. Am I to understand from the hon. Minister that this scheme has been abandoned?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; certainly not. The position of the Dominion Government was this: We were prepared, whenever the Quebec Government or the proprietors of the North Shore Railway undertook to establish this ferry, to incur a certain amount of expenditure for the purpose of aiding it. We are prepared to do that now; but, under the agreement, the movement was to come from the other parties. The scheme is by no means abandoned, and this Government is committed to the engagement to-morrow, if the parties take it up and prosecute it as originally intended; and I would be very glad to see it prosecuted in such a way as to accomplish what we had in view, namely, to be able to send not only passengers, but freight cars across the river from either side.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am obliged to the hon. Minister for the information. But it does not meet the point which strikes me as presenting a very objectionable feature in the matter of affording connection with the Eastern Provinces. The conditions are now very materially altered. The Quebec Government owned a line between Quebec and St. Martin's Junction, with running powers to Montreal. The people of the Dominion had a right to expect, from the way in which public money was granted by the Province of Quebec, that the road would be maintained as an independent line between the eastern portion of our railway system controlled by the Government, and the western portion controlled by companies. Although the vote to make the Lévis connection was a very large one, we all know that the money was given willingly, because it was considered most desirable that this connection should be made. And yet we find that the company that holds the key to the situation and controls the trade between the West and the East has now, if we are to judge by the agreement which was laid before a Committee the other day, obtained control of the North Shore, and its interests lie in the direction of not having this ferry established. The Grand Trunk, which controls the North Shore, has an interest, not to have the ferry established, but to compel every person to go by the way of Richmond and Montreal. Their interests are in making all the traffic run over their road as formerly, maintaining the road on the North Shore, not as a means of connection with the Lower Provinces, but as a convenience for freight shipped from Quebec, and as a local road for the Province of Quebec.

What I would like to press upon this House, and the Government, is this: It is the duty of the Government to ascertain, and with as little delay as possible, whether the people who control the North Shore road now, whether the Grand Trunk directly, or a company controlled by the Grand Trunk, which I believe to be the fact, intend to carry out the engagement entered into between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of the Province of Quebec, and contribute a portion of the subsidy for the establishment and maintenance of the ferry at Quebec? This is a matter in which every one in the Maritime Provinces, and also, I believe, a large portion of the western section of the Dominion, are interested; and it is of so much importance that I trust we shall get an assurance from the Minister that steps have been taken to see that this arrangement is carried out, or, at all events, to be in a position, before the House rises, to let the public know that it is not to be carried out.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know whether any estimate has been made of the cost of this ferry and this proposed arrangement; and if so, what the estimate of the cost may be? I would like the hon. Minister, also, to state what the difficulties were to which he referred—whether they are connected with the locality; whether he thinks, having looked at the locality, it is not suitable for a ferry, or whether, simply, it does not look, as the project advances, practicable? I could not very well make out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the success of the project depends on the ice. This has been an exceptionally hard winter; and when I was at Quebec recently, I was sorry to see that the difficulties seemed to be very great in consequence of the presence of the ice; but the expenditure, I think, on the building of the necessary boats for the ferry, the lifts on both sides, wharves and piers necessary, and docks in fact on each side, will, I think, come to about \$250,000. Of course, as to the success of it, at some seasons it might be carried on during the entire season, but during a very hard winter, like the present, there would be more or less obstruction.

Mr. DAVIES. Could a bridge be provided?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A bridge is possible, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, it would cost a large sum of money, and questions might arise in connection with navigation—a variety of things that would make it somewhat difficult.

Mr. LAURIER. The difficulties no doubt are very great, but the preponderance of opinion seems to be that they can be surmounted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know that they are very sanguine respecting the project.

Mr. LAURIER. But I understand that at all events the Government are prepared to make the experiment, and are only awaiting the co-operation of the North Shore Company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; that is the position. We are quite prepared now, as we always were, to bear our proportion of the expense.

83. Cape Traverse Railway, P.E.I. .... \$183,200.00

Mr. DAVIES. I see the hon. gentleman asks for a vote; and this is the same sum which was proposed last year. I would like to ask whether the Government is determined on the termini of that branch. I understood that a memorial was forwarded—I have not had an opportunity of seeing it, or of knowing what was in it—asking for a change. I do not know the nature of it; but I assume, from the fact that the sum is the same, that the Government has determined to keep to the same points as before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that after very careful examination the  
Mr. MITCHELL.

opinion of the Department now is, unless something arises to change it, after all the examination that could be given it, that the Tormentine terminus is the best. The vote was taken for that line before, and it is taken with the expectation of constructing it on that line now, although we are prepared to give the most respectful consideration to the memorial to which reference is made.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand that this vote of \$183,000 is simply for the construction of the road, and not for piers?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; it covers everything on the Prince Edward Island side.

Mr. DAVIES. And is it intended by the hon. gentleman to commence the construction of the piers this year, along with the railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I think so. I think we will go on with the whole work.

Mr. DAVIES. Can the hon. gentleman state when work will probably commence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As soon as the season opens we expect to commence work immediately.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there anything doing on the other side?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; that is in the hands of a private company.

Mr. BLAKE. I know; but is it going on?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is going on.

Mr. BLAKE. As there is a vote on the Prince Edward Island Railway, I presume that the same rule applies to the repairs and the keeping up of the rolling stock on that road, which is observed on the Intercolonial.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and rather a strong confirmation of the accuracy with which we keep the accounts is shown in that particular, whereas we were able to show a small balance in favor of the Intercolonial. We were obliged to admit a largely increased deficiency, and a very serious one, for the length of the road on Prince Edward Island—I think it was \$90,000 during the past year. This account was kept rigorously and precisely in the same way as on the Intercolonial.

84. General—Surveys and Inspections ..... \$10,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Does this apply to Government Railways?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; to all applications made for railway aid, and to everything that the Government feel necessary to employ engineers to examine and report upon, as to proposals made to the Government. This amount covers everything. I may say that it is a nominal amount, and it largely, I think, exceeds the amount expended.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a claim of Mr. Horetzky, who was once employed as an engineer on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and who still believes that he has a valid claim against the Government for not a very large sum, some \$180 I think, as due him on account of wages. His contention is, as the hon. gentleman knows, for he is no doubt familiar with the case, that he should have been paid as much per month as the other engineers who were employed on the same kind of work; that he was not so paid, and that he considers that the Chief Engineer, Sandford Fleming, specially approved of his claim, which the hon. Minister might with very great propriety acknowledge. I have the pleasure of again calling attention to the propriety of considering this claim, which it may be possible for the hon. gentleman yet to entertain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply, although this matter does not exactly belong to the vote before the Committee, that the Minister has no power to pay any person a dollar for any service whatever, except certified to by the Chief Engineer. I told Mr. Horetzky, that whatever amount—for I was not qualified to judge as to the value of professional services rendered—Mr. Fleming would state he was entitled to receive, I would cheerfully pay; and Mr. Fleming, after assuring me of his desire to give the most liberal consideration to Mr. Horetzky's views, said he would not be able to entertain the opinion of Mr. Horetzky, that he was entitled to the same salary as engineers of higher standing; that Mr. Horetzky was an able man, and had great ability as an explorer, but he was not what is technically termed an engineer. Under those circumstances—being assured by the Chief Engineer that the most liberal possible consideration had been given to Mr. Horetzky's claim—it was not in my power, of course, to pay anything beyond that.

Mr. DAWSON. I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals speak so approvingly of Mr. Horetzky's services. I think I may add my testimony to that of the hon. gentleman. Mr. Horetzky was a very able and active engineer indeed, and did some very good work in the North-West, where he was for a very long time employed. I would be very glad, indeed, if it was possible, to consider his case, as he was a very deserving officer while in the service of the country, and I would be glad if the Government will do something for him.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman was speaking on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway the other day, he mentioned that arrangements had been concluded for the transfer of the Thunder Bay Branch to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He subsequently learned, as he stated, that there was some difficulty in the way. As this is a matter of great public interest perhaps the hon. gentleman will state how it stands now?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am happy to say that the difficulty has been removed, and that the road is now transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are making all necessary arrangements for effectively carrying freight upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. On the same terms as the hon. gentleman stated?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the difficulty did not at all affect the relations with the Government, but was entirely between the contractors and the Company.

85. Railway Statistics..... \$1,200.00

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated the difficulty he has found in obtaining these statistics, and it would be interesting to know if he has been able to obtain the information which the Statute requires.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. And has he matters so arranged that there will be no trouble in future?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope, by means of an amendment to the Consolidated Railway Act, of which I have given notice, to bring this matter more under control.

86. To recoup town of Pembroke for change of route..... \$85,250.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What is the rate of interest to be paid on this \$75,000 of debentures mentioned in the Order in Council?

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is 6 per cent.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Yes; it is 6 per cent.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Then there appears to be an error in the calculation of the interest. Six per cent, on

\$75,000 for a year would be only \$4,500, whereas the amount mentioned in the Order in Council puts the interest at \$6,750.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If there is any error it will be carefully looked into, and rectified before the payment is made.

Mr. BLAKE. I notice that another claim made is the sum of \$3,500, balance of indebtedness for right of way. I hope the hon. gentleman will include this in the explanations which I hope he deems it necessary to make with regard to this vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that the return has been brought down, giving very full information, and that the matter has been discussed on a former occasion, when I was not here, and, therefore, I should rather weary the Committee if I were to enter into any lengthy explanations to-day. Suffice it to say that this was a claim made by the town of Pembroke, owing to our having been obliged, in consequence of the settled policy of Canada, to carry the railway in another direction. They were compelled either to go without railway facilities at all, or to incur this indebtedness by taking the responsibility for assisting to carry the road to Pembroke. Subsequently the Government changed their policy, and carried the road from Pembroke, so that those advantages that were given to the town of Pembroke were lost. We had the advantage of carrying the line from Pembroke to Nipissing instead of from a point considerable on this side; and after a careful review of the whole question, which was pressed on the Government with considerable persistence by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), we came to the conclusion that it would only be just to make the provision which is made in this vote, and to give them the advantage of the money they had expended, and which practically we had saved, an expenditure which would not have been involved had not the policy of the Government been changed, and changed after they were enabled to take advantage of the expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the report of the hon. Minister of Railways is dated on the 3rd of April, 1880, and that no action appears to have been taken by Council until the 19th of May, 1882, or more than two years afterwards. Perhaps the hon. Minister would explain how the matter happened to be delayed in Council for more than two years, and how it happened to be taken up just then?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can say is, that my hon. friend the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) brought this matter under my notice; I went into it very carefully, and gave it the closest attention in my power, and, after careful examination, I came to the conclusions which are stated in the report. I came to those conclusions dispassionately from their merits, that the town was entitled to this relief; and having come to that conclusion, I made the report and submitted it to Council. But my colleagues have not had the same opportunity of having this matter brought to their attention as I have, as it belongs to my Department. As the hon. gentleman knows, during that interim I was incapacitated by illness from attending to public duties, and was absent from the country. The hon. gentleman knows that, not only on account of my health, but in connection with the public business, I was in British Columbia and elsewhere, and I suppose in that way the matter was laid over from time to time, as it was thought to be one of those matters which admitted of postponement. Subsequently, however, I was able to satisfy my colleagues that the claim was a just one, which they would be warranted in paying. I can give no other explanation to my hon. friend than that after the length of these two years I was able to bring my colleagues to see the matter in the same light as I did myself.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). This matter was brought up a short time ago on the motion for papers made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and upon that occasion I brought to the attention of the House a fact regarding the hon. gentleman's own action in relation to this matter. I presume that the telegram which the hon. gentleman admits he sent to one of his friends in Pembroke just on the eve of the election was not intended to have any political effect. It is true that the hon. gentleman was suffering from a sort of mid-summer madness at that time; he was laboring under the hallucination that the people would return him to power on the following day; and I am glad to see that the fact that the electors were not with my hon. friend, has not prevented him from taking the same view that he would have taken had the hopes been consummated on the 20th of June, which he entertained on the 19th. I need not take up the time of the Committee in adverting to the arguments which have already been adduced; but I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention, and that of the Committee, to one or two points which have not yet been referred to. Prior to the selection of the route in 1874, or rather prior to the confirmation of the Order in Council fixing the route and providing for the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway, a deputation of leading gentlemen, comprising different members of the Government of Quebec, approached the hon. leader of the Government, the present member for East York, and requested that he would give the subsidy to the first route that would reach a certain point, I think the mouth of the Mattawa River. Mr. Mackenzie having refused to accede to that request, and having declared that his settled policy was to aid the Canada Central Railway, for reasons best known to himself, and which, I suppose, were in the public interest, these gentlemen suggested that instead of locating the terminus at Douglas, as stated in the Order in Council, he should locate it at Pembroke. That would have effected a saving, and would have given Pembroke that railway communication which they were anxious to have, without the granting of this subsidy. The road having been brought to Pembroke in 1876, I contended, in the arguments I presented to the Government, that the Government were enabled, through the enterprise of the people of the town of Pembroke, to effect a large saving of public money, a saving which was represented by the construction of twenty miles of railway. The subsidy from the town of Pembroke brought the railway to a point twenty miles farther west than the point it would have reached by the subsidy granted by the Order in Council in 1874. I contend, and I think it would be agreed by every right thinking man, that that advantage to the country was obtained by the sacrifice of the local interests of the town of Pembroke. I do not think there is a single member of this House, who understands anything of commercial matters, who will not admit that to carry a road past a town, making it a way station instead of a terminus, deprives it of very great advantages. My hon. friend draws attention to the fact that the town of Pembroke spent \$25,000 in securing the right of way and other advantages for the Canada Central Railway over and above the bonds issued by that company, which it purchased; and he asks the hon. Minister of Railways why that sum of \$25,000 was not given to the town of Pembroke instead of the \$3,500 mentioned in the return. If the hon. gentleman will look at the petition of the town of Pembroke, he will see that it alleges that while it has given advantages to the Canada Central Railway equivalent to \$25,000, it only asks the Government to recoup \$3,500 which it paid out in cash to secure the right of way, in addition to the \$75,000 for the bonds. The hon. gentleman took exception to the repayment of the interest.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the hon. member for West Middlesex who took exception to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps the hon. member for West Middlesex does not reflect the opinion of the Opposition, but as he is the second aspirant to the position of Finance Minister, when the hon. gentleman, fifty-five years hence, comes into power, perhaps his objection to this particular item may be taken as the opinion of that side of the House. If the hon. gentleman looks at the petition he will find that the town asks to be relieved from the payment of principal and interest. The Order in Council was passed in May, 1882; a payment of interest of \$2,250 was made on 1st July, 1882; another payment of \$2,250 was made on the 1st of January, 1883, and a further sum of \$2,250 will be due and payable on 1st July, next; and it is in that way that the charge of \$6,750 is made up. It is claimed that the interest paid by the town of Pembroke from the passage of the Order in Council should be recouped to them; and looking at the whole question—at the fact that it was by the action of Parliament that the town of Pembroke was compelled to grant this large subsidy, a subsidy which required it to strain every nerve; at the fact that by that subsidy the town induced the Canada Central Railway Company to bring the line to Pembroke; and at the fact that by that action of the town of Pembroke the Government were enabled to save so large a sum of money as was stated by the leader of the Government in 1878—I think every fair-minded man will admit that the Government have only done tardy justice to the town of Pembroke by asking Parliament to grant this sum.

Mr. BLAKE. Upon the question of interest the hon. member for West Middlesex very properly pointed out that the statement of the Administration as to what they proposed to pay was for one year's interest, while the grant is for a year and a-half. For my part, so far am I from taking the view that that is a correct provision, I hold this view: That if the town of Pembroke is entitled to relief, it ought to be relieved from the period at which the difficulty took place—from the period at which it was placed in that practical situation of loss, which the hon. gentleman says entitles it to relief at all. If at a particular point of time the town of Pembroke was turned from a terminal into a way station, and from that you are to date their loss and deprivation of benefits, it is from that time the recoupment should take place. That is, in my opinion, the true mode of carrying out the principle referred to. But the hon. gentleman takes another view. He says that the interest is for one year and offers one year and a-half interest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that is a clerical error.

Mr. BLAKE. All that my hon. friend from Middlesex pointed out was that there was an error.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Undoubtedly there is.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister has given us diplomatic reasons for the delay which took place between the period at which this recommendation of his was made and the action of the Government. He has said the only answer he can give is that he was absent, ill, that his colleagues had to be persuaded—and one thing or another of that kind. The diplomatic answers of the hon. gentleman reminded me a good deal of that diplomatic vagueness of his right hon. leader when I asked him a question—concerning no doubt the hon. Minister himself—with reference to the gentleman who was to succeed Sir Alexander Galt. In fact, I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways in having given this specimen of his qualifications for the post of ambassador. He has, however, in this instance, not exhibited proof of having full possession of a faculty very essential to persons who are to occupy the position of ambassador—that is a good memory. Because,



as the hon. gentleman has said, he had made up his mind and satisfied himself that the town of Pembroke was entitled to this relief, and having, after a careful and exhaustive examination of the subject, come to that conclusion, he felt it to be his duty to state so to Council, and to recommend that it should obtain relief, and he refers to the report as evidencing that. But the report evidences nothing of the kind. His memorandum is simply a summary of the claims of the town of Pembroke, and contains not a single expression of opinion on his part as to the justice of the claim, or a single recommendation to the Council as to the propriety of granting the claim. It is a simple statement of the facts as set up by the town of Pembroke, without a single attempt on his part to give an expression of his own opinion. That is the way the matter was represented to Council in April, 1880, after having come at that time and so long before to the settled conclusion that the town was entitled to relief, and feeling, as he said he did, that it was his duty to say so. If that is the hon. gentleman's way of expressing a strong opinion, I would recommend him to alter his mode. If he will take this Minute and read it from end to end—and it is quite long enough to embrace any expression of opinion, comprising two full pages of a printed return—he will not find in the two full pages the least clue to his own views, or the least recommendation of any kind to his colleagues. If there came a time when the hon. gentleman was convinced of the necessity of giving the relief, it was evidently not this time. But now we find there is an error there, because if he had been convinced he would have said so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We do not always say all we feel.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not always say what he feels. Perhaps he says sometimes what he does not feel; or, however it may be, he exercised a judicious reticence, and this question was kept in abeyance by the hon. Minister of Railways, who had settled the matter in his own mind, long before, for he did not express an opinion until the 19th May, 1880, and then he expressed it verbally, I presume, and succeeded in inducing his colleagues to pass an Order in Council on the matter. If the matter could have stood over for two years from 1880, and had to stand until the next Session of Parliament, before the money could be paid to the town of Pembroke, why was it attended to at that particular moment? What was the necessity of passing an Order in Council then, pledging the Government to bring down the Estimates the following Session? Why was that which was pressed long before 1880, and placed before Council on the 10th April, 1880, allowed to stand over till the 19th May, 1882? It could not then be dealt with so as to give relief to the town of Pembroke, because the vote had to be taken before such relief could be given. The only reason that can be given was that it was intended to aid the election of the Conservative candidate for Renfrew. At that time, and for that purpose, the recommendation was made, and the public papers informed us of it at the time, though the paper was not yet brought down, that the justice of the claim was recognized; and after the long delays that had ensued in this case one would have supposed he would have used the ordinary means of communicating the decision, but instead he sent, by telegraph, to somebody, the interesting information that the Government had passed an Order in Council recognizing the claim, and declaring their intention to submit a vote for it in the Estimates at the next Session. The hon. member for Renfrew says: "Oh, but Mr. Blake sent a telegram." So he did, and why should he not. I have not proof that the hon. member for Renfrew said anything on the subject; but it has been stated to me that his partisans—and I have seen it stated in the newspapers of the county—made use

of this vote. It was pointed out that the people of Pembroke should return the hon. gentleman in order to secure this amount which this Government had been so gracious as to pass by this Order in Council. That was pointed out in the newspapers, and also at public meetings, as I have been informed by those who know and say they heard the statements. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with having pointed it out, as no doubt he is too modest to do so. Probably, like the hon. Minister of Railways, he does not say what he feels, but he allowed it to be implied that this relief would be given. That was all. There are two ways in which a use is made of a procedure of this kind in an election. The first is to show what an excellent Government this is which has at length become alive to the misfortunes of this town, and which is prepared, if sustained in power, to give the required relief the next Session. And see what an excellent man this is who has, by his persistency, as the hon. Minister of Railways says, secured for you this boon. Let gratitude to the Government and the hon. member influence your votes. For it must be remembered that a Government, however charitable, however generous, however kindly disposed, has human feelings, and its feelings may be cooled and chilled if these generous motives which, at such a time, have induced it to come to this conclusion do not receive the proper reward. If, as has been said in respect to other grants, the people of Pembroke do not show themselves grateful, who knows but that these gentlemen, being human, and feeling themselves repelled by any want of confidence shown in them, may say: "Oh, well, we understand the people of Pembroke do not want this thing." Therefore the feelings of gratitude on the one hand, and of apprehension on the other, were powerful elements in inducing the people of Pembroke to support the candidature of the hon. member for Renfrew. There is another mode that was adopted, as I was informed. I received a communication on the eve of the Election, as the hon. gentleman says, not merely that all this was being done, but that it was being industriously circulated that I was opposed to this claim of the town of Pembroke, and that being opposed to it, if my friend and the candidate who was in the interest of the Liberal party were returned to power, that claim would be refused, and I was asked to say that I was in favor of the claim. Now, Sir, I should have been very glad to say I was in favor of the claim if I honestly, and with justice, and upon my information, could have said so. It would have been a very important thing, no doubt, in view of this canvass that was made, and to which I have referred, if I could have been able to say so. But I knew nothing of the merits of this claim one way or the other, I was not acquainted with the facts, I had not received the hon. member's memorandum, or the petition of the town of Pembroke, or the Minister's report, or the Order in Council—I did not know the rights or the wrongs of the matter; but it being stated to me that it was reported in the town of Pembroke that I was opposed to the claim, I felt that, not merely with propriety I could, but that also in justice I was bound to point out what my attitude would be, and I did state simply that which I believed was a proper and honest statement to make. I stated plainly that I was not acquainted with the details of this Order in Council, and, therefore, could not express an opinion upon it, but that I was prepared to do justice to the town of Pembroke. Upon that my correspondent immediately contradicted all reports to the contrary, referring distinctly to these hostile reports which, without any authority, had been circulated—I do not say by that hon. member, for I have no right to say that of him—in his interest, to the effect that I was opposed to this claim upon the merits of which I could not express an opinion. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman thinks there was anything wrong, that it was improper, that it contained more than I ought to have

stated, what else, I would like him to say, could I have stated under the circumstances? I would like any hon. member of the Committee to say what else I ought to have done under the circumstances. I was already being asked to say more, which would have been highly important and might have affected a vote, but I declined to say more, because, as a public man, I felt I could not commit myself to the support of the claim of the town of Pembroke without knowledge as to its merits. And so I simply repelled the unjust, the unfounded, the improper election story that I had expressed myself as hostile to that claim, that I would not be just to the town of Pembroke, no matter what the result might be. And I take the same attitude on this subject to-day, as I do on all subjects, no matter on what side of the House I may be, or whether I am in a minority or a majority. My desire—I fail often, I dare say, to accomplish that desire—is to find out what is just and right, and having found it, to do it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am very sorry to find the hon. gentleman has admitted, to-day, that he does not give to the proceedings of this Parliament that great care and attention which I had always believed he did give to them. If that hon. gentleman had taxed his memory somewhat he would have remembered that a return very similar to the one which he moved for this year was brought down and laid on the Table of the House last year.

Mr. BLAKE. I never saw it, nor heard of it.

Mr. WHITE. That proves what I have just said. If he had taken pains to inform himself of the contents of that return, he would have been in a position to know just as much as he does to-day of the merits of this claim. He would have been in a position to say to his friends in Pembroke: I am either ready to support your claim, or I am not. But he chose to take another course; he chose to adopt that diplomatic manner for which he is so justly celebrated. He has given credit to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways for being a diplomatist; and I think any one who reads this precious telegram must come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman, whilst not committing himself to anything, did intend that this telegram should have an effect on the electors of the town of Pembroke. Sir, he must have intended it, although, as I stated a short time ago, I was willing to admit that perhaps he did not; yet I think from the statements he has just made that he did intend this telegram should have some effect on the electors. It did not have that effect, and the Government propose now, as I think in justice they ought to propose, to grant the claim to the town of Pembroke; and I think the hon. gentleman himself must, if he had got into office, and if he had given that consideration to the claim which it deserves—he must have come to the conclusion that the town was entitled to the relief that it is now to receive at the hands of this Government, and if he had denied them that relief he would not have been doing them justice.

87. Lachine Canal..... \$530,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure on the Lachine Canal up to the 30th June was \$5,704,769. The vote for 1883-84 is \$530,000, and there is required to complete the work to twelve feet in the canal basin and fourteen feet on the mitre sills, \$213,000. That practically completes it to twelve feet; that is to say, irrespective of the second deep-water basin at Point St. Charles, which is not expected to be required for some years, and which is estimated to cost \$600,000, and providing for the two additional basins. This vote will practically complete it, leaving only a nominal sum. It is expected to be completed during the next financial year.

Mr. BLAKE. And with that deep water-basin it will be about \$9,000,000 altogether?

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but that is not expected to be required for some years.

Mr. DE BEAUJEU (Translation). Mr. Speaker: I cannot let this item pass without making a few remarks, not for the purpose of blaming the Government, but to congratulate it and at the same time express the hope that it will not stop in the work of improving our canals, but that next year it will place in the Budget a much larger appropriation in order that travel by our canals may increase and that commerce may thereby be facilitated. It is unnecessary for me to recall all the sacrifices which the several Provinces of Confederation and this House, have made to facilitate our travel by railways. The fact is that we can say with pride that there is no country of our age, which possesses so many railroads as ours, and I do not think I would be going too far in saying that we possess as many miles of railroads as all Europe. But all the money which has been expended by the several Provinces has been given to railroad companies purely and simply without receiving any direct interest from them for the State. The railways which have been benefitted by the subsidies given by this House, have nothing in the shape of money to show, except the Intercolonial Railway which this year yields a surplus for the Government instead of deficits as in past years. It is not the same, Mr. Speaker, with the Canals, and to-day, as according to the very eloquent address of the Minister of Finance, the Treasury has a considerable surplus. I think, Mr. Speaker, I am only speaking the sentiments of all the members of this House, in saying that the Government could not better employ this surplus, than in improving our water communication which not only pays more than an ordinary interest to the Government on the amount expended for their improvement, but moreover their navigation affords transportation at much lower rates, and consequently is advantageous to buyers and sellers. As proof of what I say, Mr. Speaker, concerning the advantages which the Government derives from the St. Lawrence Canals, the following tables taken from the official reports, show the traffic and the receipts from the St. Lawrence Canals, for the years 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882:—

1878.				
	Passengers.	Tons.	Tons.	Tolls.
Tonnage of vessels and steamers .....		1,793,267		\$14,921 48
Passengers carried .....	59,439			2,812 42
Products of the Forest .....			173,756	6,991 83
Animals .....			2,103	154 59
Agricultural products .....			230,951	27,600 27
Manufactured products .....			62,374	8,250 56
Merchandise .....			68,678	7,521 23
			537,862	68,162 38
1879.				
	Vessels.	Tons Up and Down.	Tolls.	
Canadian vessels and steamers .....	8,351			
Tonnage of do .....		988,426		
do do .....		690,085		
		1,678,511		\$13,810 09
American steamers and vessels .....	1,614			
Tonnage of do .....		79,553		
do do .....		34,203		
		113,756		\$1,111 39
		1,792,267		14,921 48
1879.				
	Passengers.	Tons.	Tons.	Tolls.
Tonnage of vessels and steamers .....		1,729,616		\$14,155 19
Passengers transported .....	69,648			3,171 41
Products of the Forest .....			129,083	4,035 19
Animals .....			2,334	166 01
Agricultural products .....			203,016	23,743 23
Manufactures .....			58,558	8,032 40
Merchandise .....			96,645	12,471 66
			489,636	\$65,775 06

1879.			
	Vessels.	Tons Up and Down.	Tolls.
Canadian vessels and steamers .....	8,038		
Tonnage of do .....		940,404	
do do .....		678,156	
		1,618,560	\$13,665 65
American vessels and steamers .....	1,266		
Freight transported by American vessels and steamers .....		73,691	
do do .....		37,365	\$1,089 54
		111,056	\$14,155 19
		1,729,616	

1880.			
	Passengers.	Tons.	Tolls.
Tonnage of vessels and steamers .....	1,920,312		16,731 16
Passengers transported .....	71,716		3,322 63
Products of the Forest .....		145,510	5,439 43
Animals .....		2,666	197 26
Agricultural products .....		227,562	25,836 11
Manufactures .....		80,591	11,052 41
Merchandise .....		114,489	14,619 14
		570,818	\$77,179 14

	Vessels.	Tons Up and Down.	Tolls.
Canadian steamers and vessels.....	9,438		
Tonnage of do do .....		1,045,028	
do do do .....		760,277	
		1,805,305	\$15,655 87
American vessels and steamers.....		81,179	
Tonnage of do do .....		33,878	
		115,007	\$1,076 29
		1,920,312	\$16,732 16

1881.			
	Passengers.	Tons.	Tolls.
Tonnage of vessels and steamers .....	1,997,432		\$18,152 24
Passengers transported.....	77,754		3,630 37
Products of the Forest .....		154,848	6,837 49
Animals transported.....		2,679	199 83
Agricultural products.....		270,650	31,479 21
Manufactures .....		90,334	13,237 13
Merchandise .....		140,613	17,601 87
		659,125	\$91,138 14

	Vessels.	Tons Up and Down.	Tolls.
Canadian steamers and vessels....	9,516		
Tonnage .....		1,096,791	
do .....		777,367	
		1,874,367	\$16,901 77
American steamers and vessels....	1,457		
Freight transported by American steamers and vessels .....		87,250	
do do .....		36,024	
		123,274	\$1,187 52
		1,997,432	\$18,252 25

1882.			
	Passengers.	Tons.	Tolls.
Tonnage of vessels and steamers .....	1,936,896		\$15,800 31
Passengers transported.....	75,221		4,039 11
Products of the Forest.....		160,303	7,050 79
Animals .....		2,379	177 84
Agricultural products.....		248,632	25,382 36
Manufactures .....		95,720	13,733 72
Merchandise.....		170,416	21,644 47
		677,450	\$87,823 60

1882.			
	Vessels.	Tons Up and Down.	Tolls.
Canadian vessels and steamers....	9,083		
Tonnage of do .....		1,055,887	
do do .....		747,376	
		1,803,376	\$14,515 43
American vessels and steamers....	1,521		
Tonnage of do .....		90,276	
do do .....		43,244	
		133,520	\$1,284 88
		1,936,896	\$15,800 31

As to what I said, Mr. Speaker, relative to buyers and sellers, benefiting more advantageously by water communication than by railways, I think I can satisfy you and this clause of it. If we look at the official reports we find the accuracy of what I stated. By a summary which I made and which with your permission I will read to the House, we observe that in 1878, there passed through the St. Lawrence Canals, 537,862 tons of freight; in 1879, 489,636; in 1880, 570,818; in 1881, 659,125; in 1882, 677,450; making a total of 2,934,597 tons. We observe also that in the same time, that is to say, from 1878 to 1882, 352,778 passengers passed through the St. Lawrence Canals. I regret that I had not time to prepare a similar table showing the amount of freight and the number of passengers by railroads at the same dates and during the same lapse of time, because, Mr. Speaker, you would have perceived the immense difference in favor of the canals, and I can make these statements from my observation of these reports. The matter which I forgot to bring under the attention of the House or rather which I did not resume when I gave a few moments ago, the statements from 1878 to 1882, is the amount of dues which the Government received from the traffic on the canals, from June 1878 to June 1882, which dues amounted in 1878 to \$68,162.38; in 1879, to \$65,775.60; in 1880, \$77,159.14; in 1881, to \$91,138.14, and in 1882, to \$87,828.00, making a total of \$390,063.32. The dues collected on the tonnage of vessels during the same period of time was \$79,761.38. One thing, Mr. Speaker, which must not be overlooked, is that the St. Lawrence Canals would give much larger returns if we had direct commerce with the west, and if foreign vessels could enter them; for by the official reports we see, that from 1878, to 1882, 44,426 Canadian vessels passed through our canals, and only 7,221 foreign vessels, that is to say, only about one-sixth. I will venture to show to this honorable House, that there has been during the last ten years an increase of traffic, and that there has also been a considerable increase in the number of passengers. In 1778, the number was only 59,439; in 1882, it was 75,221, and if the traffic increases the revenues increase also. I presume to hope, as I said at the beginning, that the Government will continue to give a greater depth to the canals, and that they will not confine their attention to the working of Lachine and Cornwall Canals. They will, I trust, remember that navigation between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis is interrupted by the Cascade, Cedar, and Coteau Rapids, and that consequently a canal of the same depth as that of the Lachine and Cornwall is required. Although, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to detain you any longer in discussing the question of the construction of a canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in the county of Soulanges, in the precisely mentioned places, in as much as it cannot have any practical result, as no appropriation can be made this year for such an undertaking; nevertheless I wish to invite the attention of the House, and that of the Government to the fact, that according to surveys made by several engineers, the north shore of the St. Lawrence has always been recommended as being the most favorable locality for the construction of the canal. As far back as 1834, Mr. Mills made a report favorable to the construction

of a canal on the north shore. In 1839, Colonel Philpott made a report favorable to the construction of a canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, in a military point of view, and quite recently, in 1873 and 1874, surveys under the direction of Mr. Baillaigé, the present Deputy Minister of Public Works, whose talents are so well known; and although these reports have not been submitted to the House, they are not less advantageous and favorable to the construction of a canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. I venture to hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will carefully examine this question, and will soon place in the Estimates, a sum sufficient for the construction of a canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, because the construction of a canal on that side, would be an advantage in a military point of view, and would meet the general approval of mercantile men and of those engaged in navigation.

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

**After Recess.**

88. Cornwall Canal.....\$230,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, before we pass to that item, I desire to say a few words in respect to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. De Beaujeu), who has evidently taken great interest in this matter. When the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals in the manner proposed is entered upon, a very large expenditure will be required to be made on what are termed the Beauharnois canals. A good deal of doubt had existed as to the best place where that work could be constructed, and a good deal of controversy has taken place on points in respect to the two sides of the river, into the merits of one of which the hon gentleman who addressed the House before Recess entered very fully. Surveys have been made and plans are being gradually perfected. They would have been pressed more rapidly, and brought to a conclusion at an earlier period, provided it had been intended to proceed this season with the deepening of that section of the St. Lawrence canals; but it is not proposed this year to engage in that very serious undertaking, because the expenditure on that section will amount to something like \$3,200,000 in order to obtain twelve feet of water with fourteen feet on the mitre sills, and an additional \$450,000 to give us fourteen feet depth of water, as is contemplated to be attained ultimately from Lake Erie through to Montreal. As my hon. friend will see, it is not intended to propose a vote during the present Session for this section of the work, involving, as I have pointed out, a very great expenditure; in the meantime, the plans will be perfected, and at a future Session the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, whoever may be occupying that position, will be able to submit the whole case with the judgment of the Chief Engineer of Canals in relation to this subject. It is a very important one, and one which has engaged, and will engage, the most careful attention of the Government. I may add that it is quite obvious that while the county of Soulanges has the advantage of possessing so able and energetic a representative in this House, no Government, whoever may occupy the Treasury benches, is likely to be able to lose sight for a moment of the important interests of that section of the country. With respect to the vote for the Cornwall Canal now under consideration, I may say that it is proposed to expend this money to meet the final estimates on section one. The Committee is aware that a large expenditure was made on a section of the Cornwall Canal in order to obtain fourteen feet of water on the mitre, sills and twelve feet navigation, and this appropriation of \$30,000 will complete the works that have been in progress and which were undertaken by my predecessor. \$200,000 is asked for the

Mr. DE BEAUJEU.

enlargement of the entrance to the locks at the upper end of the canal. In order to provide for the ultimate deepening of the St. Lawrence canals it is proposed that this entrance shall be of the same character as similar works undertaken by my predecessor. The total expenditure on the Cornwall canal works up to 31st last December, was \$562,020, and the estimated expenditure up to 1st July will be \$13,701 more, making a total of \$575,721. The bulk of the work covered by the vote now before the House is for new work.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the total cost, when completed, will be about \$9,010,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

89. Williamsburg Canal—For the construction of an entrance and lock at head of Rapide Plat Canal.....\$100,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote of \$100,000 is to be expended towards the construction of a lock at the Rapide Plat River, and the total cost is estimated at \$200,000. If I remember aright, I took a vote last year for this service of \$40,000; and the Committee will recollect, I dare say, that on that occasion I stated that the depth of water was less at this point than on any other portion of the St. Lawrence Canals from one end to the other; and that it was hoped that by a comparatively small expenditure we could secure an additional depth of water to improve navigation at this point, which was the ruling point on the canals. When, however, we came to look into the matter, and to prepare plans for the construction of the work, the Chief Engineer arrived at the conclusion that the expenditure of \$40,000 would really not accomplish the work in the way in which it was desirable that it should be accomplished. It was open to the further objection that this expenditure would not be \$40,000, as in the case of the Cornwall Canal, towards the enlargement, when we ultimately carried out the whole system; and he arrived at the conclusion that it would be much wiser not to expend the amount voted—and no portion of it was expended—but to ask Parliament to increase the expenditure to \$200,000, in order to make it really effective for the purpose for which it was intended, and to provide that all the work thus done should be work which, when the canals were ultimately enlarged, would all be available for the purpose. I think the Committee will agree with me that it was a wise decision on the part of the Government to abandon the immediate opportunity, and to deal with this in a way in which, I am satisfied, will be, in the end, much more economical and satisfactory. All this work will be so much work towards the completion of the system of deepening the canal to twelve feet navigation, and to fourteen feet on the mitre sills.

Mr. BLAKE. What depth of water will be given at this point?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Fourteen feet on the mitre sills. The lock will be constructed precisely as are all the other locks, for the improvement of navigation and the enlargement of the canals.

90. St. Lawrence River and Canals.....\$150,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is required to meet the expenditure towards improving the channel through the Galops Rapids. To complete the works under contract will cost about \$240,000, in addition to the sum now asked, and this will complete a channel 300 feet wide, adapted to fourteen feet navigation. As the Committee are aware, this is a work which has been going on with a chain tug and submarine blasting to obtain a depth of fourteen feet in that section. Of this \$150,000, \$102,000 is a revote, remaining from the \$154,000 taken last year. It is estimated that the probable cost of enlarging the Williamsburg canals to a draught of twelve feet on the lock

sills, with locks 70 x 45, the canal to be eighty feet wide and one foot deeper than the top of the lock sills, and so arranged as to give two feet more on the lock sills when required—will be \$2,110,000; Farran's Point Canal, \$320,000; Rapide Plat Canal, \$820,000, and the Galops Rapids Canal, \$970,000, making a total for twelve feet, of \$2,110,000.

Mr. BLAKE. This vote is entirely for the Galops Rapids?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And this work will cost \$970,000 in all when completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and the ultimate depth of fifteen feet would cost an additional \$400,000.

Mr. BLAKE. At the Galops?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Through the whole of the Williamsburg Canals.

91. Murray Canal..... \$350,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is estimated that an additional amount of \$825,000 will be required to complete this work, in addition to the vote of \$350,000 now asked.

Mr. BLAKE. That will make \$1,175,000 altogether.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. This canal, of course, connects the Bay of Quinté with Lake Ontario, avoiding a dangerous and exposed route. Presqu'Isle harbor is selected as the terminus on the lake; and as the Committee will remember, although I believe that the point was not definitely settled when the Estimates were carried through last Session, I stated to the Committee I believed, on the part of the Government, that this route would be undoubtedly selected. This canal is to be without locks, is to be eighty feet wide at the bottom, eleven feet deep at the lowest known water level of Lake Ontario, and six and one-eighth miles long. The appropriation for 1882-83 was \$200,000; the amount brought from 1881-82 was \$1,163; and this makes a total available for 1882-83 of \$201,163. The total expenditure from July 1st to December 31st last, was \$50,328; and it is expected that there will be expended by the 1st day of July next, \$40,834, or in all during the present year, \$91,163. There is a revote asked of \$110,000; in all required for 1883-84, \$350,000. The amount of the accepted tender was \$1,440,625. The superstructure of road and railway bridges are estimated at \$25,000; land damages, \$10,000; superintendence and contingencies, \$75,000, or a total of \$1,260,625.

Mr. PLATT. I would like the hon. gentleman to give me some information as to the contract—whether the amount which is paid by the cubic feet applies merely to the actual amount of the excavation for the canal, or to the quantity which it may be necessary to excavate owing to the floatable sand?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If there is floatable material they will only be required to make the canal a certain size, and they will only be paid for taking out the amount required to give that size. If more is required to be taken out to accomplish that, I am afraid the contractor will have to do it himself.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the time in which the contract is to be completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. July, 1885.

Mr. PLATT. I would like the hon. Minister to give us some idea of the consideration upon which the Government decided in favor of Presqu'Isle route as against Weller's Bay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject was discussed at very great length when the hon. gentleman's predecessor was in this House, upon the fullest information that could

be laid before it. The Government, after a careful enquiry into all the facts, and after obtaining all possible information, not only from their own engineers, but from seafaring men accustomed to navigate the waters in that section, decided in favor of the Presqu'Isle route. As the hon. gentleman knows his predecessor entertained very strong views in favor of another route, and though he was a very strong supporter of the Government, and brought every possible influence in favor of his views, his influence was overborne by what the Government regarded as facts which in their judgment were in favor of Presqu'Isle.

92. Welland Canal..... \$600,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of this sum \$33,000 is a revote, there having been paid last year an equal sum to that which is now passed, less the sum of \$5,000, which is now revoted. It is estimated that an additional amount of \$750,000 will be required to complete this work, to be expended as follows: Section 27 of the aqueduct, \$25,000; section 34, \$75,000; land and contingencies, \$175,000.

93. Construction of a raceway between the feeder and Chippewa River, Welland Canal..... \$24,500.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to complete the work, the balance of which will be \$31,000.

94. Trent River navigation—For construction of locks and the improvement of navigation between Lakefield and Balsam Lake..... \$246,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This work was entered upon last year. This vote is to be expended towards the formation of the several canals at Burleigh, Buckhorn, Fenelon Falls and Campbell's Point. The estimated cost of the whole work is \$391,007; an additional sum of \$101,000 will be required to complete it. The expenditure up to the 31st of December last was \$9,175, and it is estimated that we shall also expend \$34,824 by the 1st of July next, or \$44,000 in all.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state at what time he expects these works to be completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The dates for the completion of the contracts are—for Fenelon Falls, July 1st, 1885; for Buckhorn Canal, September 1st, 1884; for the Burleigh Canal, July 1st, 1885.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the depth of the water?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Five feet.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any progress been made in the way of investigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the survey is going on. I am asking a specific vote for that. We expect to complete it this year.

95. Ste. Anne Canal..... \$288,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote will complete the work under contract, that is, the lock 200 feet by forty-five feet, with a depth of nine feet of water on the sills, and with approaches above and below the lock, and also the deepening of the channel above the lock.

96. Carillon—Canal, Dam and Slide..... \$260,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is divided as follows:—To complete the canal and dam, \$82,000; and to form an entrance to the channel above the lock, \$178,000. It has been found, since the dam was constructed, that it will be necessary to make this expenditure for an entrance to the channel above the lock, in order to increase the safety of the transmission of boats and rafts. The total expenditure to the 31st December last was \$998,398.90, and there has been comparatively little done since. This vote will complete the work.

97. Grenville Canal..... \$241,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This amount is required to complete the works at the upper entrance, and the two locks at the lower entrance, and to settle two old claims by the contractor, Mr. Goodwin. The total expenditure on this work to the 1st of July next is expected to be \$2,123,984.

98. Tay Canal—For construction of works..... \$75,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is required to meet the necessary expenditure for connecting the town of Perth with the Rideau navigation. The total estimated cost is \$240,000, for two locks 126 feet by twenty-six feet wide with five feet of water and a bottom width of channel of thirty feet.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it under contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; for this reason: Tenders were invited, but the lowest tender was larger than the estimated cost, and consequently I did not think proper to accept it until this vote should pass the House. The estimate I gave was not very much less, taking everything into consideration. It was supposed some of these works would not be quite so extensive as they were. I estimated the cost at \$150,000, and the lowest tender was \$186,000. Therefore, although the margin was not very great, I thought it more deferential to the House to wait until the vote would be passed, before accepting the lowest tender.

Mr. BLAKE. But the total expense is \$240,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, the changes made are estimated at \$55,556.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the extent of the navigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Five miles. My hon. friend from North Lanark may be able to supply more accurate information of the locality than I can.

Mr. HAGGART. The canal is to supplant the canal which has been in existence for nearly thirty or forty years. The intention of the Imperial Government was at first to build a canal from the Rideau Lake to the town of Perth. It was undertaken by private enterprise, and a canal was built from there to the town of Perth. This is to make navigable the Tay River, which most hon. gentlemen know in this section of the country is the feeder of the whole Rideau Canal from there down to the Ottawa. It supplies the mills along the whole line of the Rideau down to New Edinburgh with water. It is a work of great necessity to that section of the country, and has been built by the private enterprise of the people of the town themselves. They were unable to build anything but wooden locks. It is the first work the county of Lanark has ever asked for, and as the canals through all the other portions of Ontario were built by the Dominion Government they thought the Dominion Government should build this.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it expected that any water power will be created by this canal available for milling purposes?

Mr. HAGGART. No; the canal diverges off from the main river and escapes the water powers altogether which are on the line of the old canal, and the canal empties into the Rideau Lake by the two locks which are being constructed.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the probable extent of the traffic?

Mr. HAGGART. There is the traffic of the town of Perth and smelting works will be erected there which require this canal. In the back section of the country, as we all know, there are the largest deposits of iron ore in Canada, as well as of phosphates of lime. It will also enable freights to be cheapened in the bringing in of coal for the purpose of smelting iron and for other works intended in that section.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

100. Construction of a swing bridge at Valleyfield.... \$8,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the Beauharnois Canal on which it is found necessary to erect a new swing bridge. When this vote was taken last year I explained the grounds on which it was asked, and the only change is a change of site for the bridge.

101. Construction of a drain between the town of Cornwall and the Canal ..... \$20,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The construction of the canal at Cornwall cut off the means of drainage of the town, and it was agreed at the time that a drain should be provided by the canal. A vote was taken last year for this service of \$10,000, but it was found that the culvert under the canal was not sufficient for carrying the drain in that direction, and to drain the whole locality. The town itself has suffered very severely from the absence of means of efficient drainage, and strong representations were made to the Government. I had the matter carefully examined by the Chief Engineer of Canals, and he reported it would be wiser to carry the drain in another direction, at a cost of \$20,000, and make it thoroughly efficient, so as to remove all cause of complaint or damage on the part of the rapidly-growing town of Cornwall. Consequently, that \$10,000 was not expended, and I am asking the House to increase it to \$20,000 this year, so as to make this work thoroughly efficient. This sum will carry the drain past the entire town and outside of it, at the mouth of the canal, so as to dispose of the entire question. It completes the whole drainage and carries out the whole sewage.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the town of Cornwall contribute anything towards the construction of the drain?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; the original agreement was, that drainage should be provided. The town had convenient access to the river, and it was a very simple matter to carry the drainage into the river. The construction of the canal entirely cut off that drainage, and we now propose to remedy the difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems entirely reasonable.

102. Welland Canal—Cleaning out back ditches ... \$6,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These ditches which were cut alongside the canal to carry off the adjacent water, have become filled up, to the detriment of the neighboring lands, which have in consequence been flooded.

103. Burlington Canal—Renewal of piers..... \$13,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$4,000 is a revote. We took a vote of \$11,000 last year, and we find this will be required to complete the work. It is for the renewal of the east end of the south pier, and replanking parts of the north pier, and to put up cap pieces.

104. Survey of Trent Valley navigation..... \$3,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I called upon the Chief Engineer to give me a progress report, but he stated that he was not in a position to do so up to the present time. The survey has been steadily prosecuted. It covers an immense range of country, and there are a great many very nice and difficult questions to be solved in the selection of the most feasible route out of the different routes that present themselves. The facts have all been collected, but Mr. Page did not feel himself warranted, with the attention he had been able to give to it and the information before him, to give a progress report. We expect this \$3,000 will complete the work, and to be able at the next Session of Parliament to lay before the House a report upon the whole scheme.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman at present able to give any information as to whether greater difficulties have

presented themselves than were supposed, or whether the difficulties have diminished on enquiry? In point of fact, I suppose there are so many routes, he is not able to choose between them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is so; but I am glad to be able to say that the result of these careful surveys have been very greatly to decrease the difficulties and the cost of the work.

106 Chambly Canal—Raising banks, lowering bottom of canal, rebuilding lock walls, &c..... \$34,100.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I stated to the Committee last, it was found that considerable expenditure would be required in this connection. It is in a very dilapidated condition. Last year the House voted \$31,000, but that sum was not expended, and this year it is found that we shall require an additional sum to complete the improvements that were begun in 1881. The principal items are, the rebuilding of two chamber walls of a guard lock, the extension and enlargement of a wharf on the west side of the canal, the rebuilding of the wing walls of locks three and six, and also seven months of dredging.

107. Rideau Canal—Building new office for Toll Collector, Ottawa ..... \$3,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The \$1,200 were taken last year for building a new office for the toll collector at Ottawa. It is now found that the amount of \$3,000 will be required for repairs. The construction of a building was postponed so as to have a sufficient amount to erect a proper building, which would compare favorably with the surroundings, to be used also as night quarters for the lock men.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems the gross revenue there is about \$6,000, while the cost of the staff and maintenance is about \$37,000. In view of the proposition that we should expend \$3,000 for a toll-house when the tolls amount to only \$6,000 as against an expenditure for staff and maintenance of \$37,000, I should think the surroundings, which the hon. gentleman should consider, were the surroundings I have just mentioned rather than architectural surroundings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman would not like to have a shed put up that would throw discredit on the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be disposed to drop the tolls altogether if it is necessary to put up a house to cost \$3,000, when the tolls collected amount to only about \$6,000.

205. Repairs and working expenses—Intercolonial Railway, ..... \$2,500,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is the same as the amount expended last year. We asked for \$1,900,000, and we were obliged to obtain, in the Supplementary Estimates, an additional amount of \$600,000, bringing the amount to \$2,500,000, being the sum now asked for, in order to meet the additional traffic on the Intercolonial Railway. Notwithstanding that large increase in the expenditure it was fully covered by the receipts of the road, there having been a small balance of \$9,000 at the end of the year. The increase in the number of passengers carried during the year was 148,749.

Mr. BLAKE. On what?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In 1880-81 the number was 631,245; 1881-82, 779,994, or an increase of 148,749. The amount received was, 1880-81, \$545,114.48; 1881-82, \$651,296.94, or an increase of \$106,182.46. This was for passenger traffic. The number of tons of freight carried in 1880-81 was 725,557 tons; in 1881-82, 838,956 tons, or an increase of 113,379. The amount received from increased freight traffic was \$189,622.79 over the amount of the previous year. The receipts from the carriage of mails and sundries amounted to \$23,063.49 over the previous year. The total earnings of the road were \$318,868.74 over those

of the previous year; the train mileage was 381,843 miles more than the previous year; and the car mileage rose from 32,201,157 to 37,409,379 of miles, or 5,288,219 miles more than the previous year.

Mr. BLAKE. It is impossible to analyze these figures at the moment, but I suppose they will appear in *Hansard* and some opportunity for discussing them will be given at a later stage. The hon. gentleman indicates increased receipts amounting, I understand, to \$295,000 in the two main items, freight and passengers. What were the gross receipts for the previous year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The gross earnings in 1880-81 were \$1,760,393.92; in 1881-82, \$2,079,262.66. The working expenses were, in 1880-81, \$1,759,851.27; 1881-82, \$2,069,657.48, or \$9,605.18 less than the earnings.

Mr. BLAKE. The result of the last six months is not quite so favorable, I think.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That does not afford any indication of the results of the year, for this reason: it depends entirely upon the portion of the year in which we do the work required to be done. The autumn was favorable for the progress of the works, and they were pushed, and last season a much larger extent of work in regard to maintenance was done than is usual; but we anticipate quite as favorable results at the end of the present fiscal year as was obtained last year.

Mr. BLAKE. Has any alterations been made in the tariff, or of rates, since last Session?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No material alterations have been made in the rates. Alterations, more or less important, are being made from time to time, but there have been no material alterations made in the rates during last year.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a very considerable increase in the traffic, and it is important to know whether there has been any marked development in any particular description of traffic, or in the development of traffic with new regions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be more satisfactory to prepare a statement and lay it on the Table of the House, which I will do, or submit it on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman submit it in advance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will; and I will have it prepared so the hon. gentleman will see exactly what is the operation.

Mr. BLAKE. And perhaps the statement from which the hon. gentleman read an extract, a tabular statement, would be a very great convenience as well.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give this to the hon. gentleman now with pleasure, and supplement it with the information required, which I am sure will be very interesting.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) There has been a noticeable increase in the working expenses of the road during the last three or four years. In 1879-80, the working expenses per mile were \$1,963; in 1880-81, \$2,085; and in 1881-82, \$2,453; an increase of \$500 per mile during three years, which perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not quite certain about the hon. gentleman's figures.

Mr. ROSS. I have taken them from the Sessional Papers of last Session, and they are correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The cost per train mile in 1881-82 was \$64.77; in 1880-81, \$62.52; and 1879-80, \$63.23; so that the hon. gentleman will see that the variation is very slight, the cost is less now than it was in 1879-80, and

very little over that of the previous year. I may at once say to my hon. friend that the cost of everything entering into the operation of the railway has increased; the cost of wages and of labor of every description has advanced, and it has been absolutely necessary to raise considerably the wages paid to all classes of employes on the Intercolonial in order to retain the services of good men and to work the road efficiently, making a considerable increase in the expenditure; then the cost of fuel, oil, and all materials used on the road has increased; and it is very satisfactory, notwithstanding this condition of things, to know that we have been able to so manage the business of the road as to meet this increased cost without making it chargeable to the country, the road paying its way.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In the report of the hon. Minister, I notice that the number of accidents on the road last year was eighty-eight, of which seventy-seven seem to have befallen employes, thirty-one arising from car coupling; and I just thought that if it were possible for the hon. Minister to give attention to this matter, it would be well. Of course the hon. gentleman knows right well, that it is in the interest of the service, that every precaution should be taken to avoid accidents of every kind, and no doubt this is done; but if it were possible by any forethought to decrease the number of accidents, it would not only be in the interest of the service, but a humane act, which the public would very much appreciate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am very much alive to the point to which he has drawn attention. I think, however, that this very unpleasant list will compare very favorably with other roads; and I am sure that if my hon. friend from Northumberland was in the House, he would be able to show that it will compare very favorably with the road to which he pays a great deal of attention. There is no doubt, however, that the climatic conditions under which railways are operated in this country, necessarily involve a very large addition to the number of accidents. It is quite impossible to operate a road in a cold winter climate like that of Canada with the immunity from accident which will be found under more favorable circumstances in Great Britain; and much as I deplore the number of accidents—and they are very great and very serious—I am sure that they will compare most favorably with those on other lines in Canada and in the United States generally. I cannot be too thankful to be able to say that on the Intercolonial, since I assumed its management some years ago, down to the present hour, not a single passenger has lost his life with one exception, and this was a case in which the road was in no way to blame, because the party attempted recklessly to get on the train while it was in motion. I am quite sure that every member of the House will be very much gratified to learn that so far we have had such a remarkable immunity from accidents in the loss of passengers on the Intercolonial. Series of accidents have occurred to employes, and it is one of the things which it is difficult to understand, but which is familiar to the minds of gentlemen who turn their attention to these subjects, that nothing is so surprising as the recklessness of the risks taken by persons engaged in hazardous employments. It is very well known that when Sir Humphrey Davey conferred such an inestimable boon on the miners as the invention of the safety-lamp, every means of compulsion had to be resorted to to compel the miners to take advantage of its protection to save them from their reckless exposures to inevitable death and destruction. So it is with railway employes. Many of them are occupied in somewhat hazardous employments, and the more hazardous it is apparently the more reckless they become, in reference to the danger to which they are exposed. The difficulty in connection with the coupling of cars has engaged my attention very much, and there is no expense to which I would

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

not be willing to go to-morrow to secure the adoption of a patent or any other means by which that danger could be lessened. The attention of railway men all over the world is being largely directed to this subject, and they are constantly adopting means and devices to give greater security, so that car coupling may be carried on without the loss of life and limb which is constantly occurring on the Intercolonial and other railways. The subject is one which has attracted a great deal of attention on the part of myself and every one connected with the road, and every precaution is being taken to protect the lives of employes of the road as well as the general public.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has received any reports of the facts with regard to an accident which happened at Thompson's Station, Cumberland county, to a man named McLeod. I have had several communications from a nephew of this man, asking me to bring the matter to the hon. gentleman's attention.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How was he injured?

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot give the details, but his complaint is that the accident happened through the negligence of the conductor, in starting the train too soon. He had his feet crushed in some way, and as he is a poor man with a family, I hope his case will be favorably considered by the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I fear that if this case proves to be one in which the accident occurred through the negligence of the party himself, as I think it likely it will prove, we would be doing wrong in encouraging anything of the kind. But if there is any ground for imputing negligence or other wrong-doing on the part of the employes, the case will certainly receive the very careful and the very favorable consideration of the Government. I will have enquiries made, and will be able to give the hon. gentleman some information on Concurrence.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Is the placing of wood in railway frogs in force on all Government railways?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I think not. We have been giving a great deal of attention to this subject, and we do not think that the putting of wood in the frog has been found sufficiently satisfactory to cause its general adoption.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the case of Morin be included in this vote? This is the case in which there has been a favorable decision by the arbitrators?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will be a vote in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if anything is to be done with regard to Moncton Station? At present it is very uncomfortable, especially for ladies in wet or cold weather.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I expect to have the station lit up by electric light, as I am aware that as so many trains arrive and depart, it is necessary that the station should be almost as light as day.

Mr. WELDON. I alluded more particularly to the necessity of having a covered way for passengers coming from one train to the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt that would be an advantage.

Mr. BLAKE. I think a serious question is raised as to what course the Government should take as regards these railway accidents. I cannot at all reconcile myself to the opinion that the people of this country who have to travel on a Government railway, should be without a remedy if they sustain a wrong upon that railway. The Government has undertaken the business of a common carrier in that regard, and, practically, the people must travel by that road if they travel at all. It seems to me that if the decision



which was recently given is to be accepted as final, there should be some arrangement or provision whereby the subject would be entitled to sue in the Exchequer Court, in case his claim was not accepted by the Government; for, of course, the Government would act just as a private railway manager would with a certain class of cases, in which it is clear that there was an impropriety of conduct which would render them liable as a private company. There ought, in a word, to be the right to sue, with proper precautions, in some court. It ought not to be a matter of pure grace, or to be settled upon considerations such as those to which the hon. gentleman has referred, of a man being poor and having a large family. I do not care whether a man is poor or rich. If, under the law, a railway company would be liable for damages, it appears to me that the Government or the public ought to be made liable in the same way. If the Government do the work of common carriers, they should not do it on different principles from individuals. Of course, there is always the difficulty which subsists to a considerable extent when private individuals sue corporations, and to a greater extent when private individuals are allowed to sue the public, namely, the lenient view that jurors take of the case. They do not appreciate that they pay a portion of the taxes, or the portion they pay is so infinitesimal that they are liable to think that the stocking is full of money, and that it will not diminish much by the abstraction of a small quantity. But with the precaution that a Judge should decide between the public and the individual, I see no danger in establishing this principle. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the principles of the law on this subject are not adequate, then we ought to alter the law for the companies as well as for this particular common carrier. As long as we oblige other common carriers to incur certain risks and be liable for certain contingencies, I do not see why the same rule should not apply to the Government, if it assumes these risks and these contingencies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to enter upon the discussion of this question with the hon. gentleman, because he has the great advantage over me, as I am not a lawyer. But I am not willing to be considered a common carrier. I think there is a very great distinction. A common carrier enters upon his employment for gain; he invests his money for the purpose of enriching himself; whereas I do not think any person will pretend that the Government of this country are operating the Intercolonial Railway, or the Prince Edward Island Railway, with a view to gain. Every person knows that the facilities for travel and traffic provided by the construction of those railways, are an immense boon to the people of the section of country through which they run, and are certainly a source of no profit to the Government. In Prince Edward Island we have some 200 miles of railway running in almost every direction, and in a very circuitous way, and furnishing railway facilities for the people all over the country; and under what circumstances? This Government had to pay last year, for the facilities they furnished to the people of Prince Edward Island, about \$90,000 over and above all the money that was received from the road. Under these circumstances I do not think that a Government who are spending the public money to furnish the people with facilities to travel and traffic, are to be placed in the same position as a common carrier who invests his money with the view of receiving not only a return for it, but of enriching himself by that return. I am not dealing with the legal aspect of the question, for I am not qualified to do so; but I do not think the cases are at all analogous. With respect to the judgment of the Supreme Court which has just been delivered, and a very important judgment it is, I may say that I intend to-morrow or next day to submit that whole question to the consideration of the Government, and I have no doubt we shall have an opportunity of stating to

Parliament what the decision of the Government is with regard to it. I am very much afraid, however, that the adoption of what my hon. friend suggests, that every person should have the right, upon any pretext however slender, to sue the Government of the country in court, and take them before a jury—

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Or a single Judge, I am not certain, after what experience I have had, that I would not prefer any jury that could be empanelled in Canada to a single Judge. My experience does not incline me very strongly to a single Judge as a means of escape to the country from being mulcted in improper or unwarranted damages.

Mr. BLAKE. I will merely say that it is not a very great compensation to an individual who meets with an accident owing to the neglect of those who are carrying, and who loses a leg or an arm, to be told: Oh, you are carried at twenty-five cents cheaper than you would have been if a private company had carried you; and when you pay the doctor's bills, and limp about for the rest of your life, you will always remember that you got the journey for twenty-five cents less than you would have got it from a private company. Nor do I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the question of gain. We have the Grand Trunk Corporation, which makes great gain, and therefore can suffer its great losses; but I am not aware that the shareholders of that company have ever received a shilling, so that its losses have to be paid out of the deficiency, as well as those of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. WELDON. The Government occupies an anomalous position in this matter, because a conductor, as a servant of the Crown, has been held liable, and heavy damages have been awarded against him; and there is no responsibility on the part of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This anomaly must exist, or every Government must cease to own railways, canals or post offices. It is an anomaly which exists in the Post Office *ex necessitate*. If the Government were responsible for every letter purloined, for every dollar stolen, or for every injury that a mercantile firm may sustain by the carelessness of a postmaster in forwarding a letter, the Post Office could not exist for a year. That anomaly must exist, and all that any Government can do—assuming its decisions to be law—is to consider every case on its merits. Of course, every Government ought to be not only honest, but liberal in the consideration of any injuries that are sustained by private individuals from the negligence of their servants or subordinates. That principle is well understood in England. For instance, in the Admiralty, they do not admit any responsibility for the consequences of any collision between an ordinary vessel and a man-of-war; but I think an annual vote is taken, out of which the Admiralty, in their discretion, can make compensation to persons suffering from such accidents, arising from the negligence of their officers commanding men-of-war. I think that all we, or any Government, can do, or that any Parliament would consider it wise for a Government to do, is to treat these cases liberally, with a just sense of the injury suffered by the party, and the compensation he ought to receive.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the Admiralty, my hon. friend is quite right; there is an annual vote. But if one of the Queen's ships comes into collision with another vessel, on application to the Admiralty, they appoint their proctor, and the case goes before the court as an ordinary case, and whatever damages are awarded, they pay. I think that New Brunswick was one of the first Provinces to build a Government railway, the line between St. John and Shediac, which is now part of the Intercolonial system; and one of the first things the Government of that Province did,

was to appoint Commissioners, to be sued, and to assume the responsibility of common carriers. In case of accidents to goods or persons, actions were brought against the Commissioners and the damages awarded were paid. So far we found it worked well, and instead of working injustice, justice was done to the people. For some ten or twelve years that system has been in force in New Brunswick and no injustice to the Crown has accrued from it.

Mr. BLAKE. It is impossible to put the matter on the basis the hon. gentleman states. If you do not recognize a liability of some kind, the giving of anything in respect to persons or goods injured must be a gratuity; and if it is to be taken as such, the Government must bring down a vote every year for the particular persons who must be compensated. A general principle of action must be laid down, and the application of it to particular cases must depend upon the circumstances of that case. The particulars must be arrived at, some way or other, departmentally or judicially, by which a conclusion is reached, and it may be a matter of favoritism and of treating one case more or less laxly than another. I do not agree that the case of the Post Office is at all analogous to the case of the railway. It is utterly impossible the Government should acknowledge the liability for the losses of letters, as we all know the room there is for fraud in cases of this kind. I do not wish, however, to discuss this matter any further at present. I desire to ask the hon. Minister what is his calculation as to the life of the rails, and what is his idea as to the charge that accrues upon the renewal of the rails?

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wish to discuss the important constitutional question that has just been mooted, as many months cannot roll on without the subject being thoroughly discussed by the lawyers of the House. The hon. Minister, if he looks into the case closer, will find that the policy of this House has been for years back more and more in the direction of making the Government liable in the case of injuries caused by the negligence of employes. In 1871 an Act was passed putting in the power of the Minister, where injury happened to the person or goods of a passenger, and application was made by him for compensation, to refer the assessment of damage to arbitrators. When the hon. Minister of Railways consolidated the Railway Act of 1879, he made a statutory declaration of the existence of liability on the part of the Government, because he declared in so many words that the Department of Railways should not exonerate itself from liability for damages caused by the negligence of employes. I do not propose to anticipate what will be a lengthened discussion on this point, and I am glad the hon. Minister intends to submit to his colleagues the matter of particular damages discussed before the Supreme Court lately, and before the end of the Session to give some information on that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. Minister state to the House what are the gross earnings per ton per mile, or per car per mile of the line for the last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will have that calculation made.

206. Repairs and working expenses—Prince Edward Island Railway..... \$220,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This increase is in consequence of that amount being required over and above what was anticipated in order to put the road in a thoroughly good condition. This expense will decrease after the present year, because the road has been placed in a much higher condition of efficiency than it was before.

207. Repairs and working expenses—Windsor Branch Railway..... \$20,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a branch between the Halifax Junction and Windsor, and is operated by the Mr. WELDON.

Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company under an arrangement by which they give us one-third of the earnings and we maintain the line. The expenditure that we are called upon to make covers the outlay.

Mr. DAVIES. Before we pass from the railway vote I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that early in the Session a question was asked by the hon. member for Prince county (Prince Edward Island) respecting the condition of the station at Summerside. I think, from the answer the hon. Minister gave, that he was under a misapprehension as to the nature of the question and the danger which the hon. member for Prince county believed existed there. The station at Summerside is built in a triangle surrounded on three sides by the railway track. I wish to call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that three successive Grand Juries have reported that station as a nuisance, and I believe their report has been forwarded to the Department. There is no protection whatever—no passage-way for man, woman or child to the station without crossing a double line railway track. Cars are being shunted there constantly, and I cannot conceive how it is possible for us to escape serious accidents there before long. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he consult with his Engineer and cause a small wooden bridge to be constructed for passengers to go over from the road to the station. Unless something of this kind is done I am perfectly satisfied that before many months are over some terrible accident will happen there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can inform my hon. friend that the Government are not responsible for the existing state of things. The hon. gentleman knows that the railway was constructed by the Government of Prince Edward Island, and that this station is now in precisely the condition it was then, so that the difficulty did not arise with us, but with them. I have an impression that the hon. gentleman would know more about that matter than I do. It was contemplated to build a bridge, but the Government of Prince Edward Island sold the land and rendered it impossible for the bridge to be built.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Minister referred to that in his answer before, but I could not understand him. It is certainly not the fact, there was no land sold there. Originally the station was to have been put a mile back of the town; then it was changed to the town, to the water side, but there never was any land sold there by the Government. I acknowledge the station was built by the Island Government, but that does not lessen the danger that exists. I think one hundred dollars would suffice to build a bridge.

Mr. BRECKEN. I was a member of the Local Government when the station at Summerside was fixed upon. It was at first proposed to put it some distance back of the city, where the dangers mentioned by my hon. friend would not have existed, and if I remember aright, the station was changed by the Liberal Government who came into power afterwards. I think my hon. friend was a member of the Legislature at that time, and supported that Government, and I am not sure but he was a member of the Government himself. However, I quite agree with my hon. friend in all he has stated with respect to the present station. It is a little triangle between a road leading into Summerside and the shore, and it is impossible for passengers to reach the station without crossing a double track railway, and they are constantly exposed to danger. It is quite true that several Grand Juries have time and again presented this station as a nuisance. I think the Minister of Railways would do well to take the matter into his consideration, and if the station here was changed, or a bridge thrown across the track, it would avoid a very great danger for the people. It is a matter of surprise that up to the present time no accidents have occurred.

Mr. HACKETT. I have felt it my duty, on several occasions, to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the railway station was situated in a very inconvenient part of the town. The fact is, that that station was placed there during the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). It is not true that that station was placed there by the Island Government before Confederation. The station built by the Island Government was placed in a most convenient position, but the Government of the hon. member for East York, no doubt, thinking they were doing it for the best, changed the site of the station to the position which it now occupies, thus exposing the passengers to great inconvenience and danger in going to the station. It is a wonder that many people are not killed in crossing over that double track to the station. However, I acknowledge that no blame can be laid to the present hon. Minister of Railways, or to the present Government. The station was placed there by the late Administration, and it now becomes the duty of the present Government to do as much as possible to remedy the evil. I think the hon. Minister of Railways, to whose attention the matter has been brought on several occasions, will do everything in his power, assisted, as he is, by an able staff of officers, to remedy this great evil. It has been brought, as the hon. member for Queen's has stated, to the notice of the Grand Jury of the county on several occasions, and they have represented very strongly the facts of the case. But I think the hon. gentleman, in taking special charge of Queen's county, is going outside of his record. The hon. members for the county are quite capable of looking after the interests of the county, and I feel I have not been derelict in my duty, because I have drawn the attention of the hon. Minister to this matter on several occasions, and conferences have been held with the engineers who are considering the subject with a view to remedying evils existing at present.

208. Repairs and working expenses—Canals ..... \$429,584.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that there is a considerable increase in the expenditure on the canals. The price of labor has much increased; and in regard to the Welland Canal, there are now two canals instead of one, which involves a very large increase in the annual expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. Has there been any increase in the traffic?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The traffic returns have not been at all satisfactory, but I think the prospects are that this year the traffic will be much larger than last year. The cost of the staff in connection with the new canal is placed at \$93,000, and of the old canal at \$14,400.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the number of employes been increased?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, very much, on account of the opening of the new canal, for we are unable to close the old canal. We have considerably reduced the staff on the old canal, but we are obliged to maintain a staff, as the canal is still used for the traffic of vessels, and it is absolutely necessary to keep it open, because of the water-power all along its banks.

Mr. BLAKE. Then we may understand that the expense is as nearly as possible the normal one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not expect we can reduce it much lower than it is now.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). A considerable decline has taken place in the revenue from the canals. In 1881, the receipts were \$339,833; last year they were \$304,014, being a decline of about \$35,000. The Report of the Minister of Inland Revenue gives details in regard to the kinds of produce on which the decline has taken place. While I call his attention to this point, I wish to ask the hon. Minister

whether he considers the policy of reducing the canal tolls has been a success. If I understand rightly, the object was to secure to Canada a class of freight which otherwise would have gone by the Erie Canal, on which there are no tolls. The consequence has been largely to reduce the receipts, and while they have thus fallen off, there has been an increase in the expenditure. There has been spent on canals, \$43,000,000 between the Canadian and the Imperial Governments, and the expenditure has not ended yet, but will probably reach \$50,000,000 before the canals are completed. Does the hon. Minister believe that by reducing the tolls on the canals this country has received any equivalent in increased traffic or commercial advantages for the loss of revenue sustained? This is a very broad question, and I do not know whether it is fair to spring it on the hon. Minister at a moment's notice, for it is one that requires very serious consideration. I would, however, be glad to hear the hon. Minister's opinion on this point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There can be no doubt that the question which the hon. gentleman has opened is a very wide question, and one the importance of which can scarcely be overrated; but I am glad to be able to inform the hon. gentleman—and I will furnish the figures so as to show exactly what the result has been—that the decrease in receipts has not arisen from the reduction of tolls; that so far from that being the case, the reduction of tolls has not been attended with any decrease in the amount received from the class of vessels in respect of which the reduction has been made. No doubt the traffic through the canals last year was very considerably less than previous years, but the reduced receipts did not arise from the diminished tolls, the effect of which was rather the other way.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Then, the conclusion we shall be obliged to draw will be that the railways are absorbing the traffic which formerly went by way of the canals. I observe that in 1861 the tolls collected on vessels amounted to \$16,417, while last year the amount was only \$12,514. Of course, the reduction in receipts may arise from a smaller number of vessels, or from the reduction in tolls, outside, of course, from any amount collected from the produce of agriculture. This was a trade which, I suppose, the reduction of tolls, was particularly designed to secure for our canals. The decrease was from \$79,213 to \$39,652. I would be very glad to examine the report when the hon. Minister brings it down, and I think this is a matter which the House should not lose sight of. If we are to lose the trade which we expected to receive by the enlargement of the canals, and the expenditure from year to year of a very large amount of money on the St. Lawrence canals and the other inland waters, it becomes a very serious matter. The interest on the investment itself is a very serious item, and it may be necessary to consider whether any means can be adopted whereby the canals can be rendered at least self-sustaining. It is a pity if we lose not only the interest on the investment, but also are obliged to contribute from revenue a considerable amount each year over and above the collections from tolls on our inland system of canals.

Mr. CHARLTON. The completion of railways and their increasing traffic, have led to the tolls being entirely removed from that great water highway, the Erie Canal; and I wish to enquire of the Minister, whether it is not deemed probable, that it will be rendered necessary to take the same course with reference to the Canadian Canals, removing the tolls as on the Erie Canal, for the purpose of keeping the trade we already have.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is engaging the attention of the Government, but I do not think that there is any prospect of a proposal being made to abolish the tolls on the canals. There may be, however, some reductions, and I expect we will be able to state to the House in a very short time what view we take of this question.

209. Salaries and Contingencies of Canal Officers... \$33,320.00

Mr. BLAKE. This vote is the same as last year, while there is the considerable increase of \$37,000 on working expenses generally; and I think the hon. gentleman stated that a considerable portion of the increase is due to the increased cost of employes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not so much on the salaries of officers and staff, as on employes—laboring men.

211. Repairs and working expenses—Harbors and Slides..... \$96,250.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The decrease is \$4,500. The details will be found on page 93.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the general result respecting these works? Are they self-sustaining?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In some of them more revenue is collected than the amount expended. In the Saguenay district there is a deficit, I think, of \$5,000, and in the St. Maurice district, a deficit also exists, due to the building of the new works.

Mr. BLAKE. What is their normal condition?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If these large works had not been required, I think we would have had a surplus in the St. Maurice district. For instance, in 1870, the deficit was only \$1,200; in other years it was \$6,000, and sometimes \$16,000, according to the extent of repairs made and of booms removed altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. There is always a deficit?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is generally a deficit. In the case of the Ottawa Works, it is different. The net revenue of them for 1882 was \$26,000, and for the previous year, \$18,000. During the three years previous to that, it was \$18,000; in 1878, \$32,000; in 1877, \$61,000; in 1873, \$78,000; in 1874, \$68,000; in 1875, \$24,000, and in 1876, \$33,000, &c. These are surpluses.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that now that we have been so many years in obtaining these works, the aim of the Government should be, at any rate, to obtain sufficient from them to keep up these works and to pay the expense of maintaining them. The Local Governments receive, of course, as proprietors of the timber lands, large revenues from this timber; the timber goes down these streams, and these slides and booms afford facilities for letting the timber down. Under these circumstances, I can see no reason why the system should not be made practically a self-sustaining system. If it is not made self-sustaining, you are either allowing the Provincial Governments by that means to obtain an indirect revenue by charging larger stumpage or other dues than they otherwise would, or you are assisting the lumbermen, not merely by affording them facilities for getting out their stuff, but also by paying them a sort of bonus. If that general proposition should be admitted that we, as proprietors of the navigation, are conducting these enterprises for the benefit of this great trade—the Local Governments and private individuals deriving large profits—why should we carry them on upon a system which, taking a series of years together, involves a loss to Canada? I should not object to an occasional deficit; but when we find that the normal condition, taking one year with another, is a condition of deficits, I think the system is unsound.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right and he is wrong. If the normal condition of these works was a deficit, I agree with him that some means should be taken to increase the revenue and make them self-sustaining. But the hon. gentleman will admit that on large works where there are a great many logs and timber passing, the revenue there will be necessarily larger, and the cost of maintenance smaller, in proportion, than in places

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

where there is less timber and logs passing. It happens, therefore, that upon some of these works there may be a deficit, while upon others there is a surplus; but, taking all in all, the result is a satisfactory one, just such a result as the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not appear to me, that because the works in one region of the country are carried on upon a principle which produces a surplus, that fact compensates for the other fact that the works in other parts of the country are carried on upon a principle which produces a deficit. If this trade is so valuable that the Local Governments derive stumpage dues, and the lumbermen derive a profit, there are two profits made, and a portion of these profits is made out of this Government, which has nothing to do with either, and which is supplying these facilities, not at cost, but below cost.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Once more the hon. gentleman is right and he is wrong. If the principle which he advocates were applied to the post offices in the Dominion, it would require that each post office should be self-sustaining, while the fact is that some have large surpluses, while others in smaller places where the distances are greater, and the population is sparser, are not self-sustaining; but as the country grows and the population increases, new offices are opened and a larger number of offices become self-sustaining. So with these works: as more timber comes down, slides and booms are wanted, and they are built, and for a few years there is a deficit instead of a surplus. Nevertheless, you are encouraging trade by constructing them; and it pays you in the long run by giving the country the benefit of employment for our vessels, and so on. Of course we require certain sums every year for repairs, and though some of the works do not produce a surplus, we have, as I have already stated, on the whole, a large surplus.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree that the analogy which the hon. gentleman has drawn between these works and the Post Office service is an accurate one. If he will take the case of the Toronto Post Office, he will find that the large surplus which it produces is due to the existence of non-remunerative offices, and a large number of letters go from Toronto to these offices without which that great centre would not obtain its surplus. So, independently of the other differences between the two cases, there is an absence of this inter-communication and inter-dependence by which one central office produces a surplus on account of the existence of smaller and non-remunerative offices. But what has the amount of expense with which the lumber trade of the Ottawa is conducted, to do with the system under which a more limited trade in another part of the country is conducted? It has nothing to do with it; the circumstances are entirely different. The hon. gentleman says that you are increasing the trade, and giving larger exports to the country. These are propositions which would have an application if you cut down the tolls whenever it was necessary to keep the business going and get dues. But that is not the fact; and without desiring to protract the discussion, I must say that I do not see any ground for departing from my proposition, that in a series of years each work should be so conducted as to pay its own way.

214. Telegraph Lines—Manitoba and the North-West Territories ..... \$24,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of this vote, \$15,200 is to be for the staff, and \$8,800 for repairs. The control of these telegraph lines was transferred from the Railway Department to the Department of Public Works, by Order in Council. The vote is made up as follows:—From Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, 435 miles, for the staff, \$7,000; for repairs, \$1,000; and for the line and office, materials, stationery, &c., \$2,000. From Qu'Appelle to Edmonton, 537 miles, for the

staff, \$8,200; for repairs, \$1,800; and for the line and office, materials, stationery, &c., \$4,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what the returns are?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. The line has existed from Edmonton to Humboldt, which is about 120 or 130 miles north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it has been in bad order, and was hardly used. In two or three weeks that line will probably be connected with Troy or Qu'Appelle Station, on the Pacific Railway, and we shall then have communication between Edmonton and any other part of Canada. The staff has been reorganized, in order that the line may be in working order, and that we may obtain revenue at the different stations. It is also proposed to extend a branch line from the Saskatchewan River, between Humboldt and Battleford, to Prince Albert, a distance of something like ninety miles, the people of Prince Albert and the neighboring parishes furnishing the poles.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the tariff fixed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; because the line was not completed. The Superintendent will prepare a tariff which will be submitted to Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us information about the line from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That portion of the line during last year has been put in the hands of the railway contractors because it was not in order, and we had not the staff necessary to keep it up. The time is now come when we must take it back, and our intention is to put it in good order with this money. No doubt, during the next two years it will not be self-sustaining, but after three or four years it will be more than self-sustaining.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that the House should invite the Government to study, at an early day, a general policy in reference to the telegraph system of the North-West. Unless we are going to adopt a system of permanent operation of the telegraph lines, I do not see why we should not dispose of our interests in the line from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which must have telegraphic communication from station to station, if some fair bargain could be made by which the interests of the public would be protected. But if the Government adopt the general policy of keeping up a telegraphic system as part of the public service, of course such a source would be out of the question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right. The Government consider the propriety of selling that portion from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay, but the offer was so ridiculously small that we did not think it advisable to do so. We thought it better therefore to repair the line and in a few years, after it had acquired some value, we might consider the question of disposing of it. I am not now in a position to say what course the Government will adopt. The question will be taken up during Recess.

Mr. TROW. Is that portion of the old telegraph from Humboldt to Selkirk still in operation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has been abandoned. I understand the line passed through a swampy part of the country, and was most difficult to keep in order. A portion of the wire has been removed, to be used on the line from Humboldt to Qu'Appelle Station.

Mr. TROW. Could not the material of the old line be used in this branch, and go direct from Qu'Appelle to Touchwood Hills, and thence direct to Prince Albert?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so. The distance may be shorter, and my attention was called to that lately, but the intention was first to do as I have said, and, of course, we will have to take the shorter route.

215. Telegraph Lines—British Columbia .....\$7,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is an increase of \$2,000 in the staff, and of \$5,000 in the repairs. We had to increase the salaries of the staff, or the operators would have left us. It is very difficult to keep operators there, except at increased salaries, owing to the high price of labor. The repairs are for new poles, and the renewal of a portion of the wire. The line will prove to be one that will give a good revenue to the Government, as the revenue is increasing largely. There is still a deficit, but that deficit is decreasing yearly.

217. Agent and Contingencies—British Columbia.....\$4,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman state what is the entire salary of Mr. Trutch?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He receives \$600 for the agency of my Department, and if I remember aright he has \$3,000 in all. Then the accountant, \$1,200; allowance to the engineer employed in the Department of Railways, \$300; wages of messenger, \$400; stationery, \$200; fuel, \$200; advertisements for tenders, \$200; travelling expenses and contingencies, \$840.

210. Collection of Slide and Boom Dues..... \$21,210.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This vote is given in detail on page 92. There is a proposed increase of \$650 to the salaries of the six clerks employed in that Department. There is an increase of \$15 to the allowance made the slide master. There is a decrease in some items and an increase in others:

218. To meet expenses in connection with the Post Office Department.....\$2,238,310.50

Mr. CARLING. The increase for mail service is \$134,500; salaries, \$57,510; miscellaneous, \$27,400. The increases are extra mail service in Province of Ontario, \$45,000; in Quebec, \$27,000; in New Brunswick, \$13,000; in Nova Scotia, \$9,500; in Prince Edward Island, \$1,000; British Columbia, \$5,000; Manitoba, \$34,000. The increase in salaries is: Ontario, \$27,570; Quebec, \$2,823; New Brunswick, \$840; Nova Scotia, \$2,570; Prince Edward Island, \$200; British Columbia, \$3,887; Manitoba and North-West, \$19,620. The increase in the miscellaneous is: Ontario, \$16,000; Quebec, \$3,000; New Brunswick, \$800; Nova Scotia, \$1,000; Prince Edward Island, \$200; British Columbia, \$500; Manitoba and North-West, \$4,900. These are the increases in the different Provinces, and amount altogether to \$219,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The increase in the mail service of Ontario, \$45,000, appears to be very largely an increased payment to the railway companies, while there is an increase of \$10,000 for ordinary land conveyance.

Mr. CARLING. It has been found necessary to have increased accommodation between Montreal and Toronto, and arrangements have been made with the Grand Trunk Railway, by which, instead of having part of one car for the conveyance of mails, we are to have two cars on the road between Montreal and Toronto, for which we pay \$5,000 a year additional. \$9,000 is for mail service on the Canada Atlantic and the Credit Valley Railways.

Mr. VAIL. I observe, under head of mail service in Nova Scotia, there are \$4,000 for steamboat and sailing craft. What routes are these employed on?

Mr. CARLING. There is no change, it is the same as last year. New post offices have been opened and increased facilities afforded. The contracts entered into have been at higher prices than previously.

Mr. PLATT. I desire to interview the hon. Minister in regard to a subject which particularly affects a large majority of the people whom I have the honor to represent. Hon.

members who are acquainted with the geographical position of Prince Edward county are aware that, for many years, we were isolated from the rest of the world, so far as railway accommodation was concerned, and we looked forward with pleasure to the time when we would possess railway facilities, and have our mails rapidly delivered. We hailed with delight the advent of that period, and we heralded with pleasure the day when the Government saw fit to place the carriage of the mails to the western part of the county, in the hands of what was then the Prince Edward County Railway and has since been known as the Central Ontario Railway. During the time the mails were carried by that railway, I heard very little complaint, and no complaint which was directed against the carriage of mails on that railway, but since that time, for reasons best known to the Government, and for reasons which have never been made public, the Government have seen fit to change the carriage of the mails from the railway to the old-fashioned method. As the First Minister said yesterday, we have returned to the days of the old ox-team, and although unlike the Indians, who on being pitched into the ditch, refused to be carried further on the railway train the mails have not refused to be so carried. I am at a loss to know the reason why they have been transferred to the olden time honored system of ox-teams. I suppose the Government will be prepared to state that a slight saving of money is thereby affected. I am not, however, aware that there have been any petitions in favor of the change made on a recent occasion, nor am I aware that any very serious complaints have been laid before the Government with respect to the manner in which the mail service was conducted by the railway. I hope the hon. Minister will be in a position to state clearly to the Committee the reason which induced him to make that change, and make it at that particular period. I may state that, so far as the eastern section of the county is concerned, they are not very materially affected by the recent change, and I have not heard many complaints from the eastern part. As regards the county town there have been very loud complaints against the mail service as it is at present conducted. When the mails arrived by train a considerable time was given for the answer to be forwarded. As a rule, the mail arrived about half-past 9 o'clock, and the afternoon train left at 3:30 or 3:45, giving time to enable answers to be sent east or west. Since the change was made the average time at which the mails arrive by ox-team from the east is between 10 and 11 o'clock during the winter, and frequently not until after 11 o'clock, and the mails closed at 1:30, leaving the people little time to answer correspondence. When we go west from Picton the difficulty becomes greater and the complaints are more numerous. When the mails were carried by railway the people in the western part of the county received two daily mails, and in Picton people who had correspondence with villages west could get a reply the same day the letters left that town, but now two or three days are occupied. If a letter leaves Picton in the morning at 9 or 10 o'clock for the western part of the county, it will cross the mail going in the opposite direction, and there is no possibility of a letter arriving until the following day, and then it arrives too late for distribution, so the parties would not receive it until the third day. This is a ground for very serious complaint. Many people in the villages adjacent to Picton, and on that line, have transferred their post offices from where they live to Picton in order that they may obtain their mail matter more quickly. In the western part I have known packages of letters taken to parties on the railway train, and a quarter of a dollar paid in order to get them taken more rapidly to their destination than the present mail can take them. These are very serious grounds of complaint, and in view of the fact that the public have never been made aware of any reason for the change, and no petitions have been

Mr. PLATT.

presented to the hon. Minister, the question may fairly arise as to the reasons for making this particular change. The mails which leave Toronto in the morning do not arrive in Picton in time for distribution, whereas formerly we obtained them at three o'clock. Newspapers have to be sent by express, or they will not reach there until the following morning. This, of course, is not the case in the summer time, but I am speaking specially of the winter season. With respect to the eastern section, there are no complaints of the service in the summer, when it is performed by the Bay of Quinté Railway and the line of boats from Desoronto to Picton. This change of system cannot involve a saving of more than two or three hundred dollars; it is said that it will reach five hundred or six hundred dollars. I can scarcely make that out from an analysis of the expenses; however, the hon. Minister will be able to state what the extent of the saving will be. But it is not a question of expense. I know that any hon. member who casts suspicion on the motive of the Government in making such changes is very likely to provoke the displeasure of Ministers, but I cannot be blamed if I run the risk of provoking displeasure by stating what is the impression of the people in that section of the county. The suspicion prevails that some other motive than the welfare of the public service induced the change to be made. I do not say that is my own opinion, but it is the opinion generally entertained by the public in that section, and it would not be fair to the people who entertained that opinion, if I did not state the reasons which led them to come to such a conclusion. Hon. members are aware that at the time the carriage of the mails was given to the railway, it was in the hands of a friend of the present Administration, Mr. Manning of Toronto, owning the road, and the mails were carried by that railway so long as Mr. Manning possessed the control and reaped the benefits from the mails being carried over that road. I wish to state, too, that the people bear in mind, what I state here, that no petitions were presented by the public against the service as conducted on that railway. They likewise bear in mind that the press of the county, with one single exception, have condemned the change in the strongest terms, while the Government press of the county has maintained a golden silence on the subject, and have never seen fit to mention it, favorably or unfavorably. Then we know the season of the year was not most opportune for making the change. It was at the advent of winter, when the disadvantages were greater than in summer, and likewise in the middle of the financial year. I am in duty bound to state that it was not long after the last election; and also during the election threats were made, that if the proprietors of the railway did not see fit to stand by the Government candidate, very great injury to their own interests in this respect would ensue; and I know for a fact that after the election was over, these threats were repeated and made stronger than ever to the effect, that they would actually lose the benefits accruing to them from performing that portion of the service.

Mr. BOWELL. By whom?

Mr. PLATT. I leave the hon. gentleman to infer to whom I allude when I state that the only gentleman who petitioned the Government in favor of the change was the gentleman who made particular threats in this direction; but he was not entirely, though almost, alone in this regard. Then the people have not forgotten, in their own minds, that the owners or proprietors of the Central Ontario Railway, who have lost the carrying of the mails by the recent change, are parties who are not supposed to lay any particular claim to the love and regard of the present Administration; and the people cannot fail to think that if the Vice-President of the road had never been the instrument of causing a cloud to be cast over the First Minister, he might have stood a better chance, perhaps, in

maintaining his position in the public service. We know very well that the parties benefitted by the contract since, are those who stand in exactly the opposite relation as far as the Government, and the Government candidate, are concerned. The gentleman who received the contract for the carriage of the mails, just happened to be the man who was instrumental in arranging or organizing an election petition against myself, and who did a great deal of what is vulgarly known as the low or bad work of the party in that respect. His funds becoming low, he saw no method of being recompensed for this work, and through some strange combination of circumstances, he received the contract, although, I believe, it was let out by public tender. By some very curious arrangement of circumstances he received the contract for the carriage of the mails for the first section; and the second portion was given to the unfortunate individual who was the nominee of the Minister of Militia, as the canteen tenant at the late camp, and who suffered so disastrously from that violent attack which was made on what is familiarly known as Fort Heffernon.

Mr. BOWELL. Was that the reason for withdrawing the petition against you?

Mr. PLATT. No; I think the reason was lack of funds. It was for the same reason that these men could look nowhere else than to the Government for pay for his services. These are the two gentlemen who received the contract, and this is why people hold peculiar views as to the reasons which caused the Minister to make the change. Grounds of complaint still exist, and notwithstanding that a long time has lapsed, and summer is approaching, these complaints, I believe, still continue. I am, as well, informed that friends of hon. gentlemen opposite have made most strenuous efforts in order to secure the return of the mails to the railway. I feel that, regardless of the reputation of the Minister, which seems to a certain degree at stake in this matter, for the good of the public service and for the well-being of the people interested in this particular portion of the mail carriage of the country, the mails should be returned to the railway at once. It cannot be denied, if the Government do not see fit to make the change as before, that at any rate the railway should carry the mails for the western part of the county. There is no reasonable excuse to be given for persistence in the present course; and I am sure that the day is not far distant when the Government will, of necessity, treat with the gentlemen who own the Central Ontario Railway for the carriage of the mails. We know it is being extended back into the constituency of the hon. Minister of Customs, who, I am sure, will not allow his constituents in the far and remote regions of the county, to be supplied with their mails by ox-carts or horse-carriages, after the railway reaches those remote districts. I am not sure that the proprietors of the road have any quarrel with the Government. They are thoroughly business men, not politicians, who are doing as much, probably, to open up the resources of the country, as any other railway promoters in Canada; and there is no reason I know of that can be given, why the mails should be carried as they now are. I have asked for the papers on this question, but up to the present, not been able to get them, I am forced to ask the hon. gentleman to give explanations, which I hope will be satisfactory, not any more on my account, than on behalf of the people of the county of Prince Edward, who are daily expecting them.

Mr. CARLING. One of the important reasons for continuing the present system, is, that it gives better satisfaction to the public, as far as I am informed, and it is done at a less rate. The cost of carrying these mails by rail was \$3,721, while the present cost is \$3,339. A great many complaints were made against the railway for the manner in which the mails were carried during last winter. I believe that, on the average, they only made connection three times a week

in carrying the mails from Trenton and Picton, instead of six times; but since the arrangement has been made with the present contractors, the other mails, as well as the way mails, are more regularly carried; and, so far as I can learn, the people are better satisfied with the present arrangement than they were before, because the railway company did not give them their mails regularly, while the cost to the country is some \$300 or \$400 less.

Mr. BLAKE. Slow and sure now.

Mr. CARLING. Not so slow but sure, because the railway company would not wait for the Grand Trunk when the trains were late, while the present contractor does wait. The people, as a general thing, now get their mails more regularly than when these were carried by the company. That is the information I have from the reports of the Inspectors who have examined and enquired into the working of the present system:

Mr. PLATT. The Minister does not intend to convey the idea to the House, that if they missed the mails from the east, this was any fault whatever of the railway?

Mr. CARLING. I can only say it is reported to me, that on the average they missed the train three times a week during last winter, and since the present arrangement has been made, the people get their mails every day, because the contractor regularly awaits the arrival of the train.

Mr. PLATT. During the winter just passed, allow me to state that although the mails might have been missed from the east by the morning train, they would have been carried to Picton by the afternoon train, which arrived here nearly as soon as the stage from Desoronto during the winter. But so far as the western mail is concerned, which is more important to the town of Picton, it is seldom or ever missed by the downward train, because there are two or three hours difference between the time of its arrival at Trenton, and the leaving of the train for Picton. I am confident that the hon. gentleman has not received information which represents the views of the general public upon this question.

Mr. BLAKE. The vote for salaries has been increased by \$6,740, but I have only the total for last year, so that we can make no comparison.

Mr. CARLING. The Estimates are prepared in a different way, I believe; but there are no increases except in the number of persons employed in the service. There are an additional number of mail clerks as well as in the post offices. I cannot state the exact number, but I will be very glad to give the hon. gentleman the information on Concurrence. The only ones appointed are junior clerks at the lowest salaries on the railways and in the post offices.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the salaries?

Mr. CARLING. In the city post offices, \$400, and railway clerks \$480, according to the Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many grades on the railways?

Mr. CARLING. Three. They commence at \$180, and first-class clerks get up to \$960.

Mr. BLAKE. Passing on to the next head, Post Offices, Ontario, I find an increase of \$27,570, but no details are given.

Mr. CARLING. There are no increases in any of the salaries, except those provided by the Civil Service Act, in any of the city post offices. The other increases are the ordinary increases and the increases for additional help required.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, passing on to the heading Miscellaneous, there have been a number of increases for station-

ery, printing and advertising, manufacturing of postage stamps, post-cards, envelopes, stamps, &c.

Mr. CARLING. These are the regular increases. Owing to the increase of business, as, of course, we require more postage stamps, more paper and every thing of that kind required for the working of the Department.

Mr. HESSON. I think it is fair to state that the increase of mileage, according to the report of the Postmaster-General, is 1,416 miles over 1881, that the total number of miles of mail travel was 1,023,755 miles greater than the number for the preceding year, and that the total number of letters has increased by about 8,030,000 in the year. These figures indicate a very much larger income, and it necessarily follows that there must be a very much larger expenditure. I am pleased to see that the income has more than kept pace with the expenditure. I see that Ontario is only \$31,000 short of paying its own expenses, and Manitoba is in almost an equally good position. The whole record must be very gratifying to the country. I should be very glad if, at an early period, the hon. Postmaster-General could see his way to reducing the rate on letters from 3 cts. to 2 cts. The example has been set on the other side of the line, and I think that example could be followed without loss to the Department, but rather with gain to the whole country, and I am satisfied that the whole country would approve of any change in that direction. With regard to the increase in the salaries, and in miscellaneous expenses, for stamps, &c., I find that no less than 236 new post offices have been opened during the past year, which necessarily increased the expenditure all round.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure the hon. Minister must be very much obliged to the hon. member for North Perth for undertaking the vindication of his Department. The hon. Minister would, no doubt, have taken advantage of those figures if he had not known that they were behind time. The hon. member has been talking of increases that have already occurred; he has been comparing last year with the previous year. We are talking about the estimated increases of next year. I would recommend the hon. gentleman, before he undertakes the vindication of the Minister, to get a little more abreast of the times, rather than a year behind them.

Mr. HESSON. My figures are from the last Report of the Postmaster-General. I spoke of that which we are in possession of, and I think it reasonable that these increases should be looked for by the House in consequence of the additional mileage and the number of new offices which have been established.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the Postal Treaty between the United States and Canada provides that prepaid letters and newspapers should be carried free to their destination in either country; but I find a vote of \$7,500 for transit postage payable to the United States. I should like to know what it is for.

Mr. CARLING. That is for carrying foreign mails through the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Another matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister is a question which is frequently raised in the section of the country which I belong to, that is, the carrying of the mails on fast express trains. The Canada Southern Railway runs three express trains daily, but the mails are not carried on these, but on slow way trains, and the service is very bad. Why could not the Canadian Government have a postal car on each of these fast trains, and have the mails delivered at the various stations while the train is in motion as is done in other countries? This would probably require slightly increased expenditure, but the service would be so much better that the small increase would be cheerfully borne by the country.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. CARLING. I believe the plan suggested by the hon. member, has been tried, and has not worked satisfactorily. The difficulty is to get the railway companies to stop these fast trains at the railway stations.

Mr. CHARLTON. They do not need to stop.

Mr. BLAKE. They have a system of delivering the mails as they go.

Mr. CARLING. I am told by officers of the Department, who have had considerable experience in this matter, that it has never worked well.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the fast mail train between New York and Chicago was adopted, although it ran at the rate of forty miles an hour, the mails were delivered and received by this fast train at all the small stations. The system has worked successfully there and in England for years, and if we are unable to work it successfully, it must be because we do not understand how it is done. All we have to do is to adopt the plans they have adopted, and we can deliver the mails as they do.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. Minister give us information as to the subsidies, said to have been given to the steamer *Folger*, for carrying the mail from Murray Bay to Kamouraska during the winter season? I called for the papers two months ago. They are not yet down.

Mr. CARLING. I understand that no money has been paid.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the matter was taken up as an experiment. I suppose, the experiment not being satisfactory, no money was paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The arrangement was made, subject to the sanction of Parliament, with the Department of Railways. If the experiment had succeeded, we would have submitted an item in the Estimates for that purpose. I understand the hon. Minister of Railways to say the experiment did not succeed, and therefore no money was paid.

Mr. LAURIER. Nor is to be paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. LAURIER. I see there is an increase of \$9,000 to the Intercolonial Railway for mail services in Quebec; \$10,000, New Brunswick; and \$5,500 in Nova Scotia. Will the hon. Minister explain that?

Mr. CARLING. I believe it is what the road is actually entitled to, on the amount of mail carried, the same as other railways.

Mr. BLAKE. When did the owners of the Intercolonial Railway complain to the Government that the Government was treating them unjustly? Was it when the balance appeared on the wrong side?

Mr. CARLING. The agreement between the Departments is on the same basis as that with the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there very much difficulty between the two Departments in coming to an agreement?

Mr. CARLING. The matter was treated in the same way as if the road was an independent company.

Mr. BLAKE. Which was Peter and which was Paul? When did the hon. gentleman come to the conclusion that the Government, for three years, had been doing gross injustice to the Intercolonial?

Mr. CARLING. I believe the hon. Minister of Railways found that this road was not properly treated, and should be treated in the same way as others.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the Order in Council referred to in the Estimates? One would like to see it, so as to apprehend how it was managed. It



is a good way to make this revenue account of the Intercolonial Railway look better. Does the hon. gentleman propose to make a large show of profits or prevent a deficit by paying money for the carriage of the mails? Have any special payments or allowances been made to the Intercolonial in respect to occasions on which special trains are despatched with English mails.

Mr. CARLING. No special despatch is included in the arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the same with the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. CARLING. I believe the Grand Trunk does get a small special rate.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster-General to the post office in St. John suburb, Quebec, with reference to the increased salary of the present over the former incumbent. The office was filled formerly by a person named Tremblay, whose salary was about \$500 a year, without any allowance for rental. I see by the return, on page 24, that the salary of the present incumbent is something like \$1,000 over that of the previous postmaster with the allowance for fuel, light and rental. Some information should be given us on this point.

Mr. CARLING. He gets paid in the usual way, by commission for services rendered. If there is anything now allowed for increased accommodation it is because there has been increased business. The salary is altogether regulated by the receipts of the office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I am not mistaken, 40 per cent. is allowed?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The amount collected this year was \$2,384.38. The salary paid him would necessitate the collection of \$3,176.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). The hon. member may see on page 84 of the appropriations for this year, that five quarters are included in the amount of \$1,588; and then there are the arrears which have been granted to the postmaster, whose salary has not been regularised. The whole forms an aggregate of \$1,588. This includes, not only the salary for a year, but the salary for a year and a quarter, besides the arrears which were due to him.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). What would then be the exact amount of his salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). The amount of salary is not indicated here. The hon. member had better ask the exact amount of salary for the year. Then, if business has increased, it has probably become necessary to give a larger office, and, consequently, to make a special allowance for that purpose. At all events, if the hon. member wishes to know the exact amount, all he has to do is to ask for it, and it will be given.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I prefer to make my remarks in English in order that the whole House may understand me. The former postmaster, Mr. Tremblay, for some cause still unknown, was dismissed, at least his services were dispensed with, and he was replaced by the present incumbent in the office. Formerly the service was performed at a very cheap rate, but now it appears that the present incumbent, Mr. Demers, who is, by the way, a supporter of the present Government, has been lucky enough to get the office and also lucky enough to get a very good salary for it. I would ask my hon. friend, therefore, to give me on Concurrence the exact amount of the annual salary that he has received up to the present time, also the amount of arrears that has been paid to him, so that we may know what his salary is this year, and what has been paid him for the previous

year. It is impossible for us to ascertain these two items when they are lumped together as they are here.

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with the information before Concurrence.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I wish now to call attention to the St. Roch Division. Speaking only from information I have received, the amount of work done in that office is nearly as large as that done in the St. John's suburbs, and the salary and allowance for the St. Roch department are much less than they should be. I do not see why such an inequality exists in rent and in salaries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some time ago two deputations waited upon me asking for the establishment of a new post office in the St. Roch's suburbs, that is to say, in Quebec East. I stated to the deputation that they could not expect to have a second post office in the city of Quebec, where there was already a very good one. I told them they could not expect to have a second post office built at the expense of the Dominion, but if the postmaster there would furnish proper accommodation—because the accommodation he has now is not convenient or proper—with the sanction of the Postmaster-General to whom I referred the matter, that then the question of increasing the amount for rent would be considered by the Postmaster-General, and that this, with the increased rent given to him by the postmaster of the locality, they would have a good post office and proper accommodation. As to the salary, it is the same as in St. John suburbs; it is based on the same principle.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Do I understand the salary is entirely composed of a percentage on the amount collected?

Mr. CARLING. On the receipts and the accommodation of course.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the manner in which the mail service has been carried out between St. John and Digby. As I understood the contract, the parties were to provide a boat in summer, and another one in winter, adapted to winter navigation. During the winter before last a boat called the *Scud* was put on, but she was lost last year, and this winter there has been a little boat put on called *Hiawatha*. I am informed, and I know, that she is unable to perform the service on account of being too small. Considerable inconvenience is occasioned from the want of adequate communication between western Nova Scotia and St. John. The Minister's attention having been called to the fact, I trust he will compel the contractors to perform their contract, by having a proper boat placed on the route.

Mr. CARLING. No representation has been made to me on the subject, but I shall be glad to enquire into the service with a view to have any defects remedied.

Mr. VAIL. I am very glad the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has called the attention of the Postmaster-General to this service, for, otherwise, I should have felt it incumbent upon myself to have done so. Fifteen or twenty years ago, long before Confederation, we had good steamers of five or six hundred tons running across the bay in winter. Last year, however, in consequence of the company having the contract not owning a proper steamer for winter service, they placed on the route a vessel of 120 tons, to run across the bay three times a week. She has been in Digby harbor three or four days at a time, and passengers have been detained from proceeding to St. John to transact important business, and in some cases they made the long railway journey round, rather than cross the bay in that steamer. I do not think the people of Nova Scotia should be placed in a worse position under Confederation than they occupied fifteen years ago.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have railways now.

Mr. VAIL. It is true there are railways, but it is hardly worth while for passengers to take a railway journey of 250 or 300 miles, when they should be able to cross the bay, a distance of thirty-five or forty miles, in two or three hours. I hope the Minister will look into this matter, and see that we obtain the accommodation to which, I think, we are fairly entitled.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:15 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 9th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### THE CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in introducing Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada, said: This is a short Bill, and will be printed immediately and put into the hands of hon. gentlemen, when I will offer explanations in relation to the various points that it touches. I may say it mainly embraces the points that have been considered in the Railway Committee, and in which there is a consensus of opinion that the Consolidated Railway Act should be amended.

Bill read the first time.

### SUPPLY—ENGLAND'S COMMERCIAL POLICY.

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

Mr. McNEILL. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I beg the permission of the House to say a word or two upon a subject to which I am almost obliged to refer. Sometime ago, I ventured to assert that England was an exception to the general rule, that, during the last few years, all the countries of the world had been visited by a wave of prosperity. My statement was received by hon. gentlemen opposite apparently with some amusement, it was received with laughter, and at the time I was not exactly certain what the cause of that emotion might be. I was not sure whether at the time hon. gentlemen opposite were laughing at the fact, or were merely laughing because they were in ignorance of the fact. I had observed that early in the Session they had received, with somewhat rapturous applause, the statement that there had been a greater number of failures in Canada this year than last year; and I was for a short time doubtful whether they were not extending the same patriotic regard to the manufacturers and traders of the Mother Country that they seemed to entertain for the traders of their own country, and, therefore, as I said, I was a little doubtful of the exact significance of the emotion manifested by hon. gentleman opposite. But subsequently a speech was delivered upon the National Policy by my old friend the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and it then became very evident what the meaning of the laughter was on the other side of the House. It was then very clear that the emotion was produced, not because they were enjoying the fact, but because

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

they were in ignorance that such was the fact. My hon. friend, in his speech, thought it necessary to refer for nearly an hour to this matter, and endeavored to persuade the House and the country that the assertion was incorrect that I had made, namely, that England had not been visited by this great wave of prosperity of which we have heard so much. I thought that the speech of my hon. friend, considering the very limited horizon within which hon. gentlemen opposite view this matter, the very low standpoint from which they view the whole subject, was a very good speech. My hon. friend, however, referred to some matters which I thought were not quite in point. He gave us some historical references to the bread riots which had occurred in England some fifty years ago, and he quoted also an extract from Sydney Smith, which I confess I had not met with before, and which I thought was very much in point, as emphasising the fact that England had built up her industries under protective duties as high as 22 per cent. However, he proceeded to prove what I think no one on this side of the House would think of denying or controverting, that since England adopted the policy of free imports she had been very prosperous; we all admitted that. But he ought to have gone a little further, he ought to have endeavored to prove that England was prosperous to-day; his Free Trade principles ought to have carried him a little further even than that, and induced him to prove, not only that England was prosperous to-day, but that she was more prosperous than any other country in the world. We all know very well that England has been the only faithful among the faithless; she is the only country that carries out in its integrity the principle of one-sided Free Trade. I may just remark, before I pass on, that there is no question of Free Trade involved, because trade is selling as well as buying, and we cannot have Free Trade where there is not free selling. However, England being the only country that carries out strictly this policy of free imports, my hon. friend ought to have proved that she was much more prosperous than any of those countries that are weighed down, trammelled, and impeded in the race by this fallacious policy of Protection to native industries. I think that he had a glimmering idea himself of something of that kind, and I thought that he was going to make some attempt in that direction. I must say that he approached his task very gallantly; he hurled hundreds of millions at our heads, and he told us that he would prove this proposition by figures that he triumphantly declared the mind could not grasp. However, he did succeed in proving that England had, as I have said, prospered since she had adopted the policy of free imports. He said, however, that she had prospered more than any other country in the world; that the development of her trade, which had been very great, had been greater than that of any other country in the world, and that it was only in a country which had adopted Free Trade that such development could take place. So far as that proposition is concerned, I must take leave to differ from the hon. gentleman, and I propose to prove that, in making that proposition, he was in error. He took a period of twenty years to compare the trade of the two countries. I think that was not altogether a fair basis of comparison, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, during a very considerable part of that period—I think it touched upon five years—the United States were afflicted with the greatest civil war the world has ever seen. The hon. gentleman well knows, and the House is well aware, that the whole industrial condition of the United States, if I may use the expression, was dislocated by that war, in which some million of lives were lost, and hundreds of millions worth of property destroyed. For years the trade of the country was crippled on account of it, and it has not recovered from it to-day. For that reason I think I may fairly say this is not a fair comparison to make between the trade of the two countries; but I am quite willing to humor the hon. gentleman, and to

consider the trade of the two countries during the period he himself has selected. In the first place, I would remind the House that England started in the race with her trade something like five times the volume of that of the United States, £392,000,000 sterling being the trade of England, and \$379,000,000 being that of the United States; in other words, England had a start of something like £116,000,000 sterling; and in comparing the relative trade of the two countries during that period, it will be necessary to bear that fact in mind. There is another fact which must be borne in mind in comparing the trade of the two countries during that time. We must recollect that any considerable increase in the volume of the manufactures of England, implied an increase of exports; but in the United States that is not the case, because at the commencement of the race her manufactures were in their infancy, and did not command their own market, and they had to overcome that leeway, so to speak. In order to show how much the manufacturing industries of the United States could advance without there being an increase of exports, I point out that the quantity of Bessemer steel manufactured in the United States in 1871, was only 19,000 tons, while, in 1881, it reached 3,500,000 tons; and yet, notwithstanding this fact, they exported last year only 1,000 tons of rails, showing the enormous development that can take place in the manufactures of a new country like the United States, without any corresponding increase in exports. The reason why this home demand is so great is, first, because they are obliged to meet the needs of their half continent which they have to supply; and, second, because of the great increase in the population of the United States, which increased 14,000,000 in that time more than that of England. That increase in population alone would make an enormous difference in the export trade, even supposing they had not been obliged to expend their energies in developing their country otherwise. With respect to the whole volume of trade, the figures are these: The whole volume of the trade of England at the commencement of this period, was £392,000,000 sterling, and last year it had increased to £694,000,000. The hon. member said £611,000,000, but it was £694,000,000; that is to say, upon £392,000,000, there had been an increase of £300,000,000; in other words, there had been an increase of about 80 per cent. in the trade of England during the period of twenty years which the hon. member selected for comparison. I quite admit that is a wonderful increase; but I deny that it cannot be exemplified and equalled, and I am about to show that it has been very much exceeded by the trade of the United States during that period. The whole volume of the trade of the United States at the commencement of that period was \$379,000,000, and if it had increased at the same ratio as the trade of England had increased, it would, to-day, have amounted to \$679,000,000. But what do we find to be the fact? The trade of the United States, to-day, is not \$679,000,000, as it would have been if the increase had only been in the same proportion as that of England, but it is \$1,544,000,000; that is to say, the whole volume of the trade of the United States during the very period which the hon. gentleman himself selected, has increased, not 80 per cent., but about 300 per cent., and that under the blighting influence of this fallacious policy of Protection. Having dealt with the whole volume of trade, and shown that, under Protection, the trade of the United States increased 300 fold in place of 80 fold, the increase of England's trade, I will now refer to the export trade, and I will take again the countries and the time which the hon. gentleman selected, and I will institute a comparison. Now, the export trade of England at the commencement of this period was £166,000,000 sterling, and it is, to-day, £297,000,000 sterling; that is to say, it has increased at just about the same rate as the whole volume of her trade did,

because, although during the last decade the increase was much slower than it was at the beginning of the period, during the first decade the increase was more rapid than the increase of imports. The increase in her export trade was at the rate of about 80 per cent. Now, what was the increase in the export trade of the United States during that period? It has been, not 80 per cent., but from \$190,000,000 to \$902,000,000, or rather more than 400 per cent., in place of 80 per cent., as in the case of the trade of Great Britain. The hon. gentleman may say that a great portion of this increase in trade is in the products of agriculture, and that is true; but with regard to this matter I would just remark, in the first place, that those products have been fortunate enough to be protected in the United States, and, in the next place, that this is proof of the absurdity of the exclamation of my hon. friend, when he said that there were 50,000,000 of people manufacturing in the United States, competing with 35,000,000 who were manufacturing in England. It is very well known to the House, and to every one, that a very much larger proportion of the population of England is taken up with manufacturing than is the case in the United States; so that this objection falls to the ground. I will humor my hon. friend still further with regard to this matter. I will throw away altogether the exports of agriculture and of the forest, and leave out of consideration altogether the product of the labor of the great bulk of the people of the United States. I will compare the exports of the United States, exclusive of the products of agriculture and of the forest, with the whole exports of England; and then let us see what the figures are. Now, the exports of England, as I have stated, have increased 80 per cent., during this period which my hon. friend mentioned, and the exports of the United States, exclusive of agricultural exports, have, during this same period, increased from \$59,000,000 to \$181,000,000; that is to say, while the whole exports of England have increased at the rate of about 80 per cent., during the period which my hon. friend himself selected, during that same period the exports of the United States, exclusive of the products of agriculture, or of the forest, have increased not 80, but 200 per cent.; and this, notwithstanding the war to which I have referred, the increase of population, and the fact that her manufactures were at the start in their infancy, and had to make enormous strides to overtake the demands of their own markets. Even this is not a fair comparison; and I think I have gone a long way to make it fair for my hon. friend,—and for this reason: That the exports of England that I have spoken of, include her exports to her colonies, and it is very well known that her colonies are her best customers. The products of the country which has been punished by protective legislation during this period has had no colonies to buy her goods; therefore, this was an unfair comparison. However, I am willing to take it as it stands; but I may just show what an enormous advantage to England the possession of her colonies is. The falling off in the export of cotton from England with Germany, Holland, and Egypt, during the last ten years, has been 40 per cent., while with one of her colonies, India, the increase has been, during that period, 70 per cent.; so you see how extremely an unfair comparison this was for the protected country—but it is sufficient, I think, for my purpose. My hon. friend may say that the United States is a new country, and that there is something in that which has been beneficial. I do not desire to treat the hon. gentleman unfairly, and I will just refer to that matter also. If I have made my remarks at all clear, and if, at this late period of the Session, hon. gentlemen have been kind enough to listen to anything I have said, I think it is very clear that the fact of her being a new country is far from being an advantage to the manufacturers of the United States—just the opposite, it was necessary for these manufacturers to overtake the markets of that

country to supply the home demand, they being in their infancy at the commencement of this race. But I will take a country which is not a new country, and which has been cursed by this policy of Protection. I will take England's nearest continental neighbor, France, and I will compare the conditions of the trade of France with that of England. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that France, too, has suffered during this period—this same period of 20 years—and has been also afflicted by a very great and destructive war by, most skilful diplomacy forced on France at a time when she was unprepared. Hon. gentlemen will recollect very well that this war was carried into the very heart of her territory, and that the whole country was devastated by it, and what its results were. That country, at the conclusion of this war, found that her armies had been swept away into captivity, that the very flower of her manhood had been decimated, that her fields, as I have said, had been devastated, and that her whole political fabric, if I may be excused the expression, had been shattered like glass; and not only so, but in addition to the sufferings which this war imposed upon her, and all the losses which such a war must necessarily entail upon her, there had been deliberately heaped upon her such a burden of debt, as the wisest statesman in Europe considered must crush her and cripple her resources for fifty years to come. There had been, in fact, imposed on that country a debt of \$1,200,000,000, in addition to all the other losses which she sustained. Two of her most fertile and most valuable Provinces had also been torn away from her—and that was not all, because at the conclusion of this great war there was a blight, as everyone will recollect, to the vine in France. The vine was blighted, and in this way one of the principal sources of revenue was cut off from her. This was the condition of France at that time. Now, what is the condition of France to-day—this country which has been cursed by this policy of Protection. She is admitted by friend and foe to be one of the most solidly prosperous countries on the continent of Europe. That is the condition of things which has been brought about—by what sort of a policy? Was it brought about by the sort of happy-go-lucky-do-nothing-fly-on-the-wheel policy—of drift, which hon. gentlemen opposite pursued in their time? Was that the policy by which the statesmen of France produced this effect, and resuscitated and built up the industries of that country, which some ten or twelve years ago were so prostrate? Did these able statesmen say, like the hon. Minister of Finance of the late Government, that a man who said a Government could advance the interests of a country, knew nothing of what he was talking about? I think not. The policy adopted in that country was a strict policy of Protection, and we know, moreover, that it has become still more strict within the last two years, because the statesmen of France have utterly discarded the Treaty of Commerce with England, so that her statesmen, at all events, have not become dissatisfied with the results of a protective policy in that country.

Mr. THOMPSON. I rise to a question of order. I wish, Sir, to draw your attention to a habit which is in vogue in this House, and is sometimes carried to too great an extent. I refer to the throwing of paper. Last Session the hon. the First Minister drew the attention of the then Speaker to this habit, and for a time it ceased. It is again becoming prevalent, and while it may be a source of amusement to some hon. members it may lead to serious consequences. I for one will not hold myself accountable for any mischief that may occur at my hands if I am suddenly struck in this way. My temper may be aroused, and cause me to do something which I would as quickly regret. I trust, Sir, you will exercise your influence, and see that this childish, unparliamentary, and undignified conduct is put a stop to.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. SPEAKER. I quite and entirely agree with the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made with regard to the practice of throwing paper in the House. It is a most unparliamentary, unbecoming, and undignified habit, which I have endeavored heretofore to put a stop to, and I have asked hon. gentlemen to desist from that practice. Hon. members who have been in this House for some time will remember that some years ago an accident, which was very nearly being a serious one, happened one evening from this practice; and it is of the utmost consequence that it should not be indulged in. I hope that it will at least be diminished and put a stop to altogether, and I ask hon. gentlemen to assist me in having it put a stop to.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry to see that the trade of France is very seriously interfering with that of the Mother Country at the present time, and that at least two large industries, which formerly were very flourishing in England, which gave employment to a vast number of people and produced a great deal of wealth, have been very seriously crippled and almost destroyed by the competition produced under this wretched Protective policy. I refer to the silk industry and the sugar refining industry. I find that the exports of refined sugar from France to England, are to-day, greater than the whole exports of refined sugar from England to all the rest of the world. The whole value of the exports of refined sugar from England are £1,218,000 sterling; from France to England, exports were £1,341,000 sterling; and France, to-day, exports five times as much refined sugar as England does.

Mr. DAVIES. Does that include taffy?

Mr. McNEILL. That includes everything. The silk industry in Coventry has almost entirely disappeared—the looms are silent and idle to-day. I call the attention of the House to some facts with regard to the woollen industry which is one of England's staple manufactures. I find, from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 3rd of March, 1882, that England exported to France £3,000,000 sterling worth of manufactured woollen goods, while France exported to England £4,500,000—that is to say, France actually exports one-half as much more to England as England, sends to France. With regard to manufactured goods, I find that France exports of these goods to England and which directly compete with England's manufactured goods in the English market, £20,000,000 sterling worth, while England exports to France less than £9,000,000. This is a fact which shows the effect of the policy of Protection as compared with the policy of Free Trade between two old countries in Europe which lie alongside one another. My hon. friend said, when he was comparing the trade of England and the United States, that the large figures which represented this trade could not be grasped by the mind, and he said that they might be somewhat misleading, and he would take some particular instances. He referred to the cotton industry, and he said that the exports of English cotton were £70,000,000 sterling, and he said of that £70,000,000 a large proportion went to the United States. I know the hon. gentleman well enough to be sure that he would be the last person in the world to make such a statement, unless he believed it to be the case; but I beg to inform him that he is entirely mistaken, and I will give him an authority which he will not gainsay—I refer to Mr. Chamberlain, President of the English Board of Trade, and the ablest representative of the Manchester school in that country. He said, on the floor of the House of Commons, that the export of cotton from England to the United States was not £70,000,000, and not a very large proportion of £70,000,000, but only £3,500,000. I find, by the Trade and Navigation Returns, so far as I can make them out after looking into the matter very carefully, that the exports for the last year were only £1,750,000. If you allow for the difference of population, you will find there is an export of 1½ millions

worth of cotton from the United States to England, against £1,750,000 from England to United States. And if you take into consideration the different circumstances of the two countries, if you recollect that this was one of the staple manufactures of England, while the American manufacturers were in their infancy at the commencement of this period, if you recollect the enormous growth of their population, and that these importations of \$1,125,000 were in direct conflict with the manufacturers of England in their own market, while the importation into the United States did not mean anything of the kind, but only that the manufacturers of the United States could not overcome the demand for these goods within their own market, the fact is a very significant one. The hon. gentleman refers to the woollen industries, and with respect to them I shall take him on his own ground. He says that England sends to the United States some £11,000,000 sterling worth of woollen goods. I wish to inform my hon. friend that he is entirely mistaken. Mr. Chamberlin says that from different countries the United States imports about that amount; and according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the United States imported from England last year only some \$2,800,000 worth. Now, during the latter part of the twenty years to which my hon. friend refers, there has been a most extraordinary development in the woollen industries of the United States, while these industries in England are in a very unsatisfactory condition. During five years the importations of woollen goods from England to the United States have decreased from \$50,000,000 to \$25,000,000; and during that time, while these industries were being so rapidly developed in the United States, prices were diminishing, and the quality of the goods was improving. Mr. Mitchell, one of the members of the Bradford Chamber of Commerce, and one of the judges of woollen fabrics at the Centennial Exhibition, says, of the worsted industries of the United States, that "the manufacture of the United States is of comparatively recent origin, but it has made very rapid progress during the last ten or twelve years, the high Tariff having stimulated its development." That is the evidence on this question of one of the best authorities of England. The condition of things in England, as I have said, is so unsatisfactory that while Germany, Holland, and the United States, in 1872, took £22,000,000 worth of woollen goods from England, in 1880, they took only £7,000,000 worth. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, in March of last year, said that these industries were in a most unsatisfactory condition, and this year it says the same thing; and you will find, if you refer to any of the trade journals in England, that there is a complaint, throughout the length and breadth of the land, of the unsatisfactory state of the woollen industries there. The imports of woollen manufactured goods are increasing in England under Free Trade, while they are diminishing in the United States under Protection. The imports into England during the three years 1869-71 were £3,500,000, and in the three years 1878-81, when trade was dull, the imports had actually increased to £6,500,000, during the very time that the imports of the same class of goods into the United States had fallen off 50 per cent. Now, at Bradford, the centre of the woollen industries in England, there was, in 1881, a petition signed in the course of a few days by 10,000 people, praying the Government to investigate the whole question of the trade relations of England with foreign powers, simply owing to the miserable condition of the woollen industries and the half starving condition of the working population there; and the *Economist*, one of the most reliable trade journals in England, referring to the unsatisfactory condition of the linen and jute industries during the last twelve months, incidentally alludes to the cotton and woollen trades, and this is what it says:

"It is, on the whole, better this year than it was last year, but it was still far from satisfactory."

My hon. friend also speaks of the iron and steel industries, and he says that these industries have been in such an unsatisfactory condition in the United States under Protection that they have had to import a great deal of iron and steel from England. Now, if there is any one thing more than another which has proved the beneficial effect of Protective duties, it is the development of the iron and steel industries of the United States. These industries, during the ten years of the period my hon. friend speaks of, have increased 100 per cent. in the United States, and only 17 per cent. in England. The United States are, to-day, the largest manufacturers of Bessemer steel in the world. In 1870, they manufactured only 19,000 tons; in 1877, they had increased their manufacture to 775,000 tons; and, according to the best computation that can be made, it is computed that their present annual manufacture is something like 3,250,000 tons. The capital invested in iron manufacture in the United States has increased 90 per cent. during the past ten years. The competition that the English manufacturers of iron and steel have to endure in the Canadian market, is a sufficient proof of what the effect of the Free Trade policy has been. If my hon. friend will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find, notwithstanding the policy adopted by the hon. Finance Minister, notwithstanding the care taken to give every advantage to English manufactures, the United States manufacturers are killing the trade of the English manufacturers in our markets in thirty-three or thirty-four lines of iron and steel goods. The same thing has occurred in Australia; and I have extracts, with which I shall not trouble the House, from statements made by some of the most influential members of the Committee of Judges at the Centennial Exhibition, showing that the United States had at that time become a most dangerous and most formidable rival to England in those industries to which the hon. gentleman referred. In Australia we find the same thing occurring, that the iron and steel manufacturers of the United States are cutting out the manufacturers of the Mother Country there. In the export trade the volume of exports from England to the United States has fallen off in the most extraordinary way during the last ten years. It has fallen off in the matter of woollen goods, to which my hon. friend refers, to the extent I have mentioned; it has fallen off in flax, from £21,000,000 to £13,000,000; in cotton, from £27,000,000 to £10,000,000; in iron and steel, from £46,000,000 to £6,000,000; in silk industries, from £18,000,000 to £3,000,000. Even Mr. Mundella, who, I think, my hon. friend will admit is sufficiently good authority, speaking at Sheffield in 1873, said:

"America is not only supplying her own country with goods, but is exporting her manufactures to such an extent that she has become a powerful rival of England."

Quotations of the same kind could be multiplied indefinitely. On the floor of the House of Commons, Mr. Ritchie called attention to the fact that there had been a decrease in the whole export trade from England of 30 per cent. from 1872 to 1880, and Mr. Hurlbert, whose work I have here, calls attention to the fact that during the last twelve years there has been a decrease in the exports from England to Germany of 33 per cent.; to Holland, 36 per cent.; to the United States, 23 per cent. In the matter of cotton yarns there has been a falling off with Germany from £6,000,000 to £1,500,000. The volume of trade during that time has increased in England, 21 per cent.; while in Holland, Belgium, France and Germany, the increase has been 57, 51 and 39 per cent., and in the United States, 68 per cent. during that time; or, in the United States the volume of trade increased three times that of England. In the staple industries of England, there has been rather a surprising increase in the import of her own staple goods during two years, from 1878 to 1880, averaging from 25 to 30 per cent.

in cottons, 20 to 25 per cent. in woollens, and 30 to 40 per cent. in iron. Now, my hon. friend took exception to my having said that England had not been blest with this wave of prosperity with which all the other countries have been blest; but he quoted not one figure, not one dictum, to disprove the truth of that statement. I will not weary the House with quoting figures on this subject, but I will quote evidence, which even my hon. friend cannot gainsay, to prove the absolute correctness of my statements. I will quote from what Mr. Gladstone, who, I suppose, is a reasonably good authority, said on this subject in 1881, on the floor of the House of Commons, when producing his Budget Speech, he being then Chancellor of the Exchequer. At the very time when hon. gentlemen opposite were talking about the great wave of prosperity from which all countries were benefiting, he said of Free Trade England:

"The revenue is just beginning to recover from a serious depression. The House will perceive from the figures I have made, that the impressions current in some quarters regarding the degree in which the revenue has revived, are more sanguine than the facts have warranted. There is upon the whole a beginning of recovery; but I do not think it will be judicious to describe it as more than a beginning."

Then he makes this remark further on, in the middle of his speech:

"We make ground at such rate and for such a long time that people begin to believe we shall never cease to make ground: but I wish Parliament to understand that we are not making ground at present."

That is 1881.

"I speak of the last few years, and without reference to party differences, and I say we are rather losing than making ground."

What was the condition of Canada then? We all recollect very well when the hon. Minister of Finance came down in 1881 and declared here, on the floor of Parliament, that he had a surplus of some \$4,300,000; that the industries of Canada had been raised from the point of depression and despair to a condition of such prosperity as surprised not only this House and the country, but the civilized world. We heard the statements made on the other side that this was merely a result of the great wave of prosperity; but that wave of prosperity was not bearing England on its crest, for, at that time, she was in the trough of the sea. Mr. McIvor, of Birkenhead, said, on the floor of the House of Commons, at that very time:

"He believed that ere long a cry would come from the working classes of the country for a reversal of our present policy."

What did Mr. Gladstone say in 1882? He said:

"With respect to the general financial condition of the country, I will only say that essentially the position of expenditure is that it is a somewhat growing expenditure; and with respect to the revenue, that it is a somewhat sluggish revenue."

This was in 1882.

"It is as much as it has been during the last two years."

We know what it was in 1881.

"It is very remarkable that although employment is generally active and although the condition of trade cannot be said to be generally satisfactory, yet the recovery of the country from the point of extreme depression has been a slow and languid recovery, especially as far as regards the action of that recovery upon the revenue of the country."

That year the hon. Finance Minister declared a surplus of over \$6,000,000. And Mr. Childers, in his Budget of 1883, says:

"Although many items of revenue have been for a long time sluggish, they are now rising."

Only "rising!" A little further on he says:

"I am bound to say that, having looked well through the revenue, as well as the expenditure, I cannot find that the Exchequer has as yet received anything in other directions, to make up for the great fall in the revenue from spirits."

Sir Stafford Northcote said:

"It is very satisfactory to find that the condition of the country is not so bad as we had some reason to think."

Mr. McNEILL.

And the *Times*, on the 6th April, instant, said:

"It was known that the surplus, of which we had to dispose, though fairly satisfactory, as a proof that the country was not unprosperous, was, as a matter of fact, a small one."

The London *Times* of the next day said:

"Without in the least desiring to take a pessimist view of our national condition, we venture to say that it is not one which dispenses us from strict caution and economy. In some respects it may be described as precarious. \* \* \* Though the volume of our trade remains, the profit has been reduced."

Mr. Rylands, in bringing forward his motion in the House, with regard to the national expenditure, referred to the unsatisfactory state of trade, and enforced his argument in favor of economy by a reference to the unsatisfactory condition of agriculture. Mr. Smith, late First Lord of the Admiralty, also referred to the depressed state of trade and agriculture. I may say that there has been a falling off of the volume of trade of England for the first three months of the present year. Now, I think, that under these circumstances, it is not necessary for me to say more to prove that the condition of England has not been one of prosperity at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite have been declaring that the whole world was prosperous, as an explanation of the fact that Canada was prosperous. My hon. friend knows very well that there has been a great reaction in England against this one-sided Free Trade.

Mr. DAVIS No, no.

Mr. McNEILL, In support of that statement, I will give an authority which I think no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will gainsay. I will read an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, on the occasion of the introduction of a motion by Mr. Richie, calling for an investigation of the whole trade relations of England with foreign powers. Mr. Gladstone said:

"Unfortunately the knowledge of the fact that proposals for a Committee of Inquiry had been supported by the late leader of the House of Commons could not be confined within these walls or within these shores. They would go abroad, and how would the right hon. gentleman face the consequences of his success (Ministerial cheers.) Did he not know very well that the knowledge of such a vote going throughout England and the civilized world at once became the strong argument in favor of Protection and hostile tariffs? (Oh! and cheers.) The advocates of Protection would then be able to say that the delusion of Free Trade, even in its very stronghold, was shaken to its base, and that one of the great parties in the country by the mouth of its leader admitted that it had become a subject for solemn inquiry. (Cheers.)"

Now, Mr. Gladstone, I suppose, can explain away his own words as well as any other person, probably better; but at all events the fact remains immovable that a proposal for an investigation into the question as to whether the policy of one-sided Free Trade was good or bad for England, was made in the House of Commons in England, and was supported by the leader of one of the great parties of the State; and this fact also remains, that eighty-nine members of the House of Commons supported that motion against 140 who were opposed to it. My hon. friend knows that while he himself was in England, only a few years ago, it would have been impossible for any member to get up on the floor of the House of Commons and suggest such an investigation and obtain a hearing. It certainly proves what the feeling in England is, and that the feeling in England is growing that this delusion of Free Trade is shaken to its base.

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

(In the Committee.)

175. Geological Survey..... \$60,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At the time the vote for Civil Government was up, I explained that the whole vote for this branch of the service, last year—some \$30,000—was included in the expenses of the Department. By a new

arrangement, the cost of the Geological Survey branch of the Department is charged under the head of Civil Government. In consequence of the rapidly increasing development of the North-West, it is thought that we should properly come before Parliament and ask them for a larger sum than has hitherto been voted for the purpose of the survey alone. I think some hon. gentleman opposite asked in what direction the survey was to be made during the year, and I shall lay upon the Table of the House, with all possible speed, a return by which hon. gentlemen may see where the work is to be done. The work proposed to be done during the present year lies in seven different districts: 1. At the Rocky Mountains, starting at the boundary line; 2. On the South Saskatchewan and a little further east; 3. A little to the north of that, and all the western country; 4. The Rainy River district; 5. The Province of Quebec—the Gaspé district and the south bank of the St. Lawrence; 6. New Brunswick; 7. Nova Scotia. I beg to lay on the Table a map showing the progress of the geographical survey. The officers who have charge of the surveys during the coming season are as follows:—Dr. G. M. Dawson, Mr. A. Bowman, and Mr. R. G. McConnell, in British Columbia and the North West; Dr. Bell and Mr. Cochrane, in the Lake of the Woods district and Western Ontario; Mr. Ellis and Mr. Low, in South Eastern Quebec—Schickshock Mountains; Mr. W. Broad and Mr. McInnes, in New Brunswick; Mr. H. Fletcher, Mr. McMillin, Mr. Brunell, and Mr. Faribault, in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CHARLTON. I observe that, out of a total of \$64,553, only \$18,000 was expended for exploration, the salaries of the staff amounting to \$25,627. The most important work of the branch is that of exploration, and the corps seems to be composed much like a company composed of a captain, sergeant, corporal, and two privates. I am glad that the amount for exploration purposes is to be increased.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad the amount of money to be voted for actual field-work is going to be so largely increased. I urged last year, as did other hon. members on this side of the House, that more money should be devoted to exploration work, especially in the North-West. I urged that, although exploration in comparatively well-known parts of Old Canada was useful in a national sense, yet, as the land in most of the districts is now in private hands, explorations were practically an advertisement for the parties who owned the lands and mines; but that the chief energies of the survey should be devoted to exploring and making known to the world the great territory which still belongs to the people of Canada, the North-West. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to still another point, namely, that sufficient attention has scarcely been bestowed to one of the purposes for which this survey was originally instituted. It is called the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada. Hitherto, insufficient attention has been paid to the subject of natural history. Of course it is exceedingly important to know what is underground, but it is of even more pressing importance, as regards immigration, to know what is on the top of the ground, to know what is grown naturally in every part of our territory. The object of geological exploration is to develop mines and products, such as stone, phosphate, &c.; but as our territory is chiefly agricultural, I think at least half the money and energy of the Department should be devoted to explorations respecting botany and natural history, and it is more important to know what are the fauna and flora than to know what are the minerals. A much wider extent of territory can be explored as regards its natural history than as regards its geology. The latter is a very slow business except in river valleys, but a very large extent of country can be surveyed in a year in

regard to its natural history. We have all read the the works of the active explorers of the North-West, and derived such information from the description of the capabilities of the country. When we read, that in the Peace River district such plants grow naturally which we know flourish in Ontario, Quebec, and other Provinces, we can form an idea of the climate and its capability for grain growing. It has been considered that in estimating the grain-growing capacity of a country, it was necessary to take account of the average temperature for the year; but it is now asserted that it is only the temperature during the summer months that has an important bearing in regard to cereals, and I think there is great force in the assertion, and that it is borne out by the fact that in districts of the North-West where the temperature falls to 50 or 60 degrees below zero in winter, cereal plants flourish naturally which flourish here. The inference is strong that if such be the case, cereals, to which we attach so much importance, will also grow. The fauna of the country is also deserving of more attention than it has received. The animal life of new districts should be carefully observed with a view to stock raising in the future. It is reasonable to suppose that when the buffalo and mustang obtain sufficient pasture during the summer, domestic cattle would do so, and the habitat should be carefully studied. I think, hitherto, on account of the great genius of Sir William Logan, who was an eminent geologist, and put so much genius and energy into the work, the second object of the survey, which should not be second in importance, has been too much neglected, and it is time the Department should devote more energy and more money to the study of natural history. In this connection I may mention that I have seen a discussion taking place in the papers with respect to a valuable collection of plants and birds said to be in existence in this country, in the possession of Professor Macoun, and which it is proposed to purchase for the Geological and Natural History Museum. I am sorry to notice from some letters which have appeared in the newspapers that there is some danger of this splendid collection going to the United States, as he has received offers from that quarter. It is stated that this collection contains 10,000 specimens of the birds and plants of the North-West; and we all know what opportunities the Professor has had for studying these matters and collecting such specimens; how far and wide he explored the North-West Territories, and what a collection he had the opportunity of bringing together. If any proof of the value of his services in this connection were required, it might be found in the fact that the collection of 2,500 plants which he sent to the Paris Exhibition in 1878, and were afterwards presented by the Government to the museum at Kew, is said, by Mr. Joseph Hooker, to be the most valuable individual collection of specimens that ever came into that museum. If so, I think it follows that his collection of 10,000 specimens must be something of surpassing value, which should not be allowed to go out of this country at the expense of the paltry consideration of a few hundred dollars, or \$2,000 for that matter. Even if it were not of surpassing value, the fact stares us in the face that if it goes out of the country it will almost be impossible to replace it. Certainly to do so we would have to send another explorer of equal ability, having equal opportunities, to make such a large collection. I would strongly urge on the Department the desirability of finding out what Prof. Macoun will take for his collection, which, I believe, is not large. We know that such collections obtain high prices in the States, and I would like to know whether any negotiations, respecting this collection, are on foot. As to maps of the North-West, I do not want to be too critical, especially as to the labors of a scientific department; but it does seem to me that maps published by the Geological Department, regarding the North-West,

are too insufficient in detail to be of much practical service. I have seen maps of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, under exploration, made in the greatest detail for publication, and while it might not be possible to go into such detail with respect to the North-West, more details should be furnished, if this would not entail too great expense. These maps should show not merely the geographical features, but also the natural products as they at present exist, in some detail, such as the kinds of grasses, and shrubs, &c., which grow in each district. This might be effected by means of an index and reference numbers. I infer from the hon. gentleman's statement, that the coal lands are to receive special attention this year. Of course, a great number of these lands have passed out of our hands, and half of them in the railway belt, at least, are owned by the Quebec and Occidental Railway; but still it is of great importance undoubtedly to explore these lands. I hope that the mistake which occurred during the past year, of having a certain number of holes bored at specified depths in certain parts of the country, will not be repeated. A couple of years ago, in the Souris District, holes 200 feet in depth were bored at arbitrary points. At one of them south of the River Valley I believe coal was found, but the next hole though made on the plateau 200 feet above, was only bored to the same depth, and consequently the coal bearing strata was not reached. If holes are bored for this purpose, I hope that they will be put down to the strata, where geologists expect to find coal.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Some three or four years ago, the hon. Minister will remember, I, in conjunction with the then representatives of Lunenburg and Queen's counties, in a letter to the Department, urged on him the importance of having the western section of Nova Scotia examined by the officers of the Geological Survey Department, and he then promised that this would be done as early as possible. I notice in this plan, that all the eastern section of Nova Scotia, including Cape Breton, has been examined and reported upon, very valuable reports and maps being prepared. That section has been fully surveyed by the officers of the Local Government during years gone by, when most valuable reports were prepared and submitted to the Mines Departments, and I would urge that, as early as possible, the western section of the Province, which, I believe, will yet be found to possess vast mineral wealth, will be surveyed by officers of the Department. I notice in this plan, that nearly all the Province of New Brunswick has been surveyed and reported upon, while it is proposed this year almost to complete the entire survey of that Province. I think that the officers of the Department in the past, have not done that justice to the western section of Nova Scotia which they seem to have done in other sections, and I, therefore, hope that the hon. gentleman will remember his promise, and have the western section surveyed as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), it is quite true that we ought to pay, if we had the money, full attention to the natural history of the country, both fauna and flora; but the main object of the Geological Survey, since it was first established, has been to define the geological position of the country, because that is the basis of the further enquiries which we hope to make by-and-bye, but which we cannot make all at once. As to the fauna and flora, and the general character of the country for agricultural and other purposes, of course the general direction of the survey, the extent to which it will go, and so on, are left considerably in the hands of Dr. Selwyn, a man of the highest standing in the profession, as the hon. gentleman knows. He is a man of European and Australian reputation as well. When Sir William Logan, of whom the hon. gentleman has not spoken too highly, felt from his increasing age that he could not

Mr. CASEY.

long remain at the head of the survey, he went to England for the purpose of obtaining the best possible man as his successor, and he was left with almost unlimited discretion in the matter. He consulted the leading authorities, including Sir Roderick Murchison, who was at the head of that branch of science in England, and, perhaps, the first geologist of the day, and on his recommendation, and that of Sir William Logan, Mr. Selwyn, the present Director General was selected. I believe he has fully justified the selection, for he is an admirable officer; and I think it would in some degree interfere with this system, if we were to interpose our own ideas upon scientific matters connected with the survey. The system has been kept up for years thoroughly well considering the limited means of the old Province of Canada at the time it was commenced. It has been followed with a great deal of perseverance and system, and as we are getting richer and the country is becoming more developed, Parliament can from time to time devote a larger sum for the purposes of a geological survey. As regards the further auxiliary duty connected with the natural history of the country, unless Parliament increases the vote very largely—perhaps more largely than the present Parliament would be inclined to vote or the people consent to give. So that we must be satisfied as they have been in the United States to limit in a great degree the duties of the geological survey to that branch only of the fiscal sciences which is the principal and chief object of the survey. By-and-bye, I have no doubt, we can increase the vote and increase the area of the survey. I think it would be most likely—though I speak with a great deal of diffidence, because I do not profess to be a man much acquainted with the natural sciences—that, in order to fully carry out an enquiry into the natural history of the country and its capabilities of various kinds, apart from geology in its strict sense, we would have to have another branch. Dr. Selwyn, though an able geologist and a generally accomplished man, could not be expected to be an authority on all the other branches of natural science, or to be able to carry them into the field. I think, however, that a great deal of information has been incidentally obtained on the branches of which the hon. gentleman speaks, and we have also a very considerable amount of information given us on the rough field notes of the surveyors who travel in that country. There is, in these notes, a great deal of information about the soil, the capabilities of the country, &c.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. gentleman did not understand me to cast any doubt on the scientific ability of Dr. Selwyn, who is, without doubt, a distinguished geologist. He certainly, however, could not have become so distinguished in that branch of natural science if he had devoted any considerable attention to other branches. I think that if the hon. gentleman holds the view that the other branches are intended by the Act to be only auxiliary he is mistaken. The Act establishes the survey as a natural history and geological survey, and I hold that for all practical purposes, for the development of the country and the attraction of immigrants, and the advertising of its capabilities abroad, natural history is not inferior in importance to the other branch. And I mean by natural history not merely the animal life of the country, but the investigation of all animal and vegetable products of the country for the purpose of ascertaining what may be propagated or cultivated with profit. The hon. gentleman says if we had money enough we might extend this branch, but at present we must devote ourselves to the geological branch. We are voting a large increased amount this year, and my contention is that a large share of this vote should not be devoted altogether to extending the geological surveys, but to instituting very considerable natural history exploration. The practical importance, or the commercial importance of geological sur-



vey is confined to a few districts where minerals are known or supposed to exist. The coal lands of the North-West, or of Nova Scotia, or in the mining districts about Rainy Lake, are all proper places for a geological exploration; but it makes very little difference to the intending settler what stratum underlies a particular part of the great plains of the North-West unless for the purpose of guessing what sort of soil is on top. But the plains of the North-West are very uniform, and a few borings a few hundred miles apart will settle the question of soil for large districts, and, in fact, it is always pretty well settled. We know what kind of soil we may expect *a priori* in any particular part of a district; but the most important thing for the settler to know is what he will grow upon the soil. He reasons that if plants grow there with which he is familiar in his own country, whether it be Europe or Old Canada, then the grains with which he is familiar will grow there too, and we know by experience that this reasoning is pretty correct. I do not complain of a geological survey being carried on where it is necessary; but I think, at the same time, that explorations in natural history should also be carried on, if we are to know what the country possesses, and what it will produce. We have all felt during the last few years that the lands of the North-West have been sold and given away in various ways, without a due appreciation of their value. Some idea of that value is now beginning to dawn upon all of us; but I do not think we shall have a proper idea of the value of these lands until we have such a survey as I have spoken of, as the law intends we should have, and as common sense dictates. With regard to directing the survey, the hon. gentleman says that he has not interfered with Mr. Selwyn, because he is a scientific man, and it would be like interfering with an expert. That is right enough. As to the other details of the work, he should not interfere with Mr. Selwyn as to the manner of surveying any particular neighborhood; but it is part of the policy of the Government to declare at what places the surveys should be made, and then to leave the director to conduct them in the proper manner which he has done. If it is the practice of the Government to place an expert at the head of the Department, and leave him to do whatever he chooses, the hon. gentleman could secure some land speculators in Winnipeg at very reasonable figures, if he would leave them to do the business of the Department without interference; and the work would be done thoroughly, but it does not follow that it would be properly done. Nor does it follow that because a man is a scientific man, he should know in what part of the country public policy requires surveys to be carried on; on the contrary, if a man is a scientific man, he is not likely to trouble himself about policy so much as about interesting scientific research. It might be a matter of great interest to him to know that Devonian strata existed at a certain place, without caring for the capabilities of the district for agriculture or stock raising; but that is not the interest of the Government, whose duty it is to find out what that country is good for; and I say that it is the duty of the responsible Minister of the Department to direct these surveys to be conducted with that view. It is quite true, if we should decide upon having a natural history survey, that Mr. Selwyn would not be qualified to direct it with the same efficiency that he does the geological branch. That is quite probable; but for that very reason the services of some man who is posted in natural history should be obtained; and I do not know anyone better qualified to conduct a natural history survey than Professor Macoun. If it is necessary to establish a separate branch, and I do not say it is, either Professor Macoun or some other man of experience in natural history, would be a very proper person to conduct it. Where would have been the "boom" in the North-West but for the explorations of Mr. Sandford Fleming, Mr. Horetzky,

and others, whose reports advertised the capabilities of the North-West to the world? And it is by such explorations that we are going to learn the value of that country more than by geological explorations. I hope, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will reconsider this matter, and decide to undertake the kind of survey I have suggested.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that I left it altogether to the Director to make the selection. I said I left pretty much the direction of the surveys to him; but if the hon. gentleman will look at the work laid out for the year 1883-84, he will see that the Director has selected, after conference with the Government, that part of the country of most interest to the settler in the North-West.

Mr. CASEY. To the geologist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; for coal and minerals. I forgot to answer the hon. gentleman about Professor Macoun's collection. Negotiations are now going on, and part of this vote is to be applied to the purchase of this collection, and \$6,000 to the purchase of Mr. Hirschfelder's collection of the flora in the Indian country of the North-West.

Mr. BLAKE. For a long time I have entertained very strong opinions, which I have expressed in this House and elsewhere, of the importance of some such steps as my hon. friend Mr. Casey has suggested. Some efforts have been made, it is true, but in a desultory and perfunctory way, considering the importance of the question, towards increasing our knowledge of the soil and its products in the North-West. We have had the information contained in the surveyor's field notes; but, of course, surveyors, although habituated to observation from being in the country, are not trained in the various topics which would make their reports much more reliable than those of ordinary land prospectors, and the results so obtained must necessarily be deficient in accuracy and in precision. Professor Macoun was called upon to make a very rapid and necessarily cursory investigation of the country. Our present survey has been very much devoted to the question of geology. I am not saying one word against continuing; on the contrary, I agree in the wisdom of continuing our efforts towards increasing our geological knowledge of the country. What was done before Confederation is no measure of what is required now, because the Province of British Columbia, of enormous extent, and the whole North-West Territories of still vaster extent have been added, and we must make efforts which, compared with our former efforts, would be entirely disproportionate, if we come up to the exigencies of the occasion. So far as the North-West is concerned, that portion of the geological survey which is devoted to the ascertainment of the extent of the fuel supply, is as important as any other object. But I have long said that I believe with very great strength of conviction, that what we ought to do is to go very strongly into a natural history survey. Continue your geological explorations of those parts of the North-West which are attractive to geologists, and afford a fair scope for geological survey—and that geological survey should be thorough and exhaustive if it is to afford a permanent record of very great value—continue your geological explorations in the older Provinces; but let us send out two or three parties for a somewhat rapid, but still practical and thorough examination of the different sections of the North-West with a view to their natural history.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the hon. gentleman includes botany.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course; the flora and fauna and the physical conditions of the country, which are on the surface, and are important to the general public in learning what manner of land that is; what the barometer says, and the thermometer says; what can be gathered from those

who have settled in the Hudson's Bay posts; the story of the past with reference to the cultivation of cereals and other things at these points. By taking up different sections of the country at sufficiently remote distances, and by ascertaining thoroughly what is to be ascertained on this subject, we would do something of note—to tell the world with authority and precision what there is in the North-West. Take the whole of the North-West district; take the Peace River district, that part of which some people think very highly. We ought to know more about it. We ought to be engaged in ascertaining the facts with reference to the duration of the seasons, to the period at which it is possible to sow and reap grain, whether the season is too short, whether the danger of frost is going to prevent the possibility of our cultivating cereal crops in that country, and what there is in it. I learn that of the vote which we supposed was for geological exploration, \$6,000, or about one-tenth of it, are to be devoted to the purchase of Professor Hirschfelder's collection. That may be a very proper object. We learn, also, that an indefinite amount is to be devoted to the purchase of another collection. That may also be a very proper object; but the sum required for these two collections will seriously trench upon the amount applicable for the geological survey. No expenditure would be more likely than this to be remunerative and presently remunerative. We want to know what our property is composed of before disposing of the rest of it, and to promote the efficient settlement of the part we have sold. We want to be able to give, as rapidly as possible, more and more exact information as to the natural history, in the extended sense to which the hon. gentleman referred, as to the physical features of the country, than we have yet given. I would very cheerfully take the responsibility of submitting a further proposal for a well considered, thorough and rapid survey by two or three parties in different portions of the country—widely apart as to degrees of latitude and longitude—so that we may be able to say we give samples in different points of what the features of the country are, and what the prospects are for the finding by settlers of a pleasant country in which to settle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very much pleased with the tone of the hon. gentleman's remarks in regard to this survey. You, Mr. Chairman, who are an old Parliamentarian, will remember that the general opinion of the country in the old Province of Canada was rather averse to a survey, and that, time and again, we had almost to imperil our existence as a Government to carry the vote for the continuance of the Geological Survey. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has said. I know from the information given me by the Director General that this sum of \$60,000 will be amply sufficient for the survey that can really be accomplished in the season of 1883. With regard to the more extended operations of this Department, we must rush things. If we are going in to consider how to prepare a methodical, thorough and scientific system of obtaining natural, botanical and atmospherical calculations, climatic changes, and so on, we must do so on a well considered, scientific system; and with the encouragement given me by the hon. gentleman it will be my pleasant duty to work out, with the assistance of men who understand the subject, some system in the enlarged sense of which the hon. gentleman speaks, and submit it to Parliament next Session.

Mr. CHARLTON. The matter under discussion is one of very great importance, and one in which I have taken great interest in the past. In 1873, a motion was moved in this House calling for a geological and geographical survey and exploration of the North-West. That motion was renewed on two subsequent Sessions, and, I believe, if the policy had been pursued that was asked, the country

Mr. BLAKE.

would have been vastly the gainer. The geographical exploration which has been fully explained by the hon members for West Durham and West Elgin, need not be expensive. In fact, it strikes me that geographical explorations should precede a geological survey. Nearly all the knowledge obtained of new countries—for instance the knowledge obtained of Africa—has been acquired in this way, namely, by explorations at the expense of private enterprise. Sir Samuel Baker, at his own expense, explored the Upper Nile, and discovered the Lakes Victoria Nyanza and Albert Nyanza. David Livingstone, the African traveller, on the salary of a missionary—and very low salary at that—explored South Africa during the sixteen years he spent there before his first return to England, and gave us all the information we really possess of that country. He removed the impression that the interior of Africa was a sandy waste, and laid bare the fact that it contained immense plains of great fertility. He discovered the Zambezi, and traversed the continent first to Angola on the west coast and then to the mouth of the Zambezi on the east coast, and afterwards, at the expense of £1,000 sterling per annum from the Royal Geographical Society, he pursued the investigations which resulted in so large an extension of our knowledge of Africa. Stanley, who explored the Congo from its upper waters to its mouth, did so at the expense of two newspapers; the cost of his explorations amounting to \$50,000. The United States, at a very early period of its history, adopted this course of ascertaining the character of its new territories. Some fifty years ago an extensive expedition was formed, under the name of the Lewiston-Clark expedition. The staff of this expedition comprised some officers whose training at West Point well fitted them for work of this kind, and with a small force, consisting mostly of trappers, they traversed the country up the Missouri river, across the Rocky Mountains, explored Oregon, and made themselves familiar to a great extent with the geographical features of Oregon and Washington Territories, and what at present constitutes the territories of Dakota and Montana. This expedition cost a comparatively small sum of money. In 1842, the celebrated John C. Fremont fitted out a small expedition of a few soldiers and trappers; he discovered what is known as the interior basin, called the Great Basin, and made very valuable acquisitions to the knowledge of the United States of their great possessions. Now, a policy of that kind ought to be pursued with reference to the North-West. We know a great deal of the country now, a large amount of information has been obtained with reference to it, and the more we know of the country it seems the more we become convinced that we have a valuable possession there. Now, there are various parts of the North-West we want to know something about as speedily as possible. For instance, I suspect we might find that east of Hudson's Bay, the timber line extends much further north in that country than it does on the western side of Hudson's Bay, and it would be a matter of importance for us to know whether we have enormous timber resources in that country. It would cost a few thousand dollars to ascertain it, and I think the Government should lose no time in inaugurating a system of geographical exploration, so that as speedily as possible we should become possessed of a tolerably accurate knowledge of the outlines and capacities of the whole North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite concur with the hon. gentleman as to the interesting nature of the region east of James' Bay. A geographical society in Quebec is now undertaking that work, and is engaged in examining, geologically Labrador and the country lying to the north of the Province of Quebec, and extending westward to James' Bay. The Province of Quebec has given a small grant, and we intend to ask Parliament, during the present Session, to aid the society in these explorations.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very glad to hear the information. I consider that one of the most interesting fields of exploration we have left. It is an unknown land to us, and it is very likely to develop some very valuable resources in that country. Could the hon. Minister state what portion of this vote will be applicable to geological explorations, and how much we are to pay for the collection?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These are the only purchases; all the rest will be for the geological survey, paying for its equipment, &c. The vote is double what it was last year.

Mr. CHARLTON. Another point is with reference to the publication of the Geological report. I see, in the Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June last, the sum of \$11,241.87 for the publication of the Geological report, and I presume the hon. Minister will be in a position to inform us as to where this report is published, and as to the number of copies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report has always been published in Montreal. The Geological Department was stationed in Montreal, and as the report contains a great many scientific and technical terms, it was important that the proof reading should be under the direction of competent gentlemen whose interest and character were dependent upon the correct issuing of the report, and that has hitherto been done at Montreal. As to the number of copies, I really cannot tell the hon. gentleman; I will be able to tell him to-night.

Mr. CHARLTON. The necessity of publishing this report at Montreal no longer exists since the Department has been located in Ottawa, and it strikes me that since the Department has been removed to Ottawa the publication should also be done in Ottawa.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose it is a matter of great interest to the House or country where the report is printed. It will be well printed, and printed at a reasonable rate, and I suppose that is all we care for. I am not at all sure that the present printing resources of Ottawa could get up that report.

Mr. BLAKE. The excuse always given for the printing of the Geological Report at Montreal was, that it should be printed where the Geological Survey was stationed, where the staff was, &c. I do not know whether that excuse was true or not, but if it be true—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was the excuse the hon. gentleman's Government gave at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. I say I do not know whether it was true or not; but if it was, as I suppose it was, it is impossible for the report to be printed in Montreal now, because the staff has been removed to Ottawa.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is quite evident that the publication of the report in Montreal, with the staff located in Ottawa, is inconvenient and delays the work; because we have not received that report yet, and probably will not receive it for some weeks. It ought to have been in the hands of the members of the House while we were discussing this item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say to my hon. friend that I am very much afraid it would not be expedited by handing it over to all the printing strength in Ottawa that exists now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand the Department is printing about 5,000 copies at a cost of a little less than \$2.50 each, which is certainly an extravagant price for a volume of that size. I think if we had the printing of that work done in Ottawa, and advertised for tenders and got it done by contract, instead of printing it at confidential rates, and 50 per cent. more than the price we could get it done for, I think the country would be the gainers. We could get the work done just as well, if not better, and we could have the

volume in our hands at a much earlier period. This is part of a system that has grown up—I do not say who is responsible for it—of giving out printing without taking the precaution to advertise for tenders and get the work done by the lowest responsible bidder, and at the lowest possible price. It is a system that has cost the country a good deal of money. I do not suppose this book is done by tender; I suppose it is handed out to some printer—he may possibly be a friend of the Government—who does this work in Montreal, and may possibly make a very large sum of money out of it; I should judge that he does if he gets \$2.50 for a volume of that size. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that in future he get the printing of this book done in Ottawa by the Government printer, and at contract rates, in order to secure despatch and a large saving of money.

Mr. CASEY. I have always supposed it was because we had a Government printer here that it was necessary to offer any excuse for having this printing done elsewhere. As to the inconvenience, I fancy it must be about as inconvenient to have the work done in Montreal when the Department is at Ottawa, as it would be to have the work printed in Ottawa and the Department in Montreal. It is just about as far from Ottawa to Montreal as it is from Montreal to Ottawa. But I would like to get some information out of the hon. Minister about this collection of Mr. Hirschfelder's, for which he says \$6,000 is to be paid. I think he said that collection was made on the Indian lands, by which he means, I suppose, the lands not yet acquired from the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot tell the hon. gentleman over what area this botanical collection was made. It was on the recommendation and the valuation of Dr. Selwyn that the collection was purchased.

Mr. CASEY. Can the hon. gentleman say whether it is all botanical, or whether a part of it is Indian curiosities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is purely a botanical collection. It is not an exactly parallel case to the one I have referred, and the price is four or five times as much as I have heard spoken of as the proper price of such collections. It is an immensely high price for Mr. Hirschfelder's collection. Professor Macoun has been offering his very cheaply indeed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not suppose the hon. First Minister can be supposed to be able to answer every question of detail, but there are one or two points on which I would like to get information. I see a sum of \$3,795 was paid to G. M. Dawson; could the hon. Minister tell me where his field of exploration was last year? In what part of the Dominion was he engaged?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Dawson was along the Rocky Mountains. As the hon. gentleman knows, he is a most distinguished naturalist and geologist.

Mr. CHARLTON. I observe that Mr. Robert Bell, another distinguished officer, was paid \$2,728. Where was he located?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report is not out, but from my general recollection he has been employed in the Hudson's Bay region. He has given us most valuable reports as to the climatic conditions there, and his report as to the climate and the capability of navigating Hudson's Straits in autumn and winter goes to show, if it is verified—no doubt what he has stated is quite correct as to what he saw, but it might have been an exceptional season—that we have another means of entrance and exit into our North-West.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it is very desirable that we should have a survey of Hudson's Bay. I am glad to hear that my namesakes the Dawsons', although I have not the pleasure of their acquaintance, have so highly distinguished themselves in the North-West.

176. Annual Grant to Supplement the Indian Fund,  
Ontario and Quebec, and the Maritime Pro-  
vinces..... \$31,880.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The two first items are the regular votes. There is an increase of \$600 under the item for Indian schools in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. That is to provide for the establishment of two additional schools in the Province of Nova Scotia, at Lunenburg and Halifax. This matter has been strongly pressed on the Department, and the officers hold that such additional schools are absolutely necessary.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to a matter respecting which I had the privilege of directing his attention several months ago, in connection with the Indians of Quebec—the situation of affairs in the township of Dundee, in the constituency which I have the honor to represent. That township is made up of an Indian reserve. The lands were leased many years ago to the persons who now occupy them. The first leases granted were long leases—some for ninety-nine years and some for 999 years, and most of the shorter leases contained the privilege of renewal at the option of the tenant. After the greater part of the lands were leased under long tenures the policy of the Department was changed, and short leases extending over thirty years, mostly without the privilege of renewal at the option of the tenant, were granted to persons now in the occupation of those lands. Most of those leases have expired, some of them years ago, and the tenants are occupying the lands, as it were, upon sufferance. Most of the lands were taken in a state of nature, and have been rendered valuable by the labors of the tenants. Representations were made, I understand, by the Indians to the Department last year to the effect that they were desirous of occupying some of the lands and cultivating them. They represented that the portion of the reserve which they were cultivating was not sufficient, and that they desired some of the farms, the leases of which had expired, and that if such were given them it would be a great boon conferred, and they would cultivate the lands. Last autumn, as I learn from the report of the hon. Minister of the Interior, notices to surrender were served upon some of the tenants who were required to give up their lands on 31st December. These notices, however, have not been enforced. As the hon. gentleman will perhaps remember, I, in company with a delegation from the tenants, represented to him that it was very inadvisable to enforce the surrender of those lands. I took occasion then, as I take occasion now, to represent to him that it would not really be in the interest of the Indians to concede to their demands. It is within my knowledge that they have not cultivated the portion of land which they promised to cultivate, and that there is a considerable extent which has not been cultivated at all. Like their brethren of the Caughnawaga tribe, they devote themselves to other pursuits than agriculture, and their attempts in farming are not such as would warrant the belief that they would make good use of the lands they now desire to occupy if they were surrendered to them. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, knows enough of the Indian character and habits to be satisfied that they would not be desirable neighbors, if they were placed in possession of those lands. They would, in some instances, have white people holding lands under long leases as neighbors, and I am afraid, if they kept cattle, they would not maintain their fences in good order, that difficulties would arise, and in many ways they would prove undesirable neighbors to white people living there. Moreover, I may say that the notices which have been served do not affect lands actually occupied by the tenants; they are in some instances wholly or partially marsh lands, and in a few instances lands which have been cultivated and improved, but not actually occupied; that is to say, they

Mr. DAWSON.

have no buildings upon them. If the Indians were to settle upon them I doubt whether they would be able to make a living, they would certainly not be able to do so on the marsh lands. What I venture to suggest as a much better solution of the difficulty than the one proposed by the Department is, that the Government bring pressure to bear on the Indians to consent to a renewal of the leases, if not on the same terms as heretofore, on some terms which would be reasonable and equitable. I really believe this would be in the interest of the Indians themselves, and it would most assuredly be in the interests of the white people. This certainly if enforced with reference to the lands, notices with regard to which have been served on the occupants, why there is nothing to prevent a similar course being pursued with respect to the lands actually in occupation; and it would certainly be a very great hardship to turn men out of their lands, if this could be done, without compensation for the improvements they have made, and throw them on the world after they have spent a long time in making these lands, as is the case in many instances, valuable properties and homesteads for themselves and their children. I really hope that the hon. Minister will give this matter his attention, that the notices to surrender will not be enforced, and that the other alternative which I have taken the liberty to suggest, and which I am satisfied will be in the real interest of the Indians themselves, will be followed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say, with respect to the Indians, that, of course, I am acquainted with the subject, because the hon. gentleman made me acquainted with it when he called on me in company of a deputation from Dundee. It is a matter—as, of course, is the case where Indian questions are concerned—which is surrounded with some difficulty. On the one hand, the white settler complains very much of the Indians being bad farmers and bad neighbors in that sense; and then, on the other hand, the Indians say that the land is ours; we have a right to it, and if we do not get the land we must have its value. I was rather under the impression that the hon. gentleman would have introduced a Bill to renew the old Act, for I thought that the hon. gentleman had rather charge of this matter. However, I would say that he presented the case of the settler very strongly and clearly to myself, and he took, I think, a very reasonable view of the matter. I must also say that the deputation, who were all interested, of course, in these lands, took a very reasonable view of it. With respect to the leases for 999 years, these lands are freeholds for all practical purposes. In fact, there was some idea during the early part of the settlement of Lower Canada, that they had not the power to alienate Indian lands in freehold, and they did the same thing by giving long leases. These were considered freehold; and then the ninety-nine years leases were looked upon as given for an eternity, with the privilege of renewing. They must be thus dealt with, of course, under the terms of the leases as perpetual; but there was a change of policy in the interest of the Indians, or in their supposed interests. Long leases were done away with, and thirty years' leases were granted without the privilege of renewal; therefore, of course, like any other lease, at the end of thirty years the land reverts to the owner of the soil. Well, the Indian owns the soil, and if they do not get the soil, they must get the value of it. Or, on the other hand, the settlers have been there, and most likely their fathers before them, for thirty years generally cover one and a-half generations or two generations; and they say it would be very hard to expel them from these lands which were worth very little when they settled on them and that they should be confirmed in the titles in some way. Notices were given in the manner the hon. gentleman has said, with the object of asserting title, of course—the Government being the trustee or guardian of

the Indians; and I think that the hon. gentleman may trust to the usual caution of the Indian Department in their dealings with those matters, not to harass the white man. I agree with the hon. gentleman that all the pressure, not amounting to coercion, but all reasonable pressure in the way of persuasion should be used on the Indians to get them to agree to confirm the title of these parties on some reasonable terms, which will give the Indians some compensation, which would be perhaps a more real compensation, if small, than the mere vague right of occupying the land, which they cannot occupy and cultivate, as the hon. gentleman says. I think that something of this kind will have to be done. The matter is in my hands. I have the papers before me, and as soon as I have opportunity I will take up the subject. I will send an inspector down to examine and report upon it; and to see if we cannot come to some arrangement by which the Indians will not be dissatisfied fearing that they have lost their property, and while at the same time the reasonable claims of the white men will be met.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the legislation which he spoke of only affects the long leases; and an Act was introduced long ago which provided for the commutation of the rents specially exempting these short leases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know that.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman says that he was rather waiting for me to introduce a Bill on the subject, and I may say I was rather waiting for him to do so. I thought it would be a Government measure; and I was rather hoping that the hon. gentleman would introduce an Act to revise and renew the old Act, because I think that now is the time at which the holders of the land under long leases would be disposed to avail themselves of the privilege of commuting. The reason they did not do so before was probably owing to the want of means to do so. When the Act was passed before, the country was comparatively poor, but these men are better off now, and I think that they would be very glad to commute the rents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that we will arrive at a commutation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask, in relation to the item concerning Indian schools of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—as a good deal of interest is felt in our community in this regard—what results have followed the establishment of these schools? Can the hon. gentleman tell us what progress has been made, whether the schools are successful or not, whether they are likely to be continued, what good is likely to result from them, and what languages are taught in them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman has not seen it, he will be kind enough to accept at my hands a copy of the annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending the 31st of December, 1882, and he will find there a full account of all these schools.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend has been very facetious; but I wonder if he really expects that anybody ever reads the reports of that Department? For my part I frankly own I do not, and I thought that he might give us a short synopsis of it. However, as I have got the report, I thank him very much.

Mr. COOK. Has the Indian Office of Toronto been permanently removed to Ottawa, and what provisions, if any, are made in connection with the business of the Department on Georgian Bay? It is rumored that Mr. Thompson, of Penetanguishene, has been appointed to a position under the Department; and I see by the Supplementary Estimates an item to provide a salary for a surveyor from the

1st of February to the 1st of June. Is this gentleman the officer that has been appointed at Penetanguishene, and is his position to be called Indian surveyor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the office at Toronto, it has become an anachronism. It was not wanted. In the good old days, when Toronto was the headquarters of everything in the Province, the chief Indian agency was kept there, and all the subordinate agents reported at Toronto; from thence it came here. It was found to be a mere obstruction to business, and the Toronto office has been closed. Mr. Plummer, who was at the head of it, and Mr. Dalton, a subordinate, were brought down here, and their services were utilized at headquarters. This office performed good work in the days of old, but it was of late really in the way of, instead of being an assistance to, the Department. The agents now all report directly to headquarters, instead of through Toronto and around by that way. Mr. Thompson has been appointed the agent at Penetanguishene for the Christian Island Band.

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

### After Recess.

#### NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada was considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), in the absence of Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to make a single observation before the Bill is read the third time. I think that some action should be taken to get connection, in a practical, shape between the railway system of Ontario and Callander. The schemes up to this time do not appear to have succeeded in bringing about that connection, but I do not see any reason why they should not succeed. This Parliament, last Session, authorized a subsidy at the rate of, I think, \$6,000 a mile from the point of junction, Gravenhurst, I believe, and Callander. The Local Legislature of Ontario, some years ago, authorized a subsidy, I think, of \$8,000 a mile, but afterwards by the change of the plans with reference to the Pacific Railway line the destination of that subsidy was changed to the Sault Ste. Marie line to Sault Ste. Marie, and that was the point of connection then, and is now authorized for that subsidy. Now, from the course of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in building the Algoma Branch themselves, and pursuing a more interior course for their main line, it seems not unreasonable to look upon Callander or some point between Callander and Nipissing as the true objective point. Now, I think public policy and the interests of Ontario should look to concerted action between the two Governments and Legislatures, each of which has recognized the importance of this connection, and if a sum even equal to what this Parliament has authorized—and it would be less in point of mileage than that upon which the Ontario subsidy was authorized—were added to the sum authorized by this Legislature, we would have \$12,000 per mile available for the purpose of that connection. I regard it as of the greatest interest to Ontario, and the Dominion generally, that this connection should be made with a thoroughly independent line, and I think we might realize the advantage of a real independence, at no additional cost to the country, if the two Governments entered into communication, and an understanding was arrived at for the building of that line. I have no doubt that by the combining of the two subsidies an arrangement could be made for the formation of a thoroughly independent company, and that the road would be built; but I would prefer myself that the people should have the advantages of the subsidies. I believe, there being no great difficulties in the construction of that railway, that if arrangements were made whereby a Joint

Commission were established for the building of that line, it could be built probably for the two subsidies; and if \$2,000 or \$3,000 more per mile were required it could be raised by the Commission on the authority of mortgage of the enterprise. Afterwards a system could be adopted somewhat similar to the one embraced in the Bill passed in 1874 or 1875, called the Neutral Link Company Bill. The Commission could allow either the Midland or the Northern to run on equal terms on the railway, and we could keep the rates of freight, in so far as that strip stretch of over 100 miles is concerned, down to the real point which would cover the running expenses, because the country would have paid practically for the railway, and, instead of the shareholders in the large corporations, the public would get the benefit of this traffic. I throw this suggestion out for the consideration of the hon. gentleman, because I am quite convinced that neither of the plans presented to us—one in the interest of the Midland system, another in the interest of the Northern system, and the still more objectionable plan which was not passed this Session—will accomplish good results, while, with the Provincial and the Dominion subsidy taken together, I believe the road would be built, and the public would get the benefit of an independent line, and equal rates to both companies would be secured for all time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not quite agree with all that has fallen from my hon. friend. I think the great object of this connection between Gravenhurst and Callander is to give a means of communication for the cities of Toronto and Hamilton, and the western part of Ontario with the Pacific Railway. The Midland system is now virtually under the control of the Grand Trunk Railway, and forms a connection with the Canadian Pacific, more for Montreal than for Toronto and the western part of Ontario. Of course, I do not mean to say that there is not a connection with Toronto from a point near Gravenhurst by means of the Nipissing road, which is part of the Midland system; but I mean to say that by the Midland system there would be a tendency to divert the traffic properly belonging to the western part of the Province to the eastern part of the Province and Montreal, which is already sufficiently served by the Canada Central Railway. We all remember that a bonus of \$12,000 a mile was granted for the purpose of making a connection between Callander and Montreal. What the people of the West desire is that they should also have a connection with Callander, and they believe that that connection can only be satisfactorily obtained by means of the Northern and North-Western system. What I should like to see carried out is the scheme which was suggested in connection with this Bill, but which was thrown out by the technical point raised there, that is, not merely that this link should be a neutral and independent link, but that the Northern Railway should remain independent of the Grand Trunk, which threatens to absorb it, and of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is bidding in the same direction, and if any scheme could be devised by the Government by which that could be achieved, I believe it would meet with the approval of all parties, and of the people of western Ontario. The scheme as I understood it, and I think it is the only way to secure this object, was to make the subsidy which the Government propose to give, a first charge on the undertaking, in case it should lose its independence. My hon. friend has suggested that probably some arrangement could be made by the two Governments. I do not know whether such an arrangement could be made, but I trust that this Government will not wait for the Ontario Government, who two years ago granted a subsidy for a connection with Callander, but who, owing to their hostility to this Government, when the hon. gentleman who was advocating the through route by Sault Ste. Marie played into his hands by offering the subsidy to any road that went

Mr. BLAKE.

to Sault Ste. Marie. If this Government wait until the Ontario Government revise that policy, they may have to wait a long time. I think means should be taken to secure a speedy connection between the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Toronto, and Hamilton and the western part of Ontario. This has been obtained between Callander and Montreal, and we in the West desire to obtain it by this link.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for West Durham, because his scheme, as propounded to the House, is very admirable in theory. It is based on the idea that the present Government of the Dominion and the present Government of Ontario will combine to carry it out. I am afraid that we have not yet reached that Utopian stage of existence when we can hope for these two Governments to unite upon a scheme of that kind. The second point on which my hon. friend's scheme turns is that there should be a friendly or mutual link which all the roads should use.

Mr. BLAKE. I said the two connecting lines.

Mr. CAMERON. I suppose you do not intend to confine that neutral link to these two lines. If any third line were established, it ought to have the same right to use it; and therefore the proposal is that all the railways of the country which wish to use this neutral link should be allowed to use it in common. Well, I have not read or heard, in anything I have come across in reference to railway running, or the practice of railway magnates, of such a thing as two or three or four rival lines using the same lines in common, in perfect harmony. I am afraid that if my hon. friend asks the opinion of any practical railroad man not biased by this particular question, he will say that the use in perfect amity and friendship of this neutral link by competing lines would be an impossibility. If it could be carried out in practice, I agree that my hon. friend's plan would be the best solution of this difficulty. I think this link ought to be used in such a way that the whole public will have the advantage of it, especially if it be built by bonuses given by the two Governments. When the clauses in question were before the Committee, I stated that I would not have proposed them unless I had been informed and believed that the legal result would be that the Midland system would have free use of this line and have running powers over it, the line being, of course, under the control of one of the companies. Representing, as I do, a county through which the Midland system extends, it would be contrary to my duty, as the representative of that county, if I favored any road which in any way interfered with the rights or even the opportunities of benefiting itself, which the Midland system ought to have. For that reason I stated in Committee that, having understood from a perusal of the clause in the Act applying to the Northern Pacific Junction, it gave the most perfect freedom of use of that road to the Midland Railway system. I stated if it were found that that claim was not sufficient, I should urge on the Committee the adoption of any amendments or alterations which would give the Midland Railway all those rights it ought to have over the neutral link. It being a question whether the ownership and control of the running of the road should be under one company or the other, it ought, from the necessity of the case, to be rather under the control of the Northern than of the Midland, provided the rights of the Midland were preserved. If what I may term the Utopian theory of my hon. friend could be introduced, if this could be made a perfectly neutral link, owned by the Government, over which all railways should have a right to run free whenever they liked—I am perfectly willing to concede that, if railway managers could be induced to work their roads on such a plan; and if such a system could be carried out, it would be the most perfect

system. I am afraid, however, we have not yet reached that stage of happiness and perfect harmony in railway matters in this country which would render such a system practicable.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I have been a little misunderstood by the hon. gentleman. He raised two objections: the one political, the other practicable. I should be sorry to suppose there was any reason why the Governments of Ontario and the Dominion should not co-operate for any purpose which served the public interest. The hon. gentleman says they cannot. I suppose he must speak with authority so far as his friends are concerned, but I do not see why he should suppose it to be so in the case of the Ontario Government.

**Mr. CAMERON.** Take their stand on the boundary question.

**Mr. BLAKE.** They took the stand they believed to be in the interest of the Province, and the Dominion Government took the stand they thought to be in the interest of the Dominion. Both on this question happened to be in conflict, but is that any reason why, they should not act together on this or any other question in which the public interest would be promoted by their joint action? It may be the hon. gentleman's view of public duty and interest that they should not, but it is not mine. Then as to the practical objection. I have a little experience—although the hon. gentleman seems to think I have not—with reference to these matters, and I know there is nothing railway companies are more anxious to have than monopoly of a control over railway lines. Every railway manager will tell you it is utterly impossible that other people can be allowed in, or some dreadful damage will happen. I do not propose that all railway companies should be allowed to run wild over this neutral link. The hon. gentleman says each railway company should be secured perfect freedom of action over this link, and this clause provides this: but that one must have control. What I suggested was, that this road should be constructed by the Provincial and the Dominion Governments, whose money is to build it, and that it should go under the control of a Commissioner; and, if it be possible, to adopt a clause by which one company has control, the other shall have full and free access and running powers. I suppose it is probable for the wit of man to adapt a clause by which a Commissioner shall see that each has its fair share of running powers, and does not interfere with the other, to its prejudice. I suppose it will be possible for an impartial authority to do that which is secured to either by the partial authority of the other. If a clause can be adapted to secure, if the Northern gets control, all running powers to the Midland—and I do not think they are secured; or if a clause is adapted to secure, should the Midland get control, running powers to the Northern—and I do not think they are—surely a clause can be devised which will secure to each its fair share of control under the independent management of a Commissioner not subservient to either, but re-securing the country, whose money is building the line.

**Mr. O'BRIEN.** A merely local interest may perhaps be hardly worth considering, but I would like to call the attention of the Government and this House to the position in which the people I represent have been placed with regard to this railway and the way in which they have been treated. There are 20,000 of them whose existence almost depends on the construction of this line. Year after year promises are made to them, hopes held out, plans formulated, but nothing comes of it all. What between the conflicting interests of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Pacific, and the disagreement between the Ontario and Dominion Governments—what with the strife of party and the interests of railways, our unfortunate local interests are altogether lost sight of. I do not say that they are of very much consequence, but they are worthy of some consideration by this

House. There is hardly an hon. member of this House from the Province of Ontario, from as far east as Ottawa and as far west as Chatham, who has not friends living on the free grant lands who have not gone up their mainly on the understanding that the railway would be built, and that they would be given that means of subsistence which at present they have not. They are cultivating lands and raising crops, and have no means of getting to a market. It is very disheartening year after year, Session after Session, to find this thing going on. It is of little consequence to us, particularly, who build the road—whether the Ontario or the Dominion Government—but I must say the people of my county have, on the whole, reason to think they are hardly dealt with. First, we have the Ontario subsidy promised of \$3,000 a mile, but for some reason or other the arrangement by which it might be paid under the Ontario and Pacific Junction has been broken through personal quarrels among the managers concerned. Again, we have had various other schemes, and this Session is likely to be as barren of results as any other. The people of west Ontario, especially Toronto, are much interested in this road. At this moment the trade properly belonging to them is now being carried over the newly constructed branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal. If the people of Toronto and Hamilton are not fully alive to their own interests in this matter, their commercial interests must suffer. I trust this Session will not pass without something being done toward building this road. I hope that every member of this House from Ontario will consider the position of his former friends and constituents who have gone into the free grant district with the expectation that something of this kind would have been done long ago. I would also take the opportunity of saying that that country is now in an unfortunate position, because, owing to the fact that the North-West holds out so many greater inducements, immigration has almost ceased going that direction. A great many from the older Provinces are going to Manitoba, and the country is really suffering, and the only remedy is the construction of this line. I hope that in this great conflict of railways and connections some consideration will be given to those people who are so dependent on the construction of this link.

**Mr. DUNDAS.** I think that the views of the hon. member for West Durham are worthy of the consideration of the Government. I think they are not so far different from the views of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), as they appear to be at first sight, and if they were simmered down closely the difference would be found to be more apparent than real. As I understand this question, it has been the desire of both the Ontario and Dominion Governments to form an independent link between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the systems of railway which centre in Toronto. At the same time the rivalry or strife that exists between the roads who are competing for the control of that connection is so great as to embarrass the Government very much in dealing with this matter. I, therefore, cannot but think, that the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham is one that will meet the views of all parties and is worthy of the consideration of the Government, and could be carried out if gone about earnestly. There is no question about its being very desirable to have that link built at as early a date as possible. The whole of Ontario is interested in it; and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says: "and so also are the different systems of railway which centre there." The people who are living in that district, referred to by the last speaker, are more deeply interested, perhaps, than any others, and the whole stretch of territory which this line of railway would develop, will be found to be valuable both for settlement and for lumbering operations. I, therefore, hope the Government will take the matter seriously into consideration, and see if some scheme cannot be devised

whereby this Government, associated with the Government of Ontario, may secure the building of this independent line. I trust party politics in matters of that kind will not enter into a public project like this, but that the views of the hon. member for West Durham will be carried out in a practical shape.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention has been called to the fact that this Bill was amended by the Select Standing Committee on Railways as being a Bill from the Senate, and must be considered as having been amended here in Committee. Therefore, it has been reported from Committee of the Whole with amendments.

Bill read the third time and passed.

#### BILL IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate The Canadian Rapid Telegraph Company, Limited—(Mr. Davies.)

#### CREDIT VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved the second reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 50) to amend the Act respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to trouble the House with any observations with regard to the amendments, but I desire to place on record my views with respect to those amendments which have been introduced into a Bill with respect to a local railway, the Credit Valley Railway, by which it is declared to be a railway for the general advantage of Canada, and by which powers are given to that railway Company to effect a lease to another railway corporation. These are amendments "C" and "D," and I move to disagree with the amendments for the following reasons:—

Because having regard to the facts,—

- 1st. That the Credit Valley Railway Company is a Provincial Company, incorporated by the Ontario Legislature;
- 2nd. That it has received from Ontario Municipalities aid to the amount of \$1,165,000, on various conditions;
- 3rd. That it has received from the Local Legislature aid to the amount of \$457,500;
- 4th. That this aid has been given on conditions that the Local Government may require the Company to enter into agreements to be settled by the Local Government for running powers, or user, or haulage arrangements, by other companies over its road; and upon conditions for the giving of returns and information to the Local Government; and upon conditions as to the retention of its rails;
- 5th. That the Company is now subject to the control of the Local Legislature, and that its rates and tolls are regulated under Local Laws;
- 6th. That the conditions under which the Municipal grants have been given, can now be enforced by the Local Legislature;
- 7th. That it is within the competence of the Local Legislature to authorize the lease of the Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on such conditions as it deems just;
- 8th. That no application has been made for that purpose to the Local Legislature;
- 9th. That no notice has been given of any intention to apply to the Parliament of Canada for the legislation contained in the amendment;
- 10th. That no petition has been presented, praying for the amendment, it is not expedient that legislation which will have the effect of withdrawing the Railway from Provincial jurisdiction, and of vesting in the Parliament of Canada its exclusive control should be passed, without the notice required by the *Standing Orders* of The House, or any notice or petition whatever, and without giving the parties concerned any opportunity of being heard on the question.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the said amendments be amended as follows:—

6. If at any time hereafter the Credit Valley Railway Company shall enter into any agreement for amalgamation or leasing, or into any pooling arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or into any agreement for the joint use of their respective railways, either directly or through any company leasing or controlling its line, then the powers conferred by sections 3 and 4 of this Act shall cease, and determine.

Amendments, as amended, concurred in.

Mr. DUNDAS.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee.

176. Annual Grants to Supplement the Indian Fund, Ontario and Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces.....\$31,880.00

Mr. DAWSON. I desire to offer a few remarks in reference to the item now under consideration. The Indians in my constituency are numerous; we have 5,200 in Algoma proper, 3,800 on the waters of Rainy River, and 2,000 or 3,000 in the northern sections, making over 10,000 altogether. And I would say that within the last eight or ten years the condition of these Indians has been greatly ameliorated throughout Algoma, chiefly or in great part at least, from the enforcement of the laws respecting liquor. They have not been able to get intoxicants to the extent they once did, and the officers of the Government are performing their duty throughout that wide district in a very zealous and praiseworthy manner; I have great satisfaction in saying in this House, that the condition of the Indians is getting greatly better, many of them are settled on farms; we have as many as 1,700 settled at one place on the Manitoulin, 300 at another, and so on with other settlements. At Sault Ste. Marie and on the north coast of Lake Huron, the Indians are well advanced, growing large quantities of agricultural produce, including wheat. Industrial schools are also established among them; there are industrial schools at Wikwemikon, on Manitoulin Island, where Indians are taught trades of all kinds, to which they take very readily; there is also an industrial school called the Shingwauk Home at Sault Ste. Marie, which has done an immense deal of good. These institutions are sending through the country educated young Indians, and the trades they easily learn are much more to their advantage than would be mere scholastic learning. I am happy to say that this system is gradually having a good effect, and that the condition of the Indians in Algoma, a great many of whom have settled down, has been very much improved within the last few years. I wish to call attention for a moment to those Indians who ceded their lands under the treaty known as the Robinson Treaty, made in 1850, which was for many years very imperfectly carried out. The real purport of the treaty was, that the Indians should get so much per annum; but unfortunately the payments actually made to them fell very far short of what they should have been according to the treaty. They were to get a certain sum then, and if the revenue arising from the lands ever amounted to so much, as to allow them "\$1 a head, or so much more as Her Majesty might be graciously pleased to order," in that case additional payments were to be made. The lands yielded a very handsome revenue long before Confederation, such a sum as would have enabled the Government without loss—which is the expression in the treaty—to pay the full amount stipulated; but the matter seems to have been neglected, and it was not paid. For a number of years, the Indians on Lake Superior were paid \$1.49½ a head annually only, while the Lake Huron Indians got for a number of years \$1.10 a head annually, instead of the \$1 a head to which under the treaty they were entitled. When Mr. Laird was Minister of the Interior, the matter was brought to his notice, and he, on investigating the subject, found that as much as \$10,484 annually had been kept from the Indians. It was then arranged that they should get the full amount of \$4 per head, but this only occurred in 1875, and they have been paid \$1 per head ever since; but previous to that date, arrears were due them amounting to a very considerable sum. The Government could have paid them the full amount without loss. In making an estimate, I searched through the accounts of Ontario, and I looked also through some of the accounts at the Dominion office here; and according to a very moderate estimate



a sum of over \$200,000 is due the Indians without reckoning interest. If interest be added, the amount would exceed \$300,000. This is the calculation according to the estimate made by the hon. Minister of Interior in 1875; but he was in error, as I am informed, in reckoning the actual sum due them annually and kept from them; and I am under the impression that a very much larger sum is due to them. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to these arrears. I believe that the payments to the Indians were to be a charge upon the lands according to the treaty, and this applies to all of the lands which they ceded; but while the lands have fallen to the Ontario Government, the Dominion Government has to deal with the Indians. I believe that correspondence has been going on between the two Governments for some eight years or so; but still no decision has been arrived at; and it is most desirable that some understanding should be soon reached with the Ontario Government regarding this important matter, by which the Indians would get their pay in the meantime. I may say further, that a number of Indians who are entitled to pay, do not get it. They are called non-treaty Indians; but they were as much parties to the treaty as those who were included in it. The land belonged to them as much as to the others, but they happened not to be present when the treaty was made. They are not very numerous, and it would not add a great deal to the annual outlay if they were placed on the same footing as the others. They are an intelligent people; and I may say that a great many of them are not wholly Indians, though treated as such, but descendants of the old French and Indians. There is not in the whole Dominion a more quiet, a more orderly people than the Indians of Algoma.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is really true, as my hon. friend says, that this is very important, as it affects the interests of Indians occupying territory ceded under what is called the Robinson Treaty. It is also true that evidently a sum of money is due them. With respect to the arrears up to 1867 there is a debt due by the old Province of Canada. There has been an attempt made to adjust the matter; but we have never hitherto been able to get the two Governments of Ontario and Quebec to settle the account. It was understood, in fact it was promised, that it should be settled in October last; but the representatives of the two Governments met here without coming to any conclusion, and since that time there has been no action taken whatever. With respect to the accruing rights of these Indians since 1867, there is certainly a balance due them, and it is hoped that, by arrangement with the Ontario Government, this balance will be wiped off. There is a large sum of money due to the Indians, and they have so far been deprived of what is their own. I am not at all sure, however, that it has not been really for the benefit of the Indians, though it was contrary to strict rights that the money was not paid. They are now in an advanced state of civilization, I am glad to learn from my hon. friend, and though they cannot be expected to become thoroughly settled in a generation, still they are taking to the soil, they are making substantial progress. They understand their rights—they understand the object of their funds, and their money is saved instead of being squandered by the Indians—as formerly was the case—as fast as it was paid or got hold of by designing white men. It will be my duty to take the subject up the moment Parliament prorogues, and I think there is no doubt that we can come to a settlement with the Ontario Government, because it is they who are primarily held by this arrangement. Having said so much I would add that this vote is increased by \$5,680, and that that addition is made just for the purpose the hon. gentleman has mentioned. There were certain non-treaty Indians who have not come in—I fancy their representatives were not

there at the time the meeting was held and the treaty made. But still the treaty covered their land, and whenever they choose to come in they have the right to claim their share. There are 104 persons in that band who will receive their annual allowance, the same as the others when this vote is carried. Besides these there are eleven stragglers belonging to broken bands and not now attached to any band, though they have always been, and their ancestors have always been on the soil, so they have a claim; that makes 115 additional Indians who have a right to these allowances. There is no doubt when that matter is disposed of there will be ample funds to meet the just claims of the Indians—in fact those belonging to the bands covered by the treaty will eventually be wealthy.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before the item is carried I wish to make a few remarks. Some years ago there was a project started by the Six Nation Indians of Brant with a view to the erection of a monument to one who was a very distinguished chief and leader of these Indians during the time they were the active allies of the British Crown in the war which took place between the Mother Country and what are now the American States. The name of Joseph Brant is one well known to the hon. First Minister, and known, no doubt, to every hon. member of the House. The proposition first originated with the Indians that a monument should be erected to the memory of that distinguished chieftain. They have brought it to the notice of the white people—municipal authorities and others—who are interested in their welfare, residing in the country about them, and notably in the city of Brantford. Their efforts were warmly seconded, and it was considered highly proper, though that chieftain had died so far back as 1807, that there should be such a tribute to his memory. They thought, moreover, that such a movement would be likely to be productive of good results, not only in the feelings which it would engender in the breasts of the Six Nations, but that the movement would not be entirely without influence upon the red men of the West and any Indian tribes we have in the country. I believe it would be the first monument ever erected to the memory of any of the aborigines of this country, and as the Canadian treatment of the Indians has been happily in marked contrast in many respects with that of the American Government, it was thought that it would still further redound to the credit of the people of Canada, if they would be found aiding and seconding a movement such as this. When the Earl of Dufferin was on the Six Nations reserve, some six or seven years ago, they took the opportunity of presenting an address to him, and through him they desired to present an address to His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, who, in 1869, when he was in this country, was made by the confederacy one of their honorary chiefs. The address was transmitted to His Royal Highness, who was graciously pleased to express his approval of the scheme, and who signified his desire that his name should be used as one of the patrons. He also announced his desire to give a handsome subscription towards the object in view. The Earl of Dufferin himself subscribed very liberally towards the project. The present Governor-General also subscribed very handsomely, so has the hon. leader of the Government, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, and I think most of the hon. members of the Ministry and several hon. members of the last Parliament. The Indians themselves passed a resolution giving \$5,000 of their own money towards it, the City Council of Brantford passed a by-law granting \$2,500, so that a considerable amount has been raised one way or other. I think the First Minister has been communicated with by telegraph, as it was impossible that a deputation could reach him in time, requesting him to consider whether he could place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates in order to further this project. I am cognizant of the fact that he may have some difficulty, and that the

Committee may have some difficulty at the first blush in seeing their way in making such an appropriation. The First Minister may hesitate to take such a step without a precedent, as to whether such a precedent should be established, and upon this point I desire not to press him too strongly. I would suggest, however, that there are features about this movement which might justify the First Minister in acceding to the request made by many of his supporters in Brantford, and others, and the chief of the Six Nations Indians. The character of Joseph Brant shines forth conspicuously. He was not only an educated man, not only a man who was held in high esteem during his lifetime, but one whose loyalty and devotion to the British Crown has not been excelled, I believe, by the loyalty and devotion of any of the subjects or allies of that Crown. During the war that unfortunately prevailed, he, though solicited to cast in his lot with and lend his aid to the Colonists, felt such a spirit of loyalty to the Mother Country that he could not see his way to do so, and espoused the cause of Britain. He and his braves took up arms and fought side by side with the Imperial troops in order to retain the Colonies to the Mother Country. At the end of the war, when the treaty was made, the English Government, by a strange oversight, amounting to culpability on their part, forgot to stipulate in the treaty that the Six Nations Indians should have reserved to them the lands which were theirs from time immemorial; and thus it was that the Mohawk Valley, which was theirs and their fathers, was handed over, and they found themselves left without a home. This was contrary to the express promise of General Haldimand, who, I think, was acting on behalf of Britain. Chief Brant then repaired to Governor Haldimand, at Quebec, and laid the matter before him. The Governor promised to do everything he could in the way of fulfilling his promise, but it was too late to get the land, because that was ceded away by the treaty, but he agreed to give the Indians a larger tract of land on the Bay of Quinté. The Seneca Indians had, meanwhile, settled in the Genesee Valley, and they invited the Mohawks to live with them and offered them a large part of their tract. But this was distasteful to Brant, to the Mohawks, and to the members of the confederacy, because they desired to live under British rule; and, finally, the matter was settled by a grant being made to them six miles in width on each side of the Grand River, from its source to its mouth. That river runs through the county I represent. Portions of their grant have been surrendered to them from time to time until the whole of it has been surrendered with the exception of one township of Tuscarora, 6,000 acres in extent, and a slight reserve extending into the county of Haldimand. The lands have been sold from time to time by the Government and the proceeds invested, and the Indians have drawn the interest from that money ever since. I mention these matters to the Committee in order that they might understand the exact position of the case. We are sometimes inclined to think that the grants to the Indians are a great burden; but, so far as the Six Nations Indians are concerned, the Committee will recognize the fact that they are no charge to the country at all; they draw their own moneys, but none of the moneys of the country. They have, of course, to contribute towards the revenue of the country, as every one living in the country must do, so long as the revenues are levied in the manner they are; but they are without representation on the floor of this House, and therefore, when they desire to be heard in Parliament, they have to avail themselves of the service of someone who occupies a seat in the House. Now, it is not for me to say how much the grant should be. I might, however, suggest that it would be a gracious thing, if the Dominion Government entertain the proposition at all, that they would make it about the amount the Indian Council themselves have granted. If

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the Government did that they might find their justification in the fact that they have never expended on these Indians anything, while the Indians have been contributing for years and years to the revenues of the country. They might also find it possible to make such a grant without doing violence to any established principle, or setting any dangerous precedent. When other bands of Indians in Ontario are aided, this might be regarded as only a simple matter of right in the case of the Six Nations Indians. Another reason which might justify the Government in yielding to the proposition might be found in the public services rendered by Chief Brant to the British Crown; nay, more, the distinguished services rendered by that Chief, and the good feeling that exists between the Indians and the other people of the country might warrant them in making the grant. There is no fear of any jealousy arising from such a grant, should it be made. The name of Brant stands out so conspicuously among his people that there is not the slightest danger of any shade of jealousy being felt by anyone else. His name is historic; he was a gentleman in every sense of the word—a gentleman of culture, though his skin was red, and he was a true child of the forest. He visited the King, who received him at Court, and he used his influence to further the interests of the British Crown. While he lived he used all the influence he possessed, and it was great, in maintaining good feeling between his followers on the reserve and their white neighbors. His services are known and have been recognized by the people of this country and the Mother Country, but there has been no tribute paid to them that I know of at all worthy of them; and if it is right and appropriate that this should be done, even at this date, by private subscriptions and the subscriptions of the Indians themselves, I cannot see that it would be unwise or unsafe for the Government to aid them. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. First Minister, if he consulted his own feelings, would accede to my suggestion. He is not personally hostile—the handsome subscription he has given from his private purse is proof positive of that; but I think it would be a prudent act on the part of the Dominion Government, under the exceptional circumstances I have mentioned, to meet the Indian Council with a grant, in order that the work may go on. I am not making this suggestion in order that this grant may give a little prominence to the city in which I live. All will concede that the Indians should be left to select the site. If they are, it will mark a monument erected to a man whose name is known, not only throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, but in Great Britain as well—a man who, in days when British interests were at stake, was willing to sacrifice, and did sacrifice, all his possessions, and was ready and willing to sacrifice his life and those allied with him, to maintain those interests. They are to-day our allies, as faithful, I believe, as they were in days gone by, and if the hon. First Minister could see his way clear to place a vote in the Estimates for the purpose I suggest, I think it would be a prudent and proper act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend has made a strong case in very eloquent and very adequate terms. He has spoken of the services of Joseph Brant, and of the sacrifices he and his people made in adhering to the Crown of England during the revolutionary war. He sacrificed everything. They lost one of the most beautiful countries of the world, the beautiful valley of the Mohawk, and were thrown upon the wilderness of Upper Canada, where they showed their loyalty in the war of 1812. They are as ready now to go to the front with as great gallantry as did Joseph Brant and those who served under and with him for the British Crown. Joseph Brant was a very remarkable character. An Indian, without a drop of white blood in his veins, he was still a gentleman of culture. He was before my time, but I, as a young man, remember his children. I remember his son, who was a gentleman of

high culture, who sat in the Upper Canada Legislature. His daughters were ladies of education, who, although educated with all the accomplishments of a white lady, were not ashamed of their nation, garb and habits, and they lived and died glorying in the name of Brant. I received the telegram the hon. gentleman speaks of only last night. I have not had an opportunity really of considering it, or consulting my colleagues about it, but I shall submit it to my colleagues, and give the hon. gentleman's representations every consideration. Of course I know the hon. gentleman is actuated by no such feeling as he hinted might perhaps be felt, that it was to get some little kudos, or ornament, or piece of sculptural beauty in his own constituency. I have no doubt he acted solely from the desire to do honor to the memory of a great man. It may be true, as the hon. gentleman said, that it will have a wholesome and beneficial influence on the other Indians. These things spread from tribe to tribe, and I dare say Indians in the North-West, even in British Columbia, may hear—we should take care that they will—with pride that a red man has been honored by their white fellow-subjects in the Province of Ontario. We must be prepared, however, if this is entertained, to perhaps go a step further. I think that, hereafter, if this is granted, there will be an application—and I do not see well, why it should be resisted—that a monument should be erected to Tecumseh, who fell fighting the battles of the British Crown. I must say I have great sympathy with the name of Brant, from the fact of my having been personally acquainted with a great many of the descendants of Joseph Brant, who have more or less mixed blood, but are proud of belonging to that family; and I have a special regard for the name of the son of Joseph Brant, who went home to England, and, after the fashion of those days, resolved to avenge a slight on the memory of his ancestor, cast by Campbell, the poet, in "Gertrude Wyoming," when he called Joseph Brant the "murderer Brant." The false stories told of the cruelty of the Indians in the valley of the Wyoming were perpetuated in the poetical utterances of Campbell, although altogether unfounded.

Mr. PATERSON. Campbell, I believe, placed a foot-note at the end of the poem, stating his disbelief in the story.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did. He was called to account for what he wrote, and after the fashion of those days, Brant insisted on meeting him in the field if he did not withdraw the slight to the name of his ancestor; and Campbell, as my hon. friend truly says, in the next edition of his poems, placed a note stating he was altogether mistaken. I shall only say further, that I quite agree with the sentiments of my hon. friend and will submit his proposal to my colleagues.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many of the noble red men have we left in the different Provinces?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On page 260 of the Report my hon. friend will see there is a recapitulation. There is a total of 110,505: of which 17,126 are in Ontario; 11,089 in Quebec.

177. Indians of Nova Scotia, generally..... \$4,500 00

Mr. CHARLTON. I see there is an expenditure for education; what progress are the Indians making in learning the art of agriculture?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reports are favorable rather than otherwise; but they are very slow, and I do not understand why the Indians down there do not take so well to the soil as they do in other parts of the country. The Micmac Indian is rather a nomad; he prefers the water, as we see in the Maritime Provinces. But still they are improving by slow degrees. I fear, however, that in a few generations they will have disappeared altogether or be absorbed by the white population.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should infer that the efforts to educate and Christianize the Indians, and make them good members of society, are not being attended with marked success.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe they are very good Christians; they go to church regularly, and are getting a fair education, but they are nomadic in their habits, and will not settle down. The fact of the matter is, that it takes generations for the Indians to get an aptitude for the cultivation of the soil. According to the principle of development, that must be of slow growth, not in one generation. As Tyendinaga once told me: "There is no use talking about it, we are still animal, and you cannot make a deer into an ox."

Mr. CHARLTON. The evolution, I understand, is a very gradual one. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the number of generations it will take?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not sufficiently Darwinian to tell that.

180. Indians of British Columbia, surveys and reserve commission..... \$12,005.00

Mr. CHARLTON. I see, last year, about \$2,000 were expended for medical attendance. What course does the Government take to furnish medical attendance for the Indians?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Fortunately for the Indians there, the Superintendent for British Columbia, Dr. Powell, is a medical man himself. In some places there are allowances made for medical men; in others, medical men are employed, and paid for their special services. The Indian there does not require so much medical attendance as our Indians on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains and through Old Canada—whether it is because they are of a different race altogether, or whether, from their being supposed to be mingled with Mongol blood, coming across Behring's Straits, I do not know. But they are strong and hale men; they work like white men, and some are rich and own farms. Except in a few places, where they have been corrupted by being too near the towns, they support themselves a good deal. As the hon. gentleman may know, the Indians had hardly any special reserves in British Columbia before it was joined to Canada. Under the system that was carried on by Sir James Douglas—a very good system it appears to have been—the Indian was treated very kindly, but no right to the soil was practically ever admitted by the Government. Now, however, as the country is becoming settled by white population, it has been found necessary to have special reserves set aside for the Indians. Mr. Sproat, who was appointed, by the late Government, Indian Commissioner, settled a great many Indians on reserves, and, on his resigning, Mr. O'Reilly took his place, the latter having been a County Judge, retired on a pension at the time of the Union with British Columbia. He is acting as Indian Reserve Commissioner, and I hope in three or four years he will have the reserve settled. The reserve is first surveyed by this Commissioner and then submitted to the Governments of British Columbia and of the Dominion for their assent. I am happy to say there has not been any material difference of opinion between the two Governments. British Columbia has always been willing to grant a reasonable amount of land for reserve for the Indians. On the question of education, I fear we must admit, on behalf of both Governments, since 1871, that we have been too much in the habit of treating the Indians as minors and acting in too paternal a manner towards them. I understand the Indians there do not require nearly so much care or expense as we have been put to. What they ask for more than anything else is schools. The great difficulty we have is to get proper schoolmasters for them who understand the Indian character, who will not go in there

merely for the sake of pay, but who are philanthropists. The Indians say they are willing to defray the expenses if we can only find the schoolmasters, and we are endeavoring to do so.

Mr. FLEMING. There seems to me to be a discrepancy between the condition of the Indians, as just explained by the Minister, and the large sum for salaries paid out to agents. Of the appropriation of \$23,300 last year, \$11,895 were paid as salaries to agents. Would the hon. Minister explain the duties of these agents?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must remember that British Columbia is an enormously large country, and this expenditure has to be scattered over that country down to the boundary line. The Indians are scattered, and from the mountainous nature of that country they are widely scattered. They settle down in the glens, in the valleys, or on the coast. Within a very few years ago they were savage; they are now becoming quite peaceable, except in the outlying stations, such as Queen Charlotte's Island. This Island was a very formidable place for white men to visit, because the natives dealt most summarily with the crews of any vessel that called there. Along the outside coast of Vancouver Island there are a large number of scattered Indians, who are so scattered that they can scarcely be said to live in communities. They are now, I believe, very profitably employed in the canneries and establishments of that kind. Indians are also now employed as miners and they work very well. But it must be remembered that they are not white men, and civilized, and must be strictly watched. They are very suspicious and easily aroused; the white population is sparse, and the Indians feel yet that they are lords of the country in British Columbia, and they are much more numerous than the whites; the officers are not too numerous and are not highly paid, but they are the best preventive police we have.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose we must congratulate ourselves at the small vote for British Columbia as compared with the vote for the North-West, and that such a considerable number of Indians in the former Province should give us so very little trouble. I observe an item of \$7,700 for surveys. Is the Government engaged in surveying the reserves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have a Reserve Commissioner whose appointment was agreed to by the British Columbian Government, and we have a Government surveyor under him, and chain men. This is the usual vote in order to carry on the annual surveys.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many agencies have we in the Province?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Six.

181. Indians in Manitoba and the North-West ..... \$791,640.47

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I call the attention of the Committee to the very large decrease on the whole that there is in this vote. There is a decrease, in every item, except that of supplies for destitute, which is increased by \$60,708. The decrease on the whole vote is \$33,359. The expenditure under this head has been very large, but I believe it will be much diminished next year. The Indians are all moving away from Fort Walsh and going on their reserves, and so soon as we get them there we may hope they will become more and more self-sustaining.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that the votes in one or two previous years have been largely exceeded by the expenditures. I think the vote for destitute Indians in 1881-82 was \$102,000, and the expenditure \$563,000. Will the hon. gentleman give us some information as to the cause of that unusually large increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At the time we took the vote last year I went, at considerable length, into the subject of destitute Indians, the utter disappearance of the buffalo and the action of the American Government which formed a perfect cordon to prevent buffalo from crossing the lines. Formerly the Indians in the North-West, except those tribes which had some little fishing, subsisted on buffalo. Buffalo was their bread, wine, and meat, and that supply utterly and totally failed. I am not at all sorry, as I have said before, that this has happened. So long as there was a hope that buffalo would come into the country, there was no means of inducing the Indians to settle down on their reserves. The total failure of the buffalo the year before last, and last year, caused the Indians to be thrown on the mercy of the Government in the North-West. We could not, as Christians and men, allow them to starve, and we were obliged, no matter what the cost might be, to furnish them with food. It was better to feed them than to fight them. At any time we were liable to an attack, and hungry men will, if necessary, help themselves. Last year we made considerable progress in settling the Indians on their reserves, and we would have made still further progress if it had not been for the rumor that buffalo had crossed the line and were flocking into the country. The moment the Indians heard the report, all the work had to be gone over again. The buffalo did not come in, in any considerable numbers. Some few Indians having heard that the buffalo had crossed the line, went to hunt, in expectation of obtaining their old description of food, but they found they were mistaken, and would have been much better off had they remained on their reserve. I believe the system of watching the country has been made so complete by the Americans that we will not have any more buffalo in our land. The Indians are satisfied of that, and those who have settled down are proving very fair farmers, that is to say, they are self-sustaining, and the accounts given are most encouraging for the future.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice among the expenditures in the Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June last, that one firm, Baker & Co., obtained a very large sum. Where is that firm located?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At Fort Benton, Montana.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe they are Americans?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. The other night, when I referred to the system of surveys in the North-West, I asked why the hon. gentleman had not adopted the American system in its entirety, and it was said in reply, that I drew all my inspiration from Washington. Where does the hon. gentleman draw his inspiration from in permitting a Yankee firm to obtain \$462,000 for supplies, which could have been obtained from our own dealers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The inspiration from which I drew those supplies, through Baker & Co., was the greatest of all monarchs, the monarch of necessity. There was nobody else to supply the food on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for the Blackfeet and the Bloods. There were no means of getting supplies except from Montana. I may say, though the members of the firm are Americans, they are most satisfactory contractors—fair, honest, liberal and trustworthy. They have fairly competed with other traders, because these contracts have always been put up to public competition, but nobody could tender for the supplies in the extreme West. The Hudson Bay Company tendered for a good deal. Other parties, Captain Howard, who is known, perhaps, to Mr. Watson, tenders; and is the lowest for some contracts this year. By next year we will have the Pacific Railway finished to Algoma, and the supplies for all these posts can then be tendered for from all the rest of the Dominion, and especially from

Ontario, I fancy, it being the nearest, with regard to provisions, bacon, flour and all the other articles to which the Indians have a right under the seven treaties that exist, and will be freely competed for by the people generally.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very happy to hear the excellent character which the right hon. gentleman gives to these American dealers at Fort Benton, Montana. I presume it is fortunate for those gentlemen that they have not resided in Canada for twenty-five or thirty years and become British subjects, when, no doubt, their loyalty would be called into question; but as residents of the United States they enjoy excellent reputations and transact a very large amount of business with the Government. I have been looking through the accounts, and it strikes me that the prices paid are, in many cases, higher than one would suppose was necessary. Flour is charged by the sack. I do not know its weight in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 93 lbs.

Mr. CHARLTON. Barley flour at Edmonton is charged at \$6 a sack, and this seems to me excessive. It is on the Saskatchewan River.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot get it there otherwise.

Mr. CHARLTON. Owen McDonald, at Prince Albert whom I understand is in the midst of an agricultural settlement, makes a charge of the same character. Do they not raise barley there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They do not raise enough.

Mr. CHARLTON. On April 23rd, 1881, Mahoney & McDonald were paid 21 cts. a pound for bacon at Battleford. That would represent a good many cents a pound for freight. Is bacon furnished in this case by contract?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid that there are not many competitors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All these articles, along the line of the Saskatchewan, are supplied by the Hudson Bay Company; they are the lowest tenderers.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oats are charged at Fort McLeod at \$1.19 a bushel, which would seem a rather large price to an Ontario farmer. Is that reasonable under the circumstances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the price of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The firm of I. G. Baker & Co., Fort Benton, supplied 160 pairs of cotton overalls at \$1.75 each. I used to be in the dry goods trade; and I sold such an article at about 60 cts. Freight would be a small matter on these, which weigh  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or 2 lbs. each. Such prices seem hardly justifiable. One item shows the humanity of the Government, and I can dwell on it with a considerable degree of pleasure. I see charged on the 18th of February, 1881, by J. J. Clarke, at Fort McLeod, \$10 for material for a coffin for Little Drum, furnished because his family were too destitute to supply a blanket to wrap him in. Would it not have been cheaper to furnish a blanket?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We wanted to introduce civilized customs there.

Mr. CHARLTON. I doubt the propriety of going contrary to the traditions and usages of the Indians in matters of this kind. They should be allowed to bury their dead, according to the customs they have hitherto pursued, especially if it is cheaper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see you have a fit of coffin to-night.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am perfectly aware of the important functions of the pipe of peace among the In-

dians. I see an item, under supplies to sick and destitute Indians, of five gross briar root pipes, charged by J. J. Roos, of Ottawa. Might they not have been furnished with clay pipes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose that those were for the chiefs?

Mr. FLEMING. The large figures relating to the Indians of the North-West, furnish food for very considerable reflection. The policy of the Canadian Government towards the Indians under their charge, has always been one of the greatest humanity. That policy has been endeavored to be carried out by settling the Indians on reserves, and giving them instruction in the ways of civilised life. The policy, a very good one, has been further extended by the present Government, in the appointment of a large number of farm instructors, placed on the various reserves in the North-West. The result is somewhat startling, if the figures and reports of the Indian Superintendents in the North-West, are indicative of them. I find, on looking at these reports, that this very good policy which I commend the Government for continuing to carry out, has been placed to a very considerable extent in the hands of men who failed to carry out the Government's intentions. During the negotiation of the treaties made with the Indians, great promises were made. The Indians were led to believe, that if they forsook their nomadic life and resorted to the reserves, and entered on the cultivation of the land like white people, happiness, and peace and prosperity would result. Some of them were induced by those glowing promises to attempt settlement on the reserves, but these attempts have been to a great extent a failure, not altogether at least, on account of the Indian character, but largely, I think, on account of the character of the instructors, and of the inadequate way in which the policy of the Government has been carried out. When the Indians have so settled, they are promised implements, seed, grain, cattle, &c., but many of the instructors sent up to them were as little capable of entering on farming operations, as the Indians to whom they were sent. I observe that a large number of these men have been dismissed by the Government. I do not know for what reason. but I congratulate the Government on having weeded out a number of these inefficient officials; not only that, but those who were in charge of the distribution of the implements and other effects to the Indians under the treaty, have, to a very large extent, failed to carry out their purposes. I have the testimony, at page 131 of the report, of Mr. McColl, speaking of the Little Forks Band, as to how the promises which were made to them have been carried out:

"Missinawaypenesse, one of the councillors, represents that they are almost destitute of agricultural implements to cultivate their gardens. Their plough and harrow are broken and they are unable to mend them. This band is composed of seventeen families, and it is presumed that all of them are cultivating the ground, as one axe, one scythe, one spade and two hoes, were only given to such according to treaty; and I find upon referring to the records in the office that they received 20 axes, 32 hoes, 2 ploughs, 1 harrow, 15 scythes, 12 spades, &c., consequently they are still entitled to 2 hoes, 1 harrow, 2 scythes and 5 spades. I also notice in the same records, that nearly all the bands within this Agency have received more axes than they are entitled to under treaty, and that only two or three bands have received their complement of hoes, spades and scythes, notwithstanding the representations to the contrary made to the Department as well as to the Indians in reference to this matter."

On page 134 of the same report, it is stated, with reference to the Indians under the agency of Mr. McPherson:

"The agent informed me that although no potatoes had been requisitioned for this year owing to the Indians having, with few exceptions, an abundance of their own for planting, yet 175 bushels were forwarded to his agency, from Winnipeg, on the 27th of May; but before the Indians could be notified of the arrival of those supplies, they were generally through planting, hence only eighty-one and a-half bushels were taken by them; forty-nine were lent to other persons to be returned in the fall; twenty-seven and a-half bushels were sold at Rat Portage

for \$1.00 per bushel: five bushels given the freighter for taking them to market, and the balance, twelve bushels, rotted."

Now, if we are paying such large prices for the distribution of these supplies in the North-West, as has been instanced before, it is important that when articles are not required at a particular place they should not be transmitted from Winnipeg at this great expense. On page 142 the same officer says, with reference to the Beren's band:

"Two years ago 100 garden hoes were forwarded to this band, but the Agent considering them unsuitable for that rocky, timbered country, left them in the storehouse of the Hudson's Bay Company there, until last summer, when they were ordered to be returned to Winnipeg. The Indians are dissatisfied in not having received any agricultural implements this year, especially the grub-hoes promised to be supplied to replace the garden ones. The only implements delivered by the contractors at date of payment, were six hay forks and six sickles, which the Agent refused to distribute to the Indians, as these articles had not been promised by treaty to them."

So we find that articles are sent to the Indians which they do not require, and there are other instances of the same kind in the report, and instances in which articles which are required, and which have been engaged to be delivered are either not supplied at all, only partially supplied, or delivered only when they are too late for use. On page 146 of the same gentleman's report, I find the following in reference to the Cumberland band:

"Of the 110 grub-hoes shipped from Prince Albert to the agency at Grand Rapids in the spring of 1831, sixteen were distributed to this band last summer, and the balance was distributed to the Pas Indians. John Harcus, one of the councillors, complained that the agricultural implements forwarded by the Department were refused to be given them. Those supplies were generally late in arriving at the different places of payments, but even where they had been delivered on the dates contracted for the Agent objected to give them to the Indians, and also instructed Mr. Factor Belanger to retain them at Grand Rapids, until further orders from him, as he was not authorized to hand them over."

Further on in the same report I find the following:—

"There are also two ploughs, two harrows, two sets harness, and two pairs of whiffletrees lying in the Hudson's Bay Company's storehouse since last year."

So that there appears to be a concurrence of testimony to show that there has been a lamentable failure on the part of the agents of the Government in carrying out the intentions of the Government towards these Indians, and in keeping that strict faith with them which the Indian nature demands should be kept with them. As the right hon. gentleman has stated to-night, the Indian nature is a very jealous one, and if we fail on our part to carry out the engagements we make with them in strict faith, we need not expect the good results from this policy which it is intended to produce. I have read the evidence of one of the most reliable of the officers of the North-West—one who seems to do his duty with a great deal of zeal, and now I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to some testimony from an Indian source. Before doing so, however, I shall endeavor to give a character to my witnesses. In the report of Mr. Wadsworth, page 180, speaking of the Indians under Treaty No. 6, whom I am about to call as witnesses, he says:

"These Indians are Christians, and it was very pleasant to hear, during the long summer evening, the squaws and children singing 'Shall we gather at the River' instead of the monotonous drumming of the tom-tom so common to Indian camps."

"The 21st, 22nd and 23rd I spent with the Cree Indian Bands, Sampson, Bobtail and Ermine Skin, near Battle River."

I shall quote from a memorial which was published in the *Edmonton Bulletin* on the 3rd of February last, and is said to have been forwarded to the right hon. Minister of the Interior:

"A condition on the part of the Government is to furnish us with a number of farming implements and cattle proportioned to the number of families of each band. Now, during six years that we have been in the treaty, the officers acting for the Government have robbed us of more than one-half of these things on which we were to depend for a living, and they are not punished according to law. They can break their engagements on behalf of the Great Mother with impunity."

Mr. FLEMING,

"Now, hon. Sir, this is our great complaint. We have never yet been supplied with one-half of what was promised in the treaty. We who send you this letter represent seven different bands. One article promised us was one plough to every three families. Three of the bands have received only one-half the number each—the others less than one-half, and in one case none at all. Harrows, the same way. Axes, hoes, and all other instruments promised have been denied us in the same ratio. Some of us have received all our cattle, some only a portion, and some none at all. Of course, those who have received only a portion or none at all will lose the increase for so many years. We were promised, during four years, all the seed we could put in the ground, and, although many of us have been forced to break the ground with hoes, yet we have on no occasion received more than one-half what we could plant."

"Now, we consider this treatment an outrageous breach of good faith, but, of course, we are Indians. Why does not the head man of the Indians ever appear against us, he whom we call in our language the 'Whitebeard,' and by the whites called 'Dewdney?' He took a rapid run once through our country; some of us had the good or bad luck to catch a flying glimpse of him. He made us all kinds of fine promises, but in disappearing he seems to have tied the hands of the agents so that none of them can fulfil these promises. This is the cause of our dire want now. We are reduced to the lowest stage of poverty. We were once a proud and independent people, and now we are mendicants at the door of every white man in the country; and were it not for the charity of the white settlers who are not bound by treaty to help us, we should all die on Government fare. Our widows and old people are getting the barest pittance, just enough to keep body and soul together, and there have been cases in which body and soul have refused to stay together on such allowance. Our young women are reduced by starvation to become prostitutes to the white man for a living, a thing unheard of before amongst ourselves and always punishable by Indian law."

Now, Sir, we have the testimony of the inspector that the engagements of the Government are not fulfilled; we have also the testimony of a number of Indian chiefs. These chiefs, Mr. Wadsworth says, belong to the Christian bands under Treaty No. 6, and, therefore, I say their word, with the testimony of Mr. Wadsworth, is worthy of belief when it is corroborated by the representations of the inspectors themselves in regard to the way in which the Indians have been treated, and as showing that the humane policy of the Government has to a large extent failed, because it has not been carried out. I recognize the difficulty of the Government in regulating this matter at so great a distance; but, in the failure to keep the Indians on their reserves, I think we have a clearer indication of the reason for the conduct of the Indians than in the Indian character. If we find that the Government policy has been carried out in the way I have shown, that faith has not been kept with the Indians, who were induced by the promises of the negotiators of these treaties to look for large benefits from the Government, what will be the natural result? A number of the Indian bands forsook to some extent their nomadic life, and resorted to the reserves; the Government agents failed to implement the promises that were made to them; and therefore the character of a large class of Indians to-day is less self-reliant than it was when this policy was adopted. I am not finding fault with the policy, which, I believe, is calculated to promote the happiness of the Indians, and to secure the peace and prosperity of the North-West; but what I complain of, is, that those who have been appointed to carry out that policy have defrauded both the Indians and the Government, as proved by the instances I have cited from the report. What influence may such a state of things be expected to have upon the character of the Indians? They find promises broken on the part of the Government, and they are not likely to fail to break promises also. If they find frauds practised on them, they are quick enough in learning the ways of the white man, to adopt a policy of fraud towards the Government; and we find, in looking at the report, that this has been to a great extent the case. Mr. McColl, in his report, on page 113, says:

"The chief, Keezickookal, with as many of his followers as he could influence to accompany him, went away in June to visit the Sioux Indians, at Devil's Lake. The few families remaining on the reserve were most diligently engaged in hoeing an excellent crop of potatoes and corn, estimated at about twenty acres in extent. Mr. David Prince, the local Episcopal Missionary, informed me that he found it utterly

impossible to induce parents to send their children to school unless he furnished them with food and clothing. He is about to abandon the situation as a hopeless undertaking, and therefore has tendered his resignation to the Mission. The chief received payment in 1881 for nine of a family, an increase of one daughter by birth over the previous year, according to the Agent's remark on the pay-sheets, whereas I am credibly informed that no such birth occurred, hence he was overpaid five dollars. In the ensuing fall, his youngest child, aged four years, died, reducing the number of his family to seven, whereas he is represented on the pay-sheet as having received payment for eight in 1882. Punheekzee-zicknaba, one of the councillors, having two wives, is represented on the pay-sheet as receiving annuity in 1881 for a family of eleven, including two infant children, whereas at the date of payment only one of these children was born."

Now here we find the natural result of breaking faith with the Indians.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not breaking faith with the Indians. The Indians play these tricks continually in order to get more than they are entitled to.

Mr. FLEMING. That is the result of breaking faith with the Indians, that the Indians are induced to break faith with the Government. We find that the Indians, when the promises that are made to them are not fulfilled, resort to some means to make themselves square. When we find this state of things existing, when we find that Mr. Graham of Winnipeg reports that in a number of cases the Indians display less self-reliance than they did formerly, we are to some extent prepared for the large increase that has taken place in this item for some years past. In 1877, \$250,796 were expended on the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West, of which \$10,000 was for provisions. In 1878, \$333,503.68 were expended, of which \$29,400 was for provisions. In 1879, \$403,418.21 were expended, of which \$53,771.39 was for provisions. In 1880 the expenditure was \$615,041.65, of which \$157,572.22 was for provisions. In 1881 the expenditure was \$726,575.77, of which \$284,482.52 was for provisions; in 1882 the expenditure had grown to \$1,090,796.90, of which \$523,842.12 was for provisions; in 1883 the expenditure, with the Supplementary Estimates, is \$1,030,499.52, of which \$337,965.27 was for provisions; and this year it is proposed to expend \$791,064.67, including \$394,014.68 for provisions. These figures are the natural sequences of the mode in which the agents of the Government have carried on its policy. They are the natural sequences of the breach of the promises made to the Indians. They are, to a large extent, due, it is true, to the non-appearance of the buffalo in that country, but they are also, to a large extent, the natural consequence of the way in which the faith of the Government has been kept with the various bands of the North-West. If a more strict superintendency is not exercised over the carrying out of the promises, under the various treaties, to the Indians, I do not see how the promise of the hon. Minister, that these appropriations in a short time can be reduced, will be carried out. There should be a more strict investigation of the way in which the contractors, or their agents, supply these implements and goods to the Indian tribes. I have shown that the contractors fail to send supplies when they ought to send them and have sent large quantities to places where they were never required, and all these things enter into the large expenditure we are called upon to vote. I do not say the sum ought not to be voted if it is necessary to secure the peace of the North-West, but I do say that this large sum ought to be wisely expended, that good faith ought to be kept with the various Indian tribes, that the treaties ought to be faithfully carried out, and that where promises are made to the Indians the utmost care should be taken that those promises are fulfilled.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I go one step further than my hon. friend who has just spoken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Take care it is not a *faux pas*.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There have been many *faux pas* made in this matter. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be glad to know my views. However good may be the policy of the Government and its intentions, they cannot go against the natural law relating to Indians on this continent, and that is, that the Indian race is becoming gradually extinct as the white race advances. That is a broad fact. Another broad fact is, that you have not been able to bring one single Indian to the state of civilization reached by the white man. The experiment has been tried ever since the beginning of the colony, and I know of only one Indian who ever became thoroughly civilized, and that was a man by the name of Vincent, who has a mixture of white blood in his veins, and counts his descent from three or four generations. He reached such a stage of education as to go into Orders. I lay down as a principle, which cannot be controverted, that this race is becoming rapidly extinct, and we are wasting an enormous expenditure to attain an object which will never be attained, that is, to civilize these Indians. I have seen myself, at Garden River, the experiment tried by Catholic and Protestant missionaries. A small plot had been cultivated and set out in garden lots, and small houses had been built near them for the Indians, but instead of living in these houses, they built themselves, in front of the houses, small bark wigwams, and there they lived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those were their country houses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. As to their plots there was not a root to be found in any of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You might find some briar roots.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I give this as an instance of the inaptitude of the Indians to enter into civilized life. Now, Sir, I will make an exception in favor of the British Columbia Indians. They are a self-sustaining race, because they have had large fields in which to hunt buffalo, and have been obliged to resort to fishing in order to supply themselves with the necessaries of life. This gave them sedentary habits, and led them to cultivate the soil. But as to Indians of the North-West Territory, they are a doomed race, and it is only a question of how soon they will disappear. This race is extremely jealous, and they do not look to the Government employes that are bound to aid them, but, as they say, they look to the Great Mother on the other side to protect them. Of course, I do not put on the shoulders of the hon. Minister all the responsibility of the misdeeds in his Department, as he cannot know all that is going on at such a distance. But the Indians believe themselves so much neglected that, in their own primitive mode of speech, they call the head of the Indian Department, "Old To-morrow," because they never get what they want. That will give the hon. gentleman an idea of what is going on there; the name characterizes the thing completely. There is no denying the fact that in many of these outposts, agents of the Government speculate on the Indians, and often enormous sums of money voted for their assistance, by no means all goes to the Indians. The hon. gentleman asks for \$60,000 additional for supplies for destitute Indians. How many destitute Indians are there? This is to me a plain admission that they had not enough last year, and that you are obliged to keep them alive. We are required to expend this year, \$355,000 for the North-West Indians alone, and what this House would very much like to know is, how many Indians will be benefited by that sum?

Mr. CHARLTON. I find in an account here this item: "On the 28th June, 1881, Benjamin Warwick, of Fort Ellis, ten days, self and team, ploughing and harrowing, \$7 per day." Is not that rather a high price for a man and team?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I find another item. On the 28th of May, the same year, C. Henderson, Victoria, N.W.T., four days' ploughing and harrowing with his own team, \$1.50 per day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a different part of the country altogether.

Mr. CHARLTON. If one man is worth \$1.50, the other ought not to be worth \$7. There ought to be a little supervision exercised in these matters. In another account it appears one Whitcher is feeding Indians on turnips instead of flour. Is that considered good economy?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When flour gives out, they give them turnips, and when the turnips give out, we must give them grass. Food continually runs out there. Hitherto, all the caution of all the agents, cannot prevent an occasional excess at one point or a deficiency of food at another point. The Indians are migrators, and we cannot avoid that. Then the hon. gentleman knows that the great trouble there is transport.

Mr. CHARLTON. II. Rennie, Fort Walsh, freighting, 8 cts. a lb. What is the distance between Fort Walsh and Q'l'Appelle?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told about 400 miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. Eight dollars a hundred seems to be an excessive rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is almost impossible to get transport there at this moment. The immigrants going in, and the large surveying parties, will give anything for teams, and it is very difficult to get transport at any price.

Mr. CHARLTON. Bacon at Edmonton, procured from Hudson's Bay Company, 25,000 lbs., at 24 cts. a lb. Is not that rather a heavy price for bacon?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It takes the whole season to get it there up the Saskatchewan.

Mr. CHARLTON. Flour \$20 a barrel, bacon 30 cts. a lb.; these are high prices. Then, 12th November, 1881, South Branch, B. Bozer, threshing 889 bushels of grain, 14 cts. a bushel. That is about five times the price paid in Ontario. These are specimens of charges that I find in the accounts. These may be all right—I presume they are—but I am glad, in the interest of the taxpayers, that we are going to have that country penetrated by a railroad, and the rates of freight will be very much reduced. Feeding Indians with bacon at 30 cts. a lb. and flour at \$20 a barrel, is an expensive mode of keeping Indians. In the United States it is found that the agents who had charge of these matters robbed, with perfect impartiality, the Government on the one hand, and the Indians on the other. Great abuses grew up in that country, that have not been eradicated yet, that lead to Indian wars, and to great sufferings on the part of the Indians. In this respect the experience of that country is one that we might very well profit by, and it strikes me, in looking over these accounts, that possibly we are drifting into the same state of things—not to so great an extent—there are not such glaring abuses, but there are circumstances that require careful supervision. I produce these accounts for the purpose of directing the attention of the Minister to these matters, with the suggestion that it may be necessary to have greater care and closer supervision than in the past.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to one particular band of Indians, called the Swan Lake band. These Indians have been a great source of annoyance to quite a number of settlers in my county. They are supposed to live on their reserve at Swan Lake, but the chief claims that the Government have not carried

Mr. CHARLTON.

out their contract according to treaty and delivered supplies at the reserve, and consequently they have refused to remain there and have come back to the camping ground on the banks of the Assiniboine River at what is called Hamilton's Crossing. They have been a great source of annoyance to settlers in that locality on account of their habit of turning their ponies loose, breaking down the fences and burning the rails, and allowing their ponies to stray into the fields and destroy the grain. Last summer there was very nearly bloodshed between an Indian and a settler. The Indian claimed the right to live there because it was an old reserve. It was a reserve under the first treaty, but by a subsequent treaty made by Governor Morris, the Swan Lake reserve was set aside. The chief Yellow Quill complains that the farm instructor sent up was not a practical man, and could not show them how to proceed. The chief is anxious to know how to cultivate the soil, and he declared it was because the Government official could not instruct them at Swan Lake that he went back to the old reserve. He claims the Indian gardens which are on the school section at Hamilton's Crossing. The Indians of this band are a fine lot of men, although they are a little troublesome, and Chief Yellow Quill is a finely-proportioned man, and is reputed to be an honorable man, although some of his band took possession of supplies that were going out to other Indians some time ago. Inspector McColl recommends the Government to set aside the school section and give this to the Indians in order to pacify them. On behalf of the settlers in the locality I would strongly protest against this course, because it is a great source of trouble to have Indians settled on a school section. They are rather a nuisance among settlers. I hope the Minister will endeavor to have Yellow Quill and his band placed on their reserve, because, so long as they remain at Hamilton's Crossing they will be an annoyance to settlers. If they should continue to remain there they will quarrel with the white men, and there will be trouble and perhaps bloodshed. I hope the matter will be attended to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter will be attended to. The hon. member has read Mr. McColl's report, and he will remember that he enters very fully into the matter. The Indians refused to go on their reserve and went to Hamilton's Crossing. The hon. member (Mr. Watson) spoke of what he knew, and he knows all about it; but the hon. member who preceded him spoke from the Blue-books, not having the slightest idea of the difficulties which occur in that country. The Indians are well satisfied on the whole, and they should be well satisfied. The only thing the House has specially to consider is the large expenditure made on food for the Indians. Instead of breaking faith with them we have kept faith with them, and they have received large supplies. It is well known that, although the Indians agreed to go on their reserves, they have not gone in many cases. When they go on their reserves they get their cattle, implements and grain; but until they are on their reserves they eat the grain, kill the cattle and sell the ploughs, if supplied with them. It is quite impossible, from the difficulties of transportation in that country, that you can always have a given quantity of goods delivered on a particular day. The Hudson's Bay Company, which fulfil their contracts as faithfully as they can, have, from the breaking down of their steamer, and from the lowness of the water in the Saskatchewan, been two seasons behind, one season certainly. Even Baker & Co., who have had even more experience than the Hudson's Bay Company, have similarly failed, either from climatic causes or from means of transport failing them, to perform their contract; and it must be remembered that contracts cannot be performed in that country as a retail grocer can perform them here, if you buy a pound of tea, and order him to send it home by six o'clock. The report quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite, shows the



honesty of Mr. McColl. He was appointed, I believe, by the late Government, and if he was, it was a very good appointment, for he is one of our best inspectors. Mr. Wadsworth is very strict, and perhaps is inclined to find too much fault with every little deficiency of the agents. The agents are but men; they are away in the wilderness, far distant from assistance, and are sometimes bullied by the Indians. The Indians will always grumble; they will never profess to be satisfied. All the Government can do is to see that the provisions of the treaties are carried out in good faith—and they are carried out in good faith—and if there is any error, it is in an excessive supply being furnished to the Indians. But we cannot help it, of course. When once a band of Indians reach a fort or station, they always want to stay there, and want more as long as they can get any food. Why, at Fort Walsh, which was a centre near the frontier, and a place of meeting for the Indians from time immemorial, on the first settlement of the country, a fort was built to keep the Indians in good order and peace on the frontier. It has been found, however, that the Indians will go there, and it being close to the frontier, they go to the States, as they did last year, when they were driven back by the United States troops. They returned to Fort Walsh without horses, which they had sold or had been stolen from them by American Indians, and without food or clothing, actually starving. We could not allow them to starve, and we placed them on quarter rations only; but still, while Indians can get anything to support life, they will not move. We are obliged—and it was intended to have done this last year, only accidental circumstances prevented—this spring to tear down Fort Walsh, and the whole of the stores will be removed north of the Pacific Railway, and when they find no more food there, they will go north of the railway, and settle on the reserves. These things must and will happen, and all we can do is to use the most patient perseverance. It is no use to get angry with Indians. They are idlers by nature, and uncivilized. If they eat the cattle you must give them a good scolding and not shoot them down because they shot down the cattle and ate them. You must coax them to go on the reserves and do better next year. It is only by slow and patient coaxing and firmness at the same time alone that you can manage the Indians. The hon. gentleman read a letter, signed by a number of Indians; some of the names he would not read out—I do not know why—and some he did read. It is evident from the style of this paper that it was written by an uneducated Indian on bark, and in hieroglyphics, and not by a civilized man. It was evidently not written by a white man. It is the plain language of the uncivilized red man in which he complains of his troubles. Well, I know who wrote that letter, and I know that he is one of the curses of the North-West, one of the white men, despised by God and men. He is there living and getting fat upon inciting the Indians to discontent, and I know that he is under the special ban of his own Church for his conduct. He has been again and again excommunicated by his own Church for his unchristian and improper conduct in inciting Indians, for his own base and sordid purposes, to discontent.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is his name?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not give that.

Mr. GUILLET. I would like to make a suggestion. In my locality there are two very worthy and intelligent young Indian men, who are seeking to educate themselves. They are from the North-West, the Cree band, and they are struggling to educate themselves at their own expense, intending to fit themselves to become teachers among their own race. I would suggest that the Government might adopt some means to afford young Indians of intelligence and good character an opportunity to educate themselves to become teachers among their own people. It is well

understood that they cannot get this education in the North-West, and they might be encouraged to attend the Normal and Model schools, or Collegiate Institutes in the other Provinces. This is a very important matter, as they will more likely than whites succeed in educating and civilizing their own people. Of course, such candidates should be recommended and selected for this object and be placed under proper supervision while attending these schools; and in this way, I think, that they might be of great use in introducing the better phases of our civilized life among the Indians. I think that this is a matter well worthy of consideration, especially in view of our great obligations to the Indians, whose lands we have obtained. We have driven them to reserves, and we should make every effort in the way of promoting their civilization. To carry this suggestion into effect would, I think, materially assist in promoting the wise and humane policy the Government are pursuing in order to ameliorate the condition of our Indian population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt the Government experiences very great annoyance in consequence of the improvidence of the Indians, and of their wastefulness; and I can quite understand the difficulty of the situation in this regard; the difficulty of getting them on their reserves, and inducing them to perform any labor, to make use of implements and to work the cattle which the Government gives them with which to put in their crops. I have no doubt that the Government, in managing these matters, does the very best in their power. The last speaker referred to our obligations to the Indians. No man questions the policy; and the duty of the Government is to treat the Indians humanely, to keep them from starving, and doing just what it is doing. The Estimates are being discussed, not in a spirit of consorioness.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I recognize that perfectly.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course, we take some time on them, but I consider that there is not a single matter of greater importance, and scarcely of as great importance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with you.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no intention of wasting the time of the House. I see we have schools under the different treaties, for 1882. Under No. 1, the expenditure was \$79; under No. 2, \$626; under No. 3, \$120; under No. 4, \$160; under No. 5, \$1,239; and under No. 6, \$2,281. What is the result of the efforts to educate the Indians in these schools, so far as the measure of success has been attained? Will they be continued and rendered more efficient, and will a larger appropriation be granted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I think I may almost ask the hon. gentleman to look into the report on these schools, where he will find their success more or less alluded to. I believe, however, that these schools are fairly successful, especially those under the charge of religious bodies, Catholic or Protestant. These are, I believe, more successful than the merely secular schools, where the schoolmasters, who are honest men and who do their duty, are actuated, of course, by a desire to support themselves and their families. The moral restraints of the clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, are greater. They are actuated by higher motives than any secular instructor can pretend to. Secular education is a good thing among white men, but among Indians the first object is to make them better men, and, if possible, good Christian men by applying proper moral restraints, and appealing to the instinct for worship which is to be found in all nations, whether civilized or uncivilized. A vote will be asked for in the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84, for a larger description of schools. When the school is on the reserve the child lives with its parents, who are savages; he is surrounded by savages, and though

he may learn to read and write his habits, and training and mode of thought are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write. It has been strongly pressed on myself, as the head of the Department, that the Indian children should be withdrawn as much as possible from the parental influence, and the only way to do that would be to put them in central training industrial schools where they will acquire the habits and modes of thought of white men; so that, after keeping them a number of years away from parental influence until their education is finished, they will be able to go back to their band with the habits of mind, the education, and the industry which they have learned at these schools. That is the system which is largely adopted in the United States. Out of these pupils you will get native teachers, and perhaps native clergymen, and men who will not only be able to read and write, but who will learn trades. The Indians are more apt to take to trades such as carpentering, blacksmithing, &c., than to the cultivation of the soil. They have not the ox-like quality of the Anglo-Saxon; they will not put their neck to the yoke, but they can become mechanics and work at various trades. That is a scheme which I will lay before the House rather later in the week.

Mr. WATSON. I can testify to the good qualities of Mr. Ogilvy, who distributes the supplies at Portage la Prairie. I am sure that the Indians there get all that is allowed them by the Government. He takes great care of these Indians, and I believe that under his instructions they are acquiring a great deal of useful information. Some of them are very good farm laborers, though a good many of them will only work when they are hungry.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that there are quite a number of farms, some twenty-six in all. At Farm No. 1 at Bird Tail Creek, the expenses for salaries last year were \$1,922. I would like to enquire of the First Minister, whether these farms are still being carried on, and what the results have been so far as the financial aspects are concerned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the results have been, on the whole, satisfactory. Some of the farms have done very well, but it is only in cases in which the man are not only good farmers but had a good deal of tact, and had acquired a knowledge of the Indian character. In such cases—and there are several—the farms were nearly self-sustaining. I may say that, though the Government took great care in getting men who were trained to farming, and though some of them were well acquainted with agricultural pursuits, and were strong, healthy and respectable men, others have shown a woeful want of tact, and others of the most valuable would not stay on the reserves but went to work on their own account. We are altering the system very much. We find that we require men who are not only farmers, but who are accustomed to the Indians, and who know the Indian character—in fact it is more important to have a knowledge of the Indian character than that they should be first-rate farmers. What you want is to get the Indians to plant a few turnips, and perhaps in a rough way which would shock a model school alumnus, and raise cattle and roots, and perhaps by-and-bye grain, rather than that they should receive the instructions of a first-class farmer. The hon. gentleman will see that this vote has been cut down from \$40,000 to \$8,000. This is one of the economies which experience has shown could be practised.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are large numbers of these farms being abandoned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; but we find we can get men at small wages who will do better than farm instructors at salaries.

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume some of these men who were sent as instructors were entirely unfit for such duties—men who were school teachers, &c.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so. I know that we insisted for recommendations from people who were farmers, and upon whose veracity we had confidence in making selections. In some cases men who were selected, decided not to go at the last moment, and those who were sent in their places, did not in some instances prove so successful as the main body who were sent up.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is quite evident that some of these farms have not been self-sustaining, for I find in the report a number of expenditures charged for supplies, for oats, &c.; and I doubt very much, from my knowledge of agriculture, whether the Government will find the experiment of running these farms a self-sustaining one. It might be done, if they could get the right kind of men as instructors, and these men were industrious; but it is very difficult to exercise supervision over them. We shall find it a costly experiment, and, I think, the Government will find it profitable to abandon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that it is practically abandoned. There was formerly a farm outside of the reserve, and an instructor was put upon it. This has been broken up, and we will get a man, with an assistant, to work on the reserve with the Indians.

Mr. CASEY. We understood, when this experiment was undertaken, that that was to be done; the instructors were to be practical men, working on the farm and showing the Indians; but we on this side of the House were inclined to think that the experiment would be what it has turned out to be—that after a few sums of money had been spent for the benefit of a few favored individuals, the system would turn out a failure, and have to drop. I am surprised to find so sudden a change in the mind of the Government. Last year the hon. gentleman spoke very hopefully of what he expected to be done; but it now turns out that a large portion of this money which has been paid to farm instructors is simply waste. I notice that nearly all the items in connection with agriculture, such as implements, seed-grain, tools, farm maintenance, &c., are reduced. I suppose that the Indians eat the cattle and make firewood of the agricultural implements, so that there is no more stock for their farms than there were when these instructions began. I regret to see that, while these expenses, which should tend, if properly administered, to the civilization of the Indians, are decreasing, the great item which tends to demoralize the Indians is increasing. There is an increase of \$60,000 in the item for making paupers of them. The hon. gentleman says that the Indians were destitute and that they will not work so long as they get supplies, and he infers that we must feed them so long as they will not work. You must, however, not only deal with the Indian considerably but firmly. If you supply him with all the means of agriculture, and promise to continue to feed him in idleness, the Indian would be different from the ordinary savage if he did not think it would be better to make his profit out of his cattle and agricultural implements, and allow the Government to feed him besides. Under these circumstances the vote will continue to grow, and in a few years we shall have the whole Indian population of the North-West on our hands to feed. Of course you may occasionally starve an Indian who is really destitute; but I think that discrimination should be exercised by the Government agents between those who are destitute and those who are not. I know that a great deal of this talk about destitution on the part of the Indians is pretence. I happened to be present at a pow-wow between an Indian Chief and Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney, last summer. The Indians came dressed in the worst possible rags, and complained that they were destitute and starving, and had no opportunity of killing game; yet these Indians were in possession of the very best Winchester repeating rifles that could be purchased in the United States for cash. In connection with the same band of Indians, the Pie Pot

Indians, I must refer to the misunderstanding which has arisen as to the meaning of these treaties. The band refused to go on the reservations to be paid, and I must say they made out a pretty strong case for the refusal. When confronted with the treaty made with them by the then Governor Morris, binding them to go on the reserve, take their pay there, they stated that Governor Morris, at the time, verbally promised that they might get paid at Fort Qu'Appelle; and white men who were present when the treaty was made, confirmed their statements. It seems certain loose verbal promises were made to induce the Indians to sign the treaty, and it is these promises which have given rise to all these troubles. The same cause led to the difficulties with Yellow Quill's band. The hon. Minister said that Fort Walsh had been pulled down, and the station removed to a point north of the Pacific Railway. I understood the police establishment was removed from Fort Walsh to Fort Regina. The hon. gentleman says, that the police force being removed, the Indians would go to their reservations, but I believe they will simply follow the removal of the fort; and if the policy is to be followed of aiding every Indian who calls himself destitute, the Government will simply have to deal out supplies at the new depot. In this matter of Government supplies, I am astonished to find out how much of the money spent has gone to American sources. It is scarcely in accordance with the National Policy, that \$450,000 should be paid to Messrs. Baker & Co., of Fort Benton, U.S. I see no reason why the supplies for nearly all the Indian districts could not have been obtained, even last summer, just as conveniently from Winnipeg as from Fort Benton. In connection with one of these Government farmers, I notice some extravagant expenditures. A herder named Ives, gets \$150 a month, or \$1,800 a year, and his assistant got \$387 for ten months. These are very extravagant rates. The Government have hitherto been very well served by these Indian agents, and it has not become the fashion here, as in the United States, to make fortunes by being Indian agents. I know of one of our agents who returned poorer than when he went out. No proper check can be kept upon that expenditure, and it is impossible to say whether that money has been judiciously spent or not; the agent's word must be taken in every case. In the expenditure of such an enormous sum as \$355,000, it is impossible but that the agents will, either now or soon, learn to make a profit for themselves out of it. We have heard it stated that some of those agents kept little shops at which they traded with the Indians, immediately after payment of the annuities, and they may make the profit in that way. It is very common in the States, and I am afraid it will be common here before long. It is not in human nature that these men should handle such an enormous sum without some of it sticking to their fingers, especially when no check can be kept upon them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Upon page 111, part 3, salary of Mr. Dewdney, Indian Commissioner, \$3,200. What is his salary as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, in addition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He gets \$2,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Making \$5,200. Could the hon. gentleman say what portion of time the last twelve months Mr. Dewdney spent in the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Since Mr. Dewdney was appointed, he has spent all his time there, except when he was especially summoned, by myself, down here during the Session.

Mr. CHARLTON. He has spent, I suppose, at least two-thirds of his time there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he was here a little over two months this winter. Last year he was not.

Mr. CHARLTON. His services were found necessary here in reference to the management of Indian Affairs, not with reference to his duties as Lieutenant-Governor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nearly altogether with respect to the Indian Department. I have consulted him as to the future of the North-West, dividing it into electoral districts and things of that kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the hon. gentleman will succeed in getting the districts into better geographical shape than he did in arranging the districts in one of the Provinces west of us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be judicious gerrymandering, no doubt.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see an item of \$1,836, travelling, board allowance and cab hire, E. Dewdney. That applies to him as Lieutenant-Governor and Indian Commissioner?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there any way of getting these items separately, so as to find out what is for railroad fare, what for board, and what for cab hire?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I think the hon. gentleman might get all that information.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that E. T. Galt is down for \$1,250, for travelling expenses. What are his duties?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was Assistant Commissioner, and I am sorry to say we have lost his services. Mr. Elliott Galt, son of Sir Alexander Galt, was appointed originally as secretary to Mr. Dewdney, and he was found so valuable an officer that he was made Assistant Commissioner. He has found more profitable employment in the North-West, and has left the position; and Mr. Reed, a most valuable officer, is put in his place. From the beginning of the spring, and during the whole season, until mid-winter, these two gentlemen, the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner, were travelling from one end of that country to the other, at intervals, as much as possible—one remaining at headquarters while the other was travelling.

Mr. CHARLTON. I find, also, A. Macdonald down for \$1,709, for travelling allowance. What were his duties?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Angus Macdonald is Indian Agent.

Mr. CHARLTON. H. Reed, \$1,857.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was stationed at Edmonton, and is now moved to Regina as Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. CHARLTON. J. M. Ray, \$1,043.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was assistant under Treaty No. 7. I think, he was Assistant to Commissioner Reed. Mr. Reed having moved down to Regina, Mr. Ray, his assistant, has been appointed in his stead, and is reported one of the best officers we have.

Mr. CHARLTON. E. P. Wadsworth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is Inspector and travels all the time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I find quite a list of newspapers having charges for advertising. What did the Department find it necessary to advertise for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. No doubt they are advertisements of land for sale, of coal regulations, mining regulations, land regulations, colonization regulations, various regulations, timber limits.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not know any of these topics had any particular connection with Indian affairs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told those advertisements were for tenders for supplies.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose it is the custom to confine these advertisements to the party organs supporting the party in power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should think not. I cannot answer that question, but I think the *Free Press* of Winnipeg has got some advertising patronage.

Mr. CHARLTON. On looking through the list I do not find any. Probably by some oversight the *Free Press* was overlooked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When a paper is wrong in its politics it is generally wrong all round.

Mr. CHARLTON. This system may have been followed by all past Governments, but it strikes me that in the matter of advertising in the newspapers we should turn over a new leaf and advertise for the purpose of making our wants known, as business men do, for the purpose of getting value for our money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite right.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope, as the hon. gentleman approves my views, he will act on the suggestion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I will have to cross-question my hon. friend on that point, when he is my successor and I am sitting over there.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see a charge of \$500, expenses of removing Mr. Dewdney's family to the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; that is quite right.

Mr. CHARLTON. Petty cash disbursements, the same officer, \$208. When we get all these disbursements of this gentleman added together it makes quite a formidable sum, although I presume it is all right. E. McColl, expenses of inspection agencies, \$1,561.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is a good Grit and a good inspector.

Mr. CHARLTON. One pair of horses for Sir A. T. Galt, \$300. I would ask whether it is at all probable that this is in connection with the \$1,500 expended at the time he was looking up that fifty township colonization grant? I observe there was a vote for a grist mill. Where is the mill located?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grist mill was near Fort McLeod; but the Government have sold the mill and the farm. They made a very good sale.

Mr. CHARLTON. These are all the questions I desire to ask, and I must congratulate the First Minister upon the kindness which he has shown in answering these questions and on his apparent thorough knowledge of the subject he has in hand.

182. North-West Mounted Police..... \$416,000.00

Mr. CHARLTON. Baker & Co. figure largely also under this head. I suppose they provided supplies after contracts had been advertised for and their tender proved to be the lowest?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. I may tell the hon. gentleman that formerly we were obliged to advertise for tenders the season before the supplies were wanted, because the parties who had to furnish the articles required were obliged to make thorough arrangements for transport. Baker & Co. were sometimes unwilling to undertake the contract, and nobody else could supply Fort McLeod, Fort Calgary and all along that country. They have received large sums from the Government, and they have occasionally, when other contracts would have paid them better, helped us. We believe that hereafter it will not be necessary to advertise a year before the goods are wanted, under which plan the contractors must run the risk of possible change of prices next season, and must therefore have a very considerable margin. The contract will run out in

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

August or September, and we will advertise in the spring or summer for supplies next winter, which will go up by the Canadian Pacific Railway by way of Thunder Bay.

Mr. CHARLTON. Baker & Co.'s head-quarters are at Fort Benton; have all their goods been sent across the border from there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; some of the contracts have been supplied east of that. This firm has the most complete system of ox and horse teams in the North-West. They are now, I believe, sending some teams up on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the western point, and taking them from there to extreme points.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is an item of \$21,481 for provisions furnished by the Hudson's Bay Company. At what points are they so furnished?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Hudson's Bay Company obtained contracts when they were the lowest tender. They never undertook to deliver everything required in one advertisement; but they have supplied pretty much the goods along the North Saskatchewan, all the way from Winnipeg to Edmonton. They have taken some other contracts along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but Captain Howard has now got most of the contracts there, his being the lowest tender.

Mr. CASEY. While the payment of the force has been reduced by \$5,000, the item for forage has been increased \$8,400; for transport and freight charges, guides, teamsters, laborers and mail carriers, \$10,000; and clothing, \$7,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already explained that matter to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In consequence of the largely increased survey parties and the influx of immigrants the cost of transport is increased to an enormous extent, and it is very difficult to get any transport at all. For the same reason the cost of forage has increased. I hope by-and-bye that will not be the case; but at this moment hay is higher than it was last year.

Mr. CASEY. At most of the Mounted Police stations it was expected that the men would cut their own hay, and items for mowing machines have been passed on that understanding. I very much doubt the accuracy of the information that hay has risen in price, as it can be obtained for the mere cutting. As to oats, I do not think the price has increased. Last fall I think they were rather less than the year before. I notice that \$58,400 are down for the subsistence and forage of 360 horses, which seems to be very extravagant, over \$160 a horse. I would ask my friends from Manitoba, whether this is not excessive in the North-West, where nothing is paid for stabling, and you can get hay for the cutting. Oats, of course, are moderately high, but they are not such a very extravagant figure. The statement as to the cost of transportation, has, of course, considerable weight. No doubt the influx of settlers in the older parts of the country, affects this cost; but there has been no great influx to Fort McLeod that I know of, or to other points. It is only in connection with Regina and that neighborhood, that this has had very much to do with the cost of transportation. I do not think that any increase has taken place in the cost of it in the older settlements, that would account for an increase of \$10,000, or 33 per cent. over the estimate of the previous year.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Police force succeeded in furnishing themselves to any extent with forage, oats, hay, &c?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. We tried the experiment of conducting a farm, but we found that the two things did not go at all together.

Mr. CASEY. It is very likely that the policemen could not afford to do a good deal of cultivation, but it is absurd to

say that forage could not be raised for less than \$58,000. They have plenty of land and can hire labor, and I venture to say that the forage could be raised for less than \$20,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy that if the hon. gentleman became a farmer he would find there was not much money in the operation by contract.

Mr. CASEY. I have farmed all my life and by contract. To farm per acre would not cost over \$12 or \$15 per acre, and that would be a pretty high figure. At this price \$58,000 would easily cultivate from 4,000 to 6,000 acres. Oats will readily yield fifty bushels an acre, and 200,000 or 300,000 bushels could be raised for the amount put down for forage, while hay only costs there the labor for cutting. Regarding medicine and medical comforts and hospital expenses, there is an increase of \$3,000, while \$5,000 less are required for pay, and \$18,000 for food. How is this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are fitting up an hospital at Regina; and there will also be a new hospital at McLeod and Calgary. Of course, mind you, we have now 500 instead of 300 men.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How is it that we have \$58,000 for forage, which is there only needed for about five months in winter; and even then prairie horses which can find grass under the snow, can be used. These horses can be left out all winter and be caught in the spring. This item under the circumstances is enormous and preposterous. The food of 360 horses should not cost so much, unless somebody else is behind the manger to swallow it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really do not think that if my hon. friend had to go before the Minister of Militia and stand his examination as captain of cavalry, he would pass his examination. I think he would be plucked. These horses are very hardly worked, and the police are very hardly worked. They are constantly in the saddle; and the idea of turning the horses on the grass, and of getting little prairie ponies to be caught with the lasso when wanted to go off on a hard journey across the country, perhaps with prisoners and perhaps on an expedition to watch Indians, and of their riding on horses which would leave marks wherever they went, and green ones at that, across the country—is absurd. These horses must be kept in the highest state of efficiency and vigor, the same as cavalry horses, and they must be continually fed on oats and on dry food.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Ten lbs. of oats are the ration for an ordinary horse, and 11 lbs. for an artillery horse; and the idea of voting \$58,000 for oats and forage appears to me to be entirely preposterous. I know something about horses, and 10 lbs. of oats are the ration for an ordinary military horse in the Army Regulations. On the prairies the horses can be picketed. Unless details are given, for my part, when we come to concurrence, I think that we will have something more to say respecting this item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I might suggest to my hon. friend from L'Islet that the animal of Artemus Ward, of which we heard something last night, may have some of the rations out of this \$58,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that Baker & Co. charged, last year, \$13,779 for hay, oats, and bran; and the Hudson's Bay Company, \$19,696 for hay, oats, and bran. Will the hon. gentleman inform us as to the prices which are paid for these rations?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The prices vary very much in that country, but the price is from 3 cts. to 7 cts. per lb. The estimate is 400 horses at 40 cts. a day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the expenses last year showed an average of \$206 a horse, which seems a large sum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A horse's rations when they are stationary at head-quarters is 9 lbs. per day, but when travelling they are 16 lbs., and sometimes when hard worked 18 lbs.

219. Amount required for surveys, Dominion lands... \$600,000 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps, instead of making a speech, I may give the information in the more condensed form in which it appears in the memoranda supplied to me from the Department:

"This sum is \$150,000 in excess of the vote for the current fiscal year. "During the past season the outlines of 800 townships were run, and about 800 townships more were sub-divided and set out for settlement. This season it is expected that the outlines of 800 more townships will be run, and from 1,000 to 1,200 will be sub-divided into quarter sections and set out for settlement.

"These surveys are being prosecuted chiefly along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and although the sub-division of townships last season was upon a scale having no parallel in history, we were still unable to do more than keep pace with the progress of settlement. The prospects of immigration being this year so promising, it is probable that the history of last year will be repeated.

"This spring has been much more favourable than last. Our survey parties got started much earlier than usual, the state of the roads was exceptionally good, the crossing of the streams was much more speedily and successfully accomplished, operations in the field have been commenced earlier and more auspiciously than ever before, and the prospect is that we shall accomplish not only much more work than last year, but that the surveys, although more remote and less accessible than heretofore, will be made at a comparatively less cost to the country.

"The old settlements on the North Saskatchewan—Edmonton and St. Albert—have been surveyed into river lots. Surveys have also been made of lands granted to Colonization Companies, and these latter will be continued and as far as possible completed this season.

"Sub-division surveys of agricultural lands in the Edmonton and Prince Albert country were also made last season, and Prince Albert region, which is expected soon to have the benefit of railway communication, will receive a considerable share of attention this year.

"The Icelandic reserve will be surveyed also, and detached surveys will be made at other points, as the requirements of settlers necessitate.

"The system of having the sub-division of townships performed by contract, although it has its weak points, is thought on the whole to be the best, and is decidedly the most economical. The work is done very cheaply, and on the whole fairly well."

I will now read the memorandum from Capt. Deville, the Chief Inspector of Surveys:

"The scheme proposed for the surveys of 1883, comprises the sub-division into sections of about 1,000 townships, extending from Regina to the Rocky Mountains, along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a few townships in the vicinity of Prince Albert, Battleford and Edmonton.

"The cost is estimated at \$450 per township.

"The whole of this work is performed under contract at so much per mile of line surveyed.

"Thirty surveyors, under daily pay, will be employed for running the exterior lines of township. It is expected that they will, during the season, survey the outlines of 1,100 townships. Two parties have been working in the Peace River District for the last twelve months, establishing some main or governing lines from which surveys may be started whenever required. It is proposed to keep those two parties in the same district during the coming season.

"The cost of surveys, under daily pay, is estimated at \$250,000.

"For miscellaneous expenses, such as examination of surveys, in the field, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c., \$50,000, making altogether a total of \$750,000.

"Of this amount, \$600,000 are placed in the Estimates for 1883-84, and \$150,000 will be included in the Supplementary Estimates.

"This is the last year when it will be necessary to prosecute the surveys on such a large scale, as the sub-division of townships will be completed from twenty-five to forty miles on each side of the railway. Future operations may be confined to the localities required for immediate settlement.

"The grant for this year is the largest that has ever been, and probably that will ever be asked. Taking this into consideration, it is gratifying to know that there is every prospect of a very successful surveying season, so that adequate returns may be expected for the money expended. Surveyors, if not already at work, will commence in a few days. In a new country where so many unforeseen circumstances combine to thwart the most elaborate plans, the results obtained so far are a matter of congratulation."

That is all the information I can give with regard to the surveys.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice one or two items in the accounts in connection with the surveys last year, which I think are a little irregular. One D. B. Billings renders an

account for services at \$2 a day, \$730, and a bill for extra services during the same period at the rate of 50 cts. an hour, \$337. These extra services amount, in the lowest month to \$10, and in the highest month to \$73, or \$13 more than his wages by the month. He charges for extra services at the rate of \$5 a day, though his regular pay is \$2 a day. If this is a practice permitted to prevail in the Department, I think it is not a proper one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These gentlemen are not permanent civil servants. They are scientific men, surveyors, and they get \$2 a day as temporary officers. When reports come in from the surveyors, it is of the utmost importance that they should be examined and approved of at once, and they have to be submitted to competent officers, who check them. These officers have to be well paid.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to make a suggestion. I am sorry to say that some of the surveyors employed by the Department are not equal to the task. Therefore I would suggest that in choosing surveyors, the Department ought to know their antecedents, so as to know what they are able to do. I have been led to believe that the Government have been obliged to pay large sums of money for work that is entirely useless.

Mr. CHARLTON. I find that N. B. Beattie, who contracted for surveying, charges \$5.60 for first class, \$9.10 for second class, \$13.30 for third class. Will the hon. gentleman explain what the different classes are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Prairie work is first class, prairie and water work is second class, and forest, the most difficult, third class.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Another suggestion I would make is this. All the surveyors ought to be held responsible for the correctness of their surveys. And to this end, each surveyor ought to be supplied with a small label of burnt clay with his name on it, which he ought to be required to deposit under every picket that he plants. They would then be held responsible for their work, and would be all the more careful to lay down their lines.

Mr. BLAKE. Which of the two statements are we to accept as the authoritative statement? There is a discrepancy between them. The first statement said that the outlines of 800 townships were to be run, while the second stated that the number was 1,100.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I read the papers before me that the House might have every information.

Mr. BLAKE. The Secretary's statement contains the observation that there was a weak point in the system of sub-division of contract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is in the scamping of work, as every contractor is desirable to do his work as cheaply as he can, but, on the other hand, it is economical. Three or four surveyors have slighted their work, and it is only by experience we can know whether they are fit for the work or not; and these surveyors have not been paid.

Mr. BLAKE. I notice the expenditure of \$40,000 or \$50,000 entered for the maintenance of horses. Is that a mode of keeping accounts? or are the horses brought in in bulk and distributed among the contractors? or is the amount given to contractors for the purchase and maintenance of horses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The horses are bought and distributed among the surveyors. An officer was sent up to buy them, and he did not advertise for the reason that you must get horses accustomed to the country; and if advertised for the prices would be raised. They are used only for day work.

Mr. BLAKE. Out of the vote for Dominion Lands, under an Order in Council, provision has been made for the

Mr. CHARLTON.

payment to the Hon. John O'Connor of certain sums. The papers brought down do not say what these duties are. I think it is on the recommendation of the hon. Minister himself that, out of the appropriation for Dominion Lands, chargeable to Capital, this money is to be paid. A statement of the payments to a comparatively recent date show a payment of \$2,000 a quarter to this gentleman. What are the services for which the payment is made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Order in Council is down. I will not promise to lay it before the House, but I will lay before the hon. gentleman what Mr. O'Connor has done.

Mr. BLAKE. I know a good deal he has done.

Mr. CHARLTON. I find one W. Beattie, advance on contracts, \$2,500. This same surveyor had a contract the previous year amounting to \$8,702, and was sent away on the main line. He received an advance on the subsequent season's work of \$2,500. I find another, Walter Beattie, allowance May and June, \$2,110; no details received. This looks suspiciously like a defalcation. I would like information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am informed the practice is to make advances to every surveyor when he goes out. He makes reports of the work as it progresses, and during the season he gets allowances from time to time, to be accounted for in the end. With respect to Mr. Beattie, his services are to the north and west of Edmonton, at a great distance, and his reports have been delayed in consequence; but he is a good officer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understand they give bonds as security for the advances.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is quite right. In all cases they give bonds, secured by good persons, for the advances.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Government been so fortunate as to avoid any losses from advances made to surveyors last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have done their work satisfactorily, except two, who have not fulfilled their contracts, and proceedings are now going on against the securities of these two.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see an item, E. C. Dawson, awarded \$500 damages for withdrawing three and a-half townships from his contract. Why were they withdrawn?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After this surveyor got his contract the boundary of an Indian reserve was finally settled, and it was found that these townships were included in the reserve.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see Col. Dennis charges \$431.40 for travelling expenses. Is the colonel still connected with the Department?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a little matter here which is suggestive, a matter of cab hire, which has figured rather prominently in our Public Accounts. A Mr. Deville went to Montreal and purchased a return ticket amounting to \$7, his meals were \$1.50, and his cab hire \$4.75—rather out of proportion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It depends on the quantity of driving he did, I suppose.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose the hon. Minister could recollect that detail; but with reference to these advances a good many of us have recollections of a gentleman who was formerly a supporter of the hon. gentleman. He met with rather an unflattering testimonial from his constituents as to the expensive character of the votes that hon. gentleman had received from him in times

past, the result of which was that he lost his election, and I am not certain that he did not commence an action against the hon. gentleman for libel. At any rate, he thought his character had been very much aspersed. That gentleman was subsequently about to renew his suit to his constituency, whose attachment to him had been somewhat impaired, and he was supposed to be in a fair way to success. However, the hon. gentleman became reconciled to him, and the next thing we heard of him was, that he was in the North-West on one of these surveys. I would ask whether the operations of that survey have been satisfactory, or whether this abstention from voting was as expensive as the votes formerly were.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how much money went to Jones' Locker.

Mr. BLAKE. I see the hon. gentleman knows it quite well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that the gentleman alluded to got a survey, but he did not complete it. But he owes nothing to the Department; there is no default.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice a charge for silver chronometers. Are the surveyors provided with chronometers by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those are given to the daily pay men who do the outlying surveys. The chronometers belong to the Government and are returnable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see an account rendered by W. F. King, who had made advances to the amount of \$15,484 to the surveyors. Has he charge of the surveys?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. King is Captain Deville's chief inspector of surveys.

220. Dominion Lands chargeable to Income..... \$140,419.00

Mr. BLAKE. The Inspector of Colonization Societies Townships is, I believe, a new position created since last Session. I would ask the hon. Minister whether it is intended that the officer's services shall be permanent, or whether the appointment was rather with a view to the initiation of arrangements with colonization companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Inspector's salary is \$2,000. That officer, Mr. Rufus Stephenson, has been appointed for the purpose of inspecting the different colonization societies' lands. The regulations are rather rigid, the companies being obliged to place so many settlers in the townships each year; and strict supervision will be held over those societies. Besides performing these duties, this officer will inspect school lands, lands where parties have settled upon odd-numbered sections before survey, lands as to which parties claim for improvements—a good deal of that work is being thrown on Mr. Stephenson. He has been appointed also to value improvements and lands within the one-mile belt reserved on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which there was a great rush, and on which people settled, some with reason, and some without; also lands about Regina; also reserved lands at Broadview and other places, where each case must be judged according to its merits.

Mr. BLAKE. The cost of officers of Crown Land agents has almost doubled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and I fancy we shall have to add more next year.

Mr. CHARLTON. There are heavy expenses in connection with Crown Timber agencies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There have been a great many timber grants made, and we have to watch them in order to secure the stumpage and rental.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the head of Dominion Lands chargeable to Capital, I find a bill for advertising amounting to \$9,149, covering 125 newspapers. This must include nearly all the Conservative papers in Canada; there is one Reform paper on the list, the *Free Press* of this city.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These advertisements were those in regard to regulations for the sale of land. They were published in many papers at full length. We have, however, altered that system. We insert short notices and refer the parties to the full text of the regulations which may be seen at Winnipeg and other offices.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would urge on the Government the propriety of adopting the businesslike plan of inserting advertisements in papers having the largest circulation, and not in papers because they are party journals.

203. To meet expenses under the Adulteration of Food Act ..... \$12,000.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an increase of \$2,000, which is intended to provide for operations in the city of London.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The whole matter of the adulteration of food is of considerable importance. The First Minister was kind enough to let this item stand over in order that I might make enquiries and offer a few remarks respecting it; but the hour is so very late and members are so very tired, that, although my remarks would be very valuable, I will dispense with them this year. In the reports of the different analysts, we see how many different articles of food which we continually use, are adulterated, and some of them with injurious ingredients; and hence we can see that this is a matter which deserves public consideration. I find that various suggestions have at times been offered by these analysts as to steps being taken by the Government to ensure better articles both in the way of food and drink being offered for sale; and I was anxious to call the attention of the hon. Minister to it, and to find out whether any of these suggestions have been considered. For instance, in regard to condiments, I see we have summed up the results of the analysis of 132 samples, of which 56 or 57 per cent. were adulterated. In the Montreal and Quebec divisions, there were very large adulterations in this relation, but in Halifax, the spices are all reported pure. Coffee seems to be a particular article on which ingenuity is exercised, for both Montreal and Halifax report that every sample analyzed was impure. Butter is reported in many cases adulterated, but the adulterants are water and salt, which deteriorate the quality, and no doubt reduce the price very much, as well as our reputation as butter makers and exporters, but they cannot be said to be injurious to health. Out of twenty-nine samples of drinking water analyzed, fourteen are classed adulterated or very impure; and there is rather a long report from the different officers with reference to this matter, while the suggestion is made by Dr. Baker Edwards, of Montreal, that filters should be provided and charged for like gas meters. These are a few of the items to which I intended to call the Minister's attention, but it is repugnant to me to speak on any subject when any considerable number of the hon. members of the House is wearied. I can only hope that, on some future occasion, during next Session, this item may come up at an earlier hour, and that a little more attention will be directed to it, because I consider that it is a matter of very great importance indeed.

Resolutions to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:10 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 10th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 23,

Post Office and Finance Departments—Contingencies.....\$2,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I called the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the sum of \$520 paid to Senator Kaulbach in connection with legal services supplied to the Savings Bank Department; and I think that he promised to make some explanations regarding it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I recollect some enquiry being made about it. This Mr. Kaulbach was employed, I think, by the late Minister of Justice three years ago—about 1879 or 1880—to look after a claim against a savings bank agent, who had failed. It was placed in his hands to look after it, and this was the sum paid.

Mr. ROSS. Of course, the hon. Minister will notice that there is something irregular in employing a Senator by the Dominion Government for services of that kind; and it would be well to see that such a circumstance should not occur again. I do not know that it looks very well in the Public Accounts.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not see why a Senator should not be so employed, because he is a Senator.

On Resolution 39,

Salaries of officers, and contingencies of Library..\$20,260.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think that the hon. Minister of Public Works promised some information when this matter came up again, as to what disposition he was going to make of the Sessional Papers and Records, in placing them around the walls of the reading room for the greater convenience of hon. members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a matter which is much more in the hands of the Library Committee than in my own; but I said, at the time, it was a pity that the shelves all around the reading room were not used. Everybody was complaining that in the Library there was not space enough for the books, that a great many which were piled in the rooms, &c., could not be seen, and that it would be better if they were placed on shelves. Then it was stated by some hon. gentleman, that the Votes and deliberations, the Journals and appendices, and all these books might be put on the shelves in the reading room, which would give space in the Library. The objection to this was, that these books would be there without anybody to look after them, and as so many strangers go into the reading room, who very often are not known to the hon. members, these books might be carried away and disappear. It was also suggested that the books might be enclosed in frames and glass; and I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested that wire screens might be provided in place of glass. I think that this would be the proper thing to do; but in this case, before we go to that expense, it should be understood that the Library Committee would direct the librarian to act accordingly. If not done properly, it had better not be attempted.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you would take notice of the suggestion. There will be one meeting of the Library Committee before we close, and attention might then be called to this proposition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

On Resolution 40,

Printing, binding, and distributing the Laws.....\$12,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. Minister of Finance promised, before Concurrence, to look up the mode of distributing the Laws, and to tell the House on what basis the distribution was made, to whom the books were sent, &c. I called attention to the fact that magistrates complained that sometimes they failed to get what they had, or that they had a right to expect, namely, a regular copy of the Dominion Statutes. In our own town, for instance, our police magistrate failed to get them regularly, and I was ignorant of the mode of distribution.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I thought the enquiry was made especially with reference to the mechanics' institutes. I enquired into it, and I find that they are not sent there except in one or two special cases, when special applications were made. According to the paper placed in my hand, every qualified magistrate receives, or should receive, a copy; also each secretary or warden, I forget which, and the leading Judges and officials of that kind; but they are not sent to mechanics' institutes, except to one or two, at the request of individual members of the Government.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman know how they are sent? Do they go directly, or are they sent through some intermediate officer?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; they are sent to the qualified Justices of the Peace.

On Resolution 55,

Immigration .....\$517,721.00

Mr. BLAKE. Letters and announcements have appeared lately in the public papers, some of them under Sir Alexander Galt's signature, stating that a cablegram was received by him, announcing that mechanics and others were urgently wanted in the older Provinces, and that the agents of the Government should use every effort to secure them. I would like to ask whether these letters were genuine, and whether a cablegram was sent.

Mr. POPE. A cablegram was sent. A report was circulated throughout England that working people had arrived in this country, and could not get employment. Sir Alexander Galt cabled us, and I cabled back that agricultural laborers and general laborers were very much required. I said, and I told the hon. gentleman the other night, that mechanics would also get employment if they would turn their attention to farming.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the cablegram; I am speaking of the cablegram.

Mr. POPE. I said, also, that mechanics would find work in old Canada as well as in Manitoba. But what I have always said to the hon. gentleman I repeat now—that we assist agricultural laborers to come to this country; and I said I did not object, and I do not object now, to mechanics coming over, because they make some of the very best agriculturists that we get, although we do not give them assisted passages.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not criticising the hon. gentleman's policy. I only wanted to know whether, as a matter of fact, the cablegram was genuine which stated that mechanics, as well as agricultural laborers and farmers, were urgently required in the older Provinces, and that it was the duty of the agents of the Government to use every effort to secure them. I am glad to know that there is such a demand for mechanics in the older Provinces.

Mr. POPE. There is a demand for agricultural laborers.

Mr. BLAKE. I said mechanics.

Mr. POPE. I know. There is a very large demand for agricultural laborers; and as I said in that telegram, there



is also a demand for a certain number of mechanics, and I have never hesitated in encouraging them to this country, because two-thirds of them turn their attention to agriculture.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand that what the hon. gentleman said was an urgent demand for mechanics, and that, not being able to get employment as mechanics, they would have to turn their attention to agriculture.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman cannot get me away from the point by any side issue. There is employment for mechanics, both in the old and new Provinces; but I do not feel that we should give them assisted passages. I have said to that class, in whom the hon. gentleman shows such an interest, that to a certain extent I encourage mechanics to come to this country; and I have told them that, if they were industrious and attended to their business, they will soon become employers.

On Resolution 52,

To meet expenses in connection with Health Statistics.....\$20,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was to give us some information on this item, as to the plan he was going to adopt.

Mr. POPE. I did not make any memorandum of it. I know that we discussed it, but I told the hon. gentleman that I was sorry my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who took a great interest in the matter, was not present, as he knew more about it than I did; and now, as he is here, I will ask him to explain the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did take a very great interest in the subject, and I met a very large deputation of professional and other gentlemen, including the mayors of cities, and the determination arrived at was to use the health officers appointed in the various cities by the municipal authorities, and to pay them a certain amount according to population, in order to obtain for the Department statistics connected with the public health, and in order that the Department might be enabled to consult with the local authorities as to the best means to be adopted for promoting the public health. I think that the House will agree with me that it is a question of very great moment. It is one of prime importance, whether considered in relation to the question of life, or the progress of the country. The statistics connected with public health have a very great influence in determining the opinion of persons who are going to any country, because in proportion as these statistics show that the death rate is low, these localities are regarded as more attractive for settlement. Whether taken in regard to the question of the protection of life and health, or the promoting of the general prosperity of the country by giving confidence in it in regard to so important a consideration as the good health of the community, I do not think too much importance can be attached to this subject, and I believe this small vote may be used in such a way as to be productive of a vast amount of good.

Mr. BLAKE. The general observations of the hon. gentleman are such as we can all confidently subscribe to; but the information which we desire, and which the hon. Minister of Agriculture was not able to give us, and asks the hon. Minister of Railways to supply, is on what system the vote is to be expended. The hon. Minister of Railways has told us it is proposed to deal with the persons in charge of the sanitary affairs of the localities and to obtain from them certain information, but to what extent and in what manner he does not explain. I suppose by the comparatively limited vote, it was only intended to ascertain some of the conditions of existence as they affect public health rather than to attempt obtaining a complete register of vital statistics.

Such a register, unless complete, is utterly useless, and unless carried out with a high degree of accuracy is also utterly useless. Therefore, one does not want to see—with all the appreciation of the importance of the subject which the hon. gentleman suggests we entertain, and which I believe we do entertain—the country committed to that which may involve a very large expenditure beyond what we supposed by the vote will be guaranteed, or which may involve the expenditure of the particular vote for abortive ends. In the lucid explanation of the hon. Minister of Railways we have no information of the details of the system he proposes, or as to the manner in which he expects to attain the results he contemplates.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the criminal statistics contained in his report. A few years ago I had occasion to make some enquiries with reference to criminal statistics, and I found that his report was not very useful in that respect. Take for instance a charge in this report, that of drunkenness with which I am most familiar, and which is, of course, quite out of the comprehension of the other hon. members of this House. I find that in Ontario, there were, according to this report, 7,836 charged with that offence, and in Quebec only 1,690. Now, that either shows a great preponderance of temperance sentiment in Quebec—and I would be glad to believe it did—or it shows that the statistics are not complete.

Mr. BLAKE. It may show another thing.

Mr. FOSTER. In Nova Scotia the statistics are only collected from six counties, and in New Brunswick they are only gathered from a few; so that there must be some defect which makes these statistics entirely useless for the purpose of comparing the criminality of the different Provinces with each other; and I cannot see what great benefit they are, unless they give some data on which a comparison may be founded.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not had the opportunity of looking at this year's criminal statistics, but I hope they do contain comparative statements, both as to former years and as to the Provinces to which they refer. The hon. gentleman says these statistics of Quebec and Ontario, on the subject of committals for drunkenness, show either that Quebec is much more temperate than Ontario, or the statistics are inaccurate. There is yet a third proposition, namely, that the administration of the law may be more lax in Quebec and fewer drunken people taken up there.

Mr. FOSTER. In making up that 1,690 in Quebec, I find that only Quebec, Montreal and St. Francis are included, and one can scarcely come to the conclusion that these are the only places in that Province in which drunkenness exists, or in which people are taken up for it. Again, in Nova Scotia the only places taken into account are one city and five counties. I pretend that these statistics are almost entirely useless unless they furnish a basis for a comparison of the criminality of the different Provinces. I would rather see \$4,000 given to some committee of Commissioners to gather statistics carefully from the different institutions, and with regard to the different subjects each year, that we might have something really useful.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition went out of his way to save Ontario from the responsibility of the number of crimes committed there. If he knew the Province of Quebec better he would see that the statistics are quite correct.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not saying they are not; I am suggesting that they are.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I maintain that we can accept the figures as representing the actual state of temperance in our Province. It is well known that in Ontario there are

over 3,000 licences granted where there are scarcely fifteen granted in Quebec; and outside of the large centres we find very few criminal cases arising from intemperate habits. I am glad to say that in our rural districts temperance is well kept.

Mr. PLATT. In the Province of Ontario efforts are already put forth, and public money is being expended for the purpose of collecting vital statistics, and with very good results. I would ask the hon. Minister if we are to have a separate set of officers collecting the same information, or, so far as Ontario is concerned, is this scheme meant to supplement the machinery now in operation?

Mr. POPE. Under this plan we only propose to collect statistics in certain portions of the country, but the plan will embrace mortuary as well as vital statistics. At first, we propose to apply it to eleven cities of Canada, comprising the capitals of the several Provinces and other cities containing 25,000 inhabitants or over. We shall collect mortuary and vital statistics, as well as enumerate all diseases and causes of death, and gather collateral information on the state of the public health. That is not now done by every Provincial official that I know of. Last fall, a conference of medical men on this subject was held in Ottawa, and was composed of fifty or sixty of the foremost physicians of various parts of the Dominion, and these gentlemen drew up a scheme, based on that of 1879, for the collection, tabulation and publication of mortuary and vital statistics. This scheme is made dependent on the organization of Local Boards, and the appointment of local sanitary officers, who are to be the officers for the collection of such mortuary and vital statistics. Upon the strong representations of the gentlemen composing this conference, the Government decided to ask for \$20,000 this year, and it is the intention to apply the scheme, after the first year, to the smaller cities and towns of the country. The allotment to the cities from the grant is composed of a bulk sum, which is not to exceed \$400 in each case, and a *per capita* subsidy of one cent per head of the population. Then it was supposed by my deputy, to whose valuable services I am almost entirely indebted in the preparation of this scheme, that the cost would likely be as follows in the several places: Montreal, \$1,800; Toronto, \$1,260; Quebec, \$920; Halifax, \$760; Hamilton, \$760; Ottawa, \$670; St. John, N.B., \$660; Winnipeg, \$480; Fredericton, \$460; Victoria, B.C., \$460. My hon. friend must recollect that this is the first attempt to collect health statistics and information that will be of use to the medical profession and the public generally; that we are just beginning the work, and that we cannot make any very clear or positive statement in detail as to the cost. I hope that after the experience of this year we will be able, next year, to give a closer approximation of the cost.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. Minister ought to be aware of the fact—and if not I will make him aware of it—that all the based information which he proposes to collect by his system is already being collected by the Ontario Board of Health, and these mortuary and vital and health statistics, and statistics regarding the various diseases, are all arranged for in Ontario, and a law is in operation for that purpose under which public money is being expended. The question I asked the hon. Minister was whether that portion of the grant belonging to Ontario is meant to supplement the action of those officers already engaged in that work, or will another set of officers be engaged to collect exactly the same class of statistics at an extra expense.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that there was a large delegation of highly intelligent and able medical men, and other gentlemen in Ontario, who came to my hon. friend to urge the action that is now being taken. Notwithstanding,

Mr. DESJARDINS.

ing that a great deal has been done in the way of collecting statistics of this character in the Province of Ontario, it was not felt that it was desirable to supplement the provincial system by the action taken by my hon. friend. As to the agency that is to be used, my hon. friend does not propose to select the officers at all; these officers will be selected by municipal authorities, they are to be the health officers who are already engaged by the local authorities, and the grant will be used by my hon. friend to supplement the salaries they are already receiving as such officers in the various districts, and will be used for the purpose of furnishing to the Department medical statistics of this character.

On Resolution 109,

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Additional Public Buildings, Wellington street..... \$200,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works will state the plan by which the Government proposes to expropriate the property.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount asked in the Supplementary Estimates, \$84,000, will not be sufficient to meet the total sum required. There will be required about \$5,000 more. Of course, the hon. gentleman must know that we could not state exactly the amount required. I have obtained the following note from the Department. We have paid to the proprietors for the land \$87,849, and then we have settled with five tenants, \$1,250, and then there is the case of Mr. Mitchell of the *Free Press*, whose lease, I think, expires on 1st October. If we require the building before that time, compensation will have to be paid.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the principle is to deal with the owners of the property, and to pay the tenants damages for an early determination of their leases.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We purchase the property, say three months ago, and from that moment the amount of the rental belongs to the Government, and we settle with tenants.

Mr. BLAKE. You purchased the property subject to the leases, and if you want to take the property away from the tenant you make arrangements with him to do so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was the only way to do it under the circumstances.

On Resolution 168,

Salaries and disbursements of fishery overseers and wardens..... \$110,100.00

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I think that the hon. Minister promised us some information with reference to reports under this item.

Mr. BOWELL. I found when I went to the Department that the reports were so voluminous that it was utterly impossible to bring them down. Mr. Whitcher set a man at work to copy them, but I told him to desist; I thought it unnecessary to go to all that trouble and expense as the papers could not be ready in time; but if any member desires to see any one of these particular reports which is not of a confidential character, he may see it. I trust that this will be satisfactory, as it would be utterly impossible to copy them in time.

On Resolution 164,

Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog-alarms..... \$40,600.00

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that some further explanations were to be offered regarding this item.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware of it; a full list of those proposed to be erected, together with the cost of each, and \$5,000 for completion and repairs, was laid before every member of the House. If there is any particular point

to which the hon. gentleman refers, I shall be glad to give him any information at my command.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question which was raised was with reference to the definition of the words "fog-alarm" or "fog-whistle," and the propriety of putting up bells, which could only be heard a distance of 200 or 300 yards, in place of whistles.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no recollection of any explanation being asked or promised. I remember that my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) found fault with the use of the word "fog-alarm," and signified that something more was required in the interests of navigation, and he suggested that the words "fog-alarm" should be struck out of the Estimates in future, and something submitted which would convey the meaning more correctly. The principal objection taken by the hon. member for Algoma was to the character of the fog-alarms which were erected on dangerous rocks, and he wanted something which could be heard at a greater distance, and would be more effective. I will, of course, bring that matter to the attention of the Government, with a view to effecting an improvement.

Mr. MITCHELL. The point which has been raised by my hon. friend, I may say has been under the consideration of the Department for a long time. They have abandoned fog-bells and guns, and have adopted a number of what are called fog-whistles or fog-trumpets. There are several kinds in use, and for some years past the Department has been endeavoring to get the most perfect trumpet, or signal, or whatever you may choose to call it, that they could get. They have recently adopted a self-acting one, which I am told combines economy with efficiency, though I do not know much about it myself. I believe the first fog-alarms or trumpets which I have ever heard of were erected in Canada, and I have never heard that anyone could point to our system as being in any particular very faulty. It is certain at all events that both the United States and Great Britain have copied from our system. I quite remember that, in 1871 or 1872, the elder brethren of the Trinity House were specially sent out from England and spent several months on this continent, examining the fog-alarm system, as well of the United States as Canada. I was Minister at the time, and we sent one of the steamers in charge of the Deputy of the Department, to accompany these gentlemen through our whole fog-alarm and lighthouse system along the River St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coast of the Dominion. After spending ten or twelve days making a thorough examination they went to the United States and thoroughly examined the system there, and when they returned to England they made a full report on the lighthouse and fog-alarm system of this country, and gave to Canada a high meed of praise for everything they had seen in connection with that service. I have no doubt that the suggestions which were made by them were carried out, and that the same system we have in Canada was adopted on the coasts of the United Kingdom. If the Departments continue as they have been going on, creating a greater security to vessels approaching our coasts, we will be in no way behind any nation of the world in giving that security which is needed in connection with this particular service. I take occasion to make these remarks because, perhaps, the acting Minister is not so familiar with the earlier history of the Department as I am.

Mr. DAWSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the fog-alarm and coast service of the Dominion—it is improving very fast. What I called attention to before was this: That in making arrangements with the United States Government for putting up a lighthouse at Passage Island, which is in United States territory, though useful only to Canadian shipping, they arranged to put a light there in consideration of the Canadian Govern-

ment putting one on Colchester reef. In making these arrangements the words "fog-alarm" were used in the correspondence, and instead of putting up a fog-whistle, which is the proper kind of fog-alarm, they put a bell, which cannot be heard at any great distance in stormy weather, even if it is rather a powerful one. What I suggested was, that in carrying out the new arrangement with regard to the building of a lighthouse on Colchester reef, the attention of the United States Government should be called to the matter, and instead of putting up a fog-alarm in the form of a bell they should be asked to put a fog-whistle which can be heard at a distance, and thus conform to the spirit of the understanding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it right to say that all that has been said by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and a great deal more that might be said in the same direction, is not only strictly true, but reflects the highest credit, not only on the Government of Canada but upon the hon. gentleman himself. I went with the Vice-Admiral of the Halifax station, Sir James Hope, in a ship of war to test and investigate one of the early fog-trumpets which were placed on the coast at Sambro' by my hon. friend, and the report was afterwards made by the Admiralty to the Imperial Government, stating that it was not only a wonderful success, but superior to anything they had ever investigated as a fog-alarm. I may state that I myself have heard one of the fog-trumpets erected by the hon. gentleman at a distance of thirty miles; and this one on the Sambro' coast to which I have referred, could not only be heard at a great distance, but was so constructed as not only to give the alarm to ships approaching the coast in a dense fog, but by timing the succession of the reports they were able to locate the ship and tell the exact distance the ship would be from the point of danger where the alarm was placed. There is no doubt at all that the attention which the hon. gentleman gave to this very important question in connection with his other exertions in lighting the coasts of Canada, have done a great deal to raise the country in the estimation of all sea-faring people, who are so greatly interested in this and other countries in having the coasts of the country properly protected. I am satisfied that no expenditure of money can be made more valuable to a great sea-faring country like ours, with an enormous line of sea coast, than the expenditure which has been made, and is being made, to light the coasts, and erect these fog-alarms, fog-whistles, and signals of danger in the fogs which occasionally are found upon our coasts.

On Resolution 199,

Excise..... \$288,380.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. When this item was under discussion in the Committee, some objection was taken, particularly with reference to the appointment of an additional officer at Sarnia. The statement I made that that appointment was made on representations from the Inspector seemed to be doubted, and I wish, therefore, to read some proofs of what I stated. As far back as November 14th, last, the following letter was addressed to the Commissioner:—

"Sir,—I have the honor to transmit herewith a communication from Mr. Collector Gerald, of London, asking for two additional officers. I consider they should be given him as soon as possible, as the removal of Officer Cameron to Perth, to relieve Officer Mason, who is now on duty at Costicook, and the starting of additional manufactories at Sarnia, where another will be required, thus making it absolutely necessary that two officers be sent to the London Division at once to enable Mr. Gerald to efficiently carry on the work."

On January 15th, 1883, Mr. Davis, the Inspector, reported as to the candidates who had successfully passed their examinations, and in the fourth paragraph of his report he says:

"It is impossible for one officer to do the work at Sarnia properly. Another should be sent to help Mr. Elwood."

That additional officer was appointed, or two more were appointed for the London district, and Mr. Slattery was directed to go to the office at Sarnia, because he had lived there. That, I think, establishes the fact clearly, that the appointment was not made, as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) stated the other night, merely for the purpose of rewarding this man for political services rendered. The appointment was made at the suggestion of an officer, and who should clearly—and I think the House will be satisfied with the evidence—see that the appointment was necessary. I was also asked to give a statement of the increase of revenue, because it was charged that the effect of the appointment was to saddle the country with an additional expense of \$500 or \$600, to reward a political servant. Now, I will give the House some very interesting information on that point. The receipts of that division have been as follows:—In 1878, \$17,602; in 1879, \$20,111; in 1880, \$29,000; in 1881, \$21,000; in 1882, \$23,000; and in the ten months of this year, \$26,000; or, making a proportionate allowance for the other two months, \$31,000 for the 12 months. That shows a very considerable increase in the revenues; but that is not the most important part of the matter. The most important is that Sarnia was formerly a division in itself, in which there was a collector appointed by the late Administration, and a very strong friend of the party then in power, at \$1,400 a year, and an assistant at \$750 a year; that made the expense of that office \$2,150. In 1880, I think the collector died. It was then found that the division was not large enough to justify such a large expenditure, and it was taken into the London division, one officer being appointed to do the work at Sarnia at a salary of \$800, so that, instead of increasing the expense of that office, we have reduced it from \$2,150 to \$800. The work has recently been increasing, and we have sent an additional temporary officer to assist. The principal industry there, subject to Excise, is the manufacture of malt. In 1878 the manufacture of malt then amounted to 175,000 lbs.; in 1879, it was 32,000 lbs.; in 1880, 53,000 lbs.; in 1881, it was, 23,000 lbs.; in 1882, it went up to 473,000 lbs., and up to April 30th, 1883, it has been 510,000 lbs. These figures show the necessity there existed for some help. The number of manufactories has grown from three, which was the number from 1878 to 1881, to seven at present. I think the House will now understand that this was not a political appointment, but was necessary in order that the service of that office might be performed sufficiently, and I think the hon. gentleman who made the charge the other night must feel that it has no foundation whatever.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Minister states that the revenue has increased to such an extent as to render another appointment necessary. How much more is the revenue of 1882, than the revenue of 1880?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The revenue for this year is about \$2,000 more than it was in 1880; but the manufactories have increased from three to seven, which accounts for the increased work more than the mere collection of revenue.

Mr. LISTER. I only know of two manufactories. However, I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I did not state that the revenue had decreased; I merely asked for an explanation of the case. I stated that, so far as the gentleman who was appointed was concerned, that I had no objection to him on account of his ability or capacity, because I believed him thoroughly qualified; but the objection I took was that the appointment was made, not because it was necessary, but for the purpose of rewarding a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not object to hon. gentlemen appointing their own friends, for the country expects that, but what I do object to, is the appointment of a man to a position when there is no need of such an appointment. Now, so far as the collectorship of that place is concerned,

Mr. COSTIGAN.

I may say that up to the death of the late collector, which, I believe, was in 1878, the office at Sarnia had been the head office of a division, and London was a separate division; but now the office of Sarnia has been merged in that of London, of which Sarnia is made an outpost. The collector at Sarnia had been appointed previous to the time Mr. Mackenzie came into power, and remained there until his death. A committee was formed in the town of Sarnia by gentlemen who supported hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of recommending to the Government a successor to the office when it became vacant. When it became vacant hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and three out of the four of the committee applied for the place, and, in order to get out of the difficulty, the office was abolished. Since this matter came up before the House the other day, I have received a letter from Mr. Slattery, in which he states that I did him an injustice; and as I would be sorry that any statement of mine would have the effect of injuring his feelings, or of hurting him in any possible way, I hasten to declare that he states he did not circulate the manifesto of the hon. gentleman. I am glad to know he did not. He had a right to do it, but he says he did not, and as he thinks he has been injured in some way, I make this public statement for his benefit. So far as manufactories are concerned, I can only repeat that there is, to my knowledge, only one additional factory in the town of Sarnia, and that is the malt works, which were only started, I think, a year ago. It is a common rumor in that part of the country, that Mr. Elwood, who has been in the office but two years, is quite able to perform all its duties. Of course, the other gentleman has been appointed, and is now in the Civil Service, and that is an end to the matter. But I do not think the work, or the increased revenue of the office, justified the appointment.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman seems to attach a great deal of importance to the difference of receipts in the office between 1880 and the present time. I say there has been an increase of \$2,000. He seems to overlook the point that the \$29,000 collected in that division were collected by one officer getting \$1,400 and another getting \$750—a total cost of \$2,150. The revenue for 1882 amounted, for ten months, to \$26,000, or at the same rate, \$30,000 a year which was being collected by one man for \$800. Then, not entirely on account of \$2,000 increase in receipts, but also on account of the additional work created by the increased number of factories, as seen by the report—and what better evidence could the hon. gentleman want—this additional man was sent, on the representation and requisition of our officers, temporarily to assist Mr. Elwood.

Mr. LISTER. What additional factories are there? I know of only one the malt factory, and I think one man can collect \$32,000 as well as \$28,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot name them, but I take the information I get from the officers of the Department; and, according to their report, there are seven additional places working under the Excise Law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Possibly the hon. Minister may comprise all the factories that would be included when Sarnia was a division.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the first place, we are discussing the duties attached to the office held by Mr. Elwood in his division—you may call it the town of Sarnia, or it may include the outskirts, or a portion of the next township—but it is all taken in from the Inland Revenue at London. He is appointed at Sarnia, and all the duties he has to perform is to attend to and look after seven manufacturing establishments in his district.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does that district comprise?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is known as Sarnia. I do not know what its limits are. The hon. gentleman knows the extent of Sarnia.

Mr. PATERSON. It is the town of Sarnia, that is all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The manufactories at the outskirts of the town may be included in this report. It is stated in the return that there are seven manufacturing establishments within the limits of that officer's jurisdiction. To enable him to discharge the duties, another officer has been sent from London there. That will be the effect of it. If the work became less he could be removed to some other place where his services would be more required; but at the present he is required there, as has been shown by the report of that officer.

Mr. LISTER. One word of explanation. The hon. gentleman has said that the expenses up to the time of the death of the late collector amounted to \$2,150, and that on his death an officer was appointed at a salary of \$800. Now, at the time it was a division, the hon. gentleman must remember that he had the officer at Sarnia to do the work at Petrolia and other places in that division. Petrolia is as large as Sarnia, and has more manufactories than Sarnia, so that the work done in that office was more than twice—I may say three times—as much as it was from the time it ceased to be a division; and Mr. Wood, when he went into the office at \$800 a year, had not more than one-third the work the old collector had to do, so that in point of fact there has been no saving at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was understood that on this matter we should have more latitude, that we were to have a full understanding of the question when it came up. Could the hon. Minister tell us the number of manufactories subject to supervision at Sarnia in January, 1883?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Seven.

Mr. PATERSON. Then at that time there was precisely the same number. The officer runs it along, and is apparently able to run it along, until this gentleman is appointed some months after the election. He had run it for a considerable time, from June up to January, with the same number of establishments, before it was found out that he required assistance. Now, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the officers do report that two extra men are required for the London division, but the London division comprises a large extent of territory, and when those men are appointed one is detailed to go to Sarnia to assist the officer there—I think one of his officers does mention Sarnia separately. But the hon. Minister himself has told us that Mr. Slattery has been appointed there temporarily. Now, if that is the case—and the hon. Minister gave us to understand that it was—he admits that there is no necessity for placing him there permanently; there may have been for a short time a pressure upon the officer there who was entitled to get relief from the head office at London. But we understood before from the hon. Minister that this officer was appointed permanently, that his services were requisite. With all deference to the hon. Minister I think he has failed to make out just as strong a case as he desired to. Further than that, I may say, though I do not wish to find too much fault with him, that he was not sufficiently explicit in making his statements, as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—myself among the number—were rather led to a conclusion different from what we have just found to be the actual condition of affairs.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps I have not been explicit enough; perhaps I have left unsaid a great many things I might have said; perhaps I might have paid the hon. gentleman in his own coin; perhaps I might have wounded them as they would endeavor to wound me; but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I care little for the insinuations the hon.

gentleman has let fall. He has entirely misrepresented the statement I made so frankly before the House, he has tried to mislead the House, and I am not disposed to allow the hon. gentleman to do so.

Mr. PATERSON, Say how.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says that because this man continued to do the work a certain time without an officer, that was proof that he had no necessity for an officer. Did I not state clearly to the House that in consequence of the passing of the Civil Service Act we were unable to make any appointments until examinations took place, and until we had a list from which to choose our men? But he says that the officer reported that two men were required for the London division, but said nothing about Sarnia. The hon. gentleman drew his conclusion from a hint given by the hon. member for Lambton who, I am glad to say, retracted the accusation he made the other night, when he accused me of having made the appointment from a political point of view, and in order to reward this gentleman for carrying certain circulars. I told him I knew nothing about who carried the circulars. He would not accept that; but to-day he has acknowledged that he did make a mistake at the time. Now, let us see what the officer at London did say. I have a letter from Mr. Gerald, collector at London, who says:

"I beg to inform you that two additional officers are required in this division, viz., one to take charge of Slater's malt house, recently supervised by Mr. Officer Cameron, and one at Sarnia to assist Officer Elwood, who will now have more work than he can attend to."

Is that plain enough for the hon. gentleman? This was on November 10<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. PATERSON. I said that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This document proves an additional officer was required for that place, and because we could not send one in time, we appointed Mr. Slattery temporarily, before he entered the London division. But Mr. Slattery is not there now, and I gave the hon. gentleman the figures to show that the statement he made, that he had saddled the country with \$600 additional, is not true, because the expense of that office has not been increased, and is nothing compared to what it was before.

Mr. LISTER. Nor the work either.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Who was the occupant of the office in 1878? I suppose the hon. gentleman would have had a grievance if he found that, because the receipts of that office at that time did not justify the expenditure, we had removed the officer. But he was allowed to remain in the office, though a strong opponent of the present Government politically. Hon. gentlemen were fond of appointing their friends and finding places for them, and there was a good opportunity of filling that place by a political supporter at \$1,400 a year. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot complain because we allowed one of his friends to remain in office and draw that salary. But we did not fill that place by putting in a political supporter, but we brought Sarnia into the London division, and reduced the expenses of that office down to \$800. Now, on account of the increase of work, on account of the report of our own officer, and acting in perfect good faith, we have made this change, the hon. gentleman complains of it. The hon. gentleman says, or insinuates, that I ought to send a man there as a probationary clerk; he says I say that this is not a permanent employment. I say that no probationary officer is a permanent officer; every man appointed in our service is changed from one place to another wherever he is most required. If he is required at Sarnia to-day, he goes to Sarnia; if he is required at London to-morrow, he goes to London, but he is not continued there any longer than he is required.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to say—

Mr. BOWELL. Order. I would remind the hon. gentleman that we are not in Committee, and for him to speak several times on this question is certainly contrary to the rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. The discussion should be allowed to proceed, and should not be stopped at this point, when it looks as if the Government were afraid of the matter being further discussed.

Mr. RYKERT. It was not even asked that this item should be fully discussed on Concurrence. The railway policy was the only matter left open for full discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no knowledge of what occurred in Committee, and it is for the House itself to say whether it will allow its Rules to be suspended or superseded; but it is irregular for the hon. gentleman to speak more than once. It is unfortunate that the discussion was not taken in Committee.

Mr. PATERSON. What I stated was, that it was understood that we were to discuss this item; but when the Chairman of the Committee has stated that there was not any understanding to that effect, I feel it to be my duty to bow to his opinion.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It is hardly fair, after the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had made his statement, that the debate should be closed and a reply not allowed to be made from this side of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not recollect any instance on which so many items have been concurred in with so little waste of time as was the case this afternoon. If a few observations are desired to be made by hon. gentlemen it will be conceding the amenities of the occasion by not raising any objections to that course.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct when he says that Concurrence has progressed with much celerity. I think the Chairman of the Committee has stated the fact as it occurred; but, of course, if it is desired, on the other side, that there should be an answer given to the hon. Minister's statement, it is not unreasonable that this should be done.

Mr. LISTER. I only desire to say one word or two, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that there is nothing further from my thoughts than to wound his feelings by word, act, or deed. I am here as a representative of a constituency, and I conceive it to be my duty to discuss this appointment. So far as the matter relates to Mr. Slattery, I desire to say that representations made by me the other evening that the appointment was made for the purpose then stated were based on information given to me. I do not retract the statement. I accept the explanation of Mr. Slattery; he said he did not circulate the pamphlets, and I have so stated to the House. I could not be asked to do less or more. I have simply discharged what I conceive to be my duty as a man having to some extent, at least, a sense of honor. I have before stated why this vacancy was not filled. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have the House understand that it was not filled out for economical reasons; that on the decease of the late collector the Government, with that economy which has always characterized it, did not fill up the office for the purpose of saving money. I have stated that the reason why the office was not filled up was that three out of the four of a committee appointed to recommend applicants to the Government had been applicants for the office themselves, and that the gentleman who opposed my colleague in East Lambton and who expected to have opposed me, found he could not get over the difficulty, and the office was abolished in order to obviate the difficulty. As I stated before, no saving has been effected, because what has been saved in that direction has been added to

Mr. COSTIGAN.

the expenses of the London division. If the division had remained as it was before the death of Mr. Glasher there would have been the same receipts, the work would have been the same, and the same number of officers would have been necessary. Since his death one man has discharged the duties of the office up to the appointment of the gentleman whose name has been so frequently mentioned; and the Minister says another appointment was necessary, and had been recommended. If it had been recommended, he should listen to the recommendation of the officer, and, under those circumstances, he probably is blameless; but it is difficult for the people of the county to understand why the appointment was made, they being familiar with the circumstances and the duties of the office, and the manner in which Mr. Elwood performed the duties in the past. I do not desire to prolong the discussion. I make these remarks, believing that what I am stating is substantially correct, and that the Minister is relieved of responsibility, because he has produced a recommendation from his chief officer; but I believe the appointment was not necessary.

On Resolution 183,

Canada Gazette.....\$4,500.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Were we not to have a statement concerning the revenue of the *Canada Gazette*?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I find that for the year 1881-82 the *Canada Gazette* reached 2,246 pages, an increase of 368 pages, and the expenditure a total of \$3,828.06, while the receipts were as follows:—The income for the same period was more than double that of the previous year, or \$3,084.42. Subscription and sales amounted to \$377.84, and advertising to \$2,706, making a total of \$3,084.72 of receipts against a cost of \$3,828.06,

On Resolution 201,

Weights, Measures and Gas.....\$73,000.00

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister on this occasion, whether any steps are to be taken with respect to the officers who were dismissed a few years ago, touching their payments into the Superannuation Fund. Many of these officers, when the service was organized in 1879 and 1880, were dismissed, and it seemed an injustice that they should not be refunded their contributions to the fund mentioned. I remember, that at the time I called the attention of the then hon. Minister, Mr. Baby, to the fact, and he promised to enquire into the circumstances; but I am not aware whether anything has been done in that respect since.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The matter has been under the consideration of the Government, and it will shortly be disposed of.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to get this information. This subject cannot require a great deal of attention, and only needs looking into to discover what they contributed to that fund, which sums should be refunded.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there should have been as long hesitation as there has been about this matter. Why, a number of men were appointed to different offices; and Parliament thought fit to abolish these offices. They had paid, meantime, into the Superannuation Fund. Now, under the law, if they had been in the service for a considerable time, the Ministry might have added a number of years to their period of service on the abolition of their offices, so as to give them a large superannuation. So favorably does the law consider the cases of those who are removed from the public service by the abolition of their offices, that this is the subject of a provision in the Superannuation Act. Now all that is asked by these persons who were removed out of the public service, because Parliament

chose to abolish these offices—I am not now enquiring for what purpose—is, that the money which was taken from them in order that they might be entitled to the benefit of the Superannuation Act, should be returned to them therefore there ought to be no hesitation about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend, I think, in answering the question put by the hon. member for Quebec East, stated that the matter had been under the consideration of the Government, and when the Supplementary Estimates were brought down, the hon. gentleman would see that the Government had not lost sight of these cases.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know whether that statement was made, which I am very glad to learn; but if made, I did not catch it.

On Resolution 81,

Intercolonial Railway—St. Charles Branch and  
Ferry between Lévis and Quebec ..... \$133,000.00

Mr. RICHEY. Whilst expressing a desire to see all possible facilities secured for connections with the Intercolonial, and heartily approving of this item, as conducing to this end, I should like to enquire of the Government whether they have considered the report which has been recently laid on the Table of the House, in connection with the question referred to a Select Committee touching Inter-provincial trade? I may state that the evidence brought before that Committee has revealed a marvellous increase in the trade between these Provinces during the period which has elapsed since Confederation. Still, at the same time, it points to the fact that there is yet room for a very large augmentation of that trade, and that a very great portion of the traffic which would come down our own channels, is diverted through the United States, owing to the inadequacy of the railways at present in existence to meet the requirements of the traffic through Canada. It has been conclusively shown that the Grand Trunk Railway has been utterly unable to overtake the demand upon it in this direction, and that Committee, having heard the evidence which was brought before them, have presented it to this House. It shows that the commercial mind of this Dominion, so far as we have been able to ascertain, is alive to the necessity of securing some further connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and it also points to the desirability of deepening the canals, upon which a very large expenditure has already been made, and which can never fulfil what is required of them in the interests of this Inter-provincial trade without being so deepened, but this done a large amount of traffic would flow West from the Eastern Provinces in coal and other commodities. At the present time freights are very much cheaper by way of New York than by our own railway connection, and though the delays to which I have referred occurred chiefly in winter, still they happen to a considerable extent in summer, and it is desirable to provide better means of communication between the West and East through the great waterways of the Dominion. I would like to enquire of the Government whether they have the matter under consideration, with the intention of asking an appropriation to assist in establishing a line of propellers which would overcome the difficulties to which I have referred? It might be said that this connection should be undertaken altogether by private enterprise. So it would were it not that for a time whatever competition is brought into play in that direction might be choked off by lowering the freights, to be followed, when this had served its purpose, by the restoration of freights to their original rates. I trust that the matter has already engaged the attention of the Government, and if not we would ask them to take it into their consideration with a view of submitting to this House some proposition founded on the evidence presented in the report of the Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Railways will remember that when the Intercolonial items were being considered in Committee, I put a question as to the freight earnings of the road during last year, and he stated he would give the information on Concurrence.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In reply to the hon. member for Halifax, I may state that a memorial has been presented to the Government, based on the evidence taken before the Committee, asking that a subsidy be granted to a line of propellers between the western lakes and Quebec. The matter is now engaging the attention of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I may state that I directed the Chief Engineer and Manager of the Government Railways, to look into the question which the hon. member raised, and the following memorandum has been sent me:—

As the freight business is not kept separate from the passenger business, it cannot be ascertained accurately the exact cost of moving the freight per ton per mile. The tonnage of freight carried one mile last year was 177,835,869 tons. This, divided into the total expense, would give 1 16-100 cents per mile, but inasmuch as this is mixed with the cost of conducting the passenger traffic, it, of course, is not quite correct; but if the tonnage is divided into the freight earnings this gives three-fourths of a cent per ton per mile, and as the road just about pays expenses, this latter may fairly be assumed to be the cost of moving the freight per ton per mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. In order to keep track of the earnings of the line from year to year, and form a correct idea as to whether it is operated at rates which would pay the country, it is necessary that the tonnage earnings per mile should be kept. I notice that the Grand Trunk and other roads in their returns state the tonnage rate per mile; and, in order to come to a conclusion as to whether the Intercolonial is producing the same results financially as the other lines, it is necessary that the calculations should be accurately made each year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not see how that is possible, for in a mixed train you have a certain number of passenger cars and a certain number of freight cars, and it would be extremely difficult to apportion the exact cost of moving that train to the freight and passengers respectively. If you are moving simply a freight train you can tell exactly what is the cost of operating; but in the case of mixed trains I think it can only be arrived at approximately in something like the mode mentioned in the memorandum. I will, however, draw the attention of Mr. Schreiber to that point, and see if it is possible to keep any more accurate account of the cost of moving freight and traffic as contradistinguished from that of passengers.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. Minister will, perhaps, favor me with some information as to the time when he expects the St. Charles and Lévis branch to be completed. I observed about the end of last summer that the work had ceased, and I was informed that this was because the vote had been expended. I suppose that this vote will be sufficient to complete the work during the coming season. As to the ferry, I understand that some tenders have been accepted for the vessels; if I am not mistaken, I saw the plan of them in the *Scientific American*. Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to state at what stage they are at present, and whether or not they are to be delivered this season.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The work on the St. Charles branch will be carried on vigorously during the coming season, and I expect that the communication will be opened, not only by the lower valley, but also by the Grand Trunk station at Point Lévis, by the 1st of July. I do not expect that the work will be entirely completed by that time, but it will be sufficiently advanced to allow of the passage of through trains. The contract has not yet been made for the steamers for the ferry. As I stated to the hon. gentle-

man, this Government have engaged to bear a certain portion of the expense of establishing that ferry, and we are prepared to carry out that arrangement. A certain amount of progress has been made; estimates have been prepared, and very complete designs of the machinery have been prepared. A great deal of care and attention has been given to designing the lifts for removing the cars on and off the boats. A good deal of practical work has been done in that way; and this Government, having pledged itself to co-operate with the Government of Quebec in this work, will be prepared to provide the closest possible communication between the Intercolonial Railway at Point Lévis and the Quebec Railway on the Quebec side of the river. No effort will be spared on our part to carry that project out to successful completion.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. McCALLUM. I was a member of the Committee appointed to enquire into the subject of Inter-provincial trade, and to devise some means for increasing that trade. One of the recommendations of that Committee was that the Government should subsidize a line of steamers to run from the western lakes to Quebec. There is at present almost a railway rage in this country; everybody is in favor of railways; but we must not overlook our waterways. I know that our Inter-provincial trade has been increased from \$1,200,000 in 1866, to \$22,000,000 at the present time. There is no doubt that that increase has been largely due to the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway; but the evidence given before the Committee shows that it could be even further increased; and I, as a member of that Committee, would urge the Government to give the matter their most favorable consideration. In addition to recommending that a line of steamers should be subsidized, the Committee recommended the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals to the same depth and capacity as the Welland Canal. That would enable vessels from the upper ports to go down to the Lower Province ports, and bring back return cargoes. I know that it may be said that there is a line of steamers running now, without any subsidy, from Chicago and the western ports to Montreal; but they go no further. The object of the Committee is that vessels should go all the way to Quebec, so as to connect with the Intercolonial Railway and increase the traffic of that road, and to give us another route besides the one we have now by the Grand Trunk Railway. The vessels would be able to connect the Intercolonial Railway with the Canada Southern and Credit Valley Railways at Niagara and Toronto. The question we may ask regarding the present lines of steamers running from the west to Montreal, and from north to Quebec, is, are they not under the same control as the railway? I consider it would be money well invested by the Government to give a small subsidy to a line of steamers to run from Quebec to Niagara ports and back. I consider the Intercolonial Railway would make more money than what would have to be paid to the steamers to assist them to run, and that the people would get a large benefit by this in the shape of cheap freights and in the way of increasing Inter-provincial trade. Of course there is another point, the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals. That cannot, of course, be dealt with in a day by the Government; but this question of immediate relief should at once be taken up, and I trust the hon. Minister of Railways will see that such immediate relief will be given.

Mr. McMULLEN. I put a question to the hon. Minister of Railways a few evenings ago, which I think he must have misunderstood. I asked if he would be able to give the House the gross earnings per ton per mile on the Inter-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

colonial Railway, and the answer he gave me would rather lead me to suppose that he thought I wanted to know the cost per mile of moving each ton. That is not my object. The gross earnings can easily be ascertained per ton per mile on the entire line, by taking the entire tonnage carried over the road and the number of miles it was moved. My reason is simply this: I know the Grand Trunk Railway makes such a return, having seen it in the annual statement of the President, and I would like to find out how far the earnings of the Intercolonial per ton per mile compare with those of other lines.

Mr. McCRAVEY. I wish to corroborate the remarks of the hon. member for Monck. The question he raised, that of cheap freights, is one worthy of serious consideration. I know that the railways have done a great deal to lower freights in carrying produce forward to the east, but in the winter time they have everything their own way; and although the hon. Minister of Finance said that our shipping interest was in a prosperous condition, I must beg to differ with him. Although not largely engaged in the shipping business myself, I know from personal observation, and from persons engaged in that business with whom I am well acquainted, that the tonnage dues and tolls at Montreal are a great grievance and hardship to the owners of vessels on the lakes. If those tolls were removed and the St. Lawrence Canals deepened, vessel owners would be able to compete with the railway system and enable the people of the western part of our country to have cheap freights, at any rate during the season of navigation. I have a table here showing the revenue from our canals in the past ten years, but I think it would be out of place at present to refer to it. I have thought over this matter for some time, and have much desired to go fully into a discussion of it, but at this late period of the Session I should be sorry to occupy the time of the House at any length. I trust the Government will favorably consider the interests of vessel owners in this matter as well as those who have large quantities of freight to forward, and bear in mind that if they drive the vessel interest out of the country, the railways will have a monopoly of the whole trade.

Mr. VAIL. What is the present arrangement with regard to the Pullman cars, the amount charged for which is entirely out of proportion to the regular fare between Montreal and Halifax, and is there any possibility of having any change in that respect?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not in our power to have any immediate change. The agreement which exists between the Pullman Car Company was made during the time when my hon. friend was a member of the Government, and, of course, we have to carry it out. It was made for ten years, I believe. If we were free now to deal with that question, I think we ought to be able to make more satisfactory arrangements. I cannot say when the ten years will expire, but it will be some time yet.

Mr. VAIL. Is it not an arrangement by which the Government is bound to make up any deficiency from time to time. The Pullman cars are supposed to make a certain amount, and if that is not reached the Government is to make up the difference. I am not aware this contract was made for ten years; if so it would be difficult to alter it. But no matter what Government made that arrangement, the difference ought to be paid from the Public Treasury and not charged to people who travel over the road. Any excess the company might receive I believe they are not obliged to refund. It is a very short-sighted bargain, if the bargain is of this nature, that operates unjustly against the people who travel over the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say what the contract is, but I do not think it is possible my hon. friend would have been a party in any way to a contract of so



unreasonable a character as that. My impression is the company allow their cars to run over the road—we haul them—and they receive what is charged to the passengers and nothing else. I think that the maintenance of the cars and the damage resulting in running over the road, is made good by the Government; but I do not think there is such an arrangement as that to which my hon. friend has referred, of our being obliged to make up any deficiency. That seems to be so entirely unreasonable that I do not think it is part of the original.

Mr. VAIL. I may not be correctly informed, but I would like the hon. Minister to enquire into it and see if we can get any relief in that way. I am quite aware that Government is responsible for the acts of its officers, and I am inclined to think that my hon. friend does a good deal himself on the railway without consulting Government in the general management of the road, and it is just possible that his predecessor may have done the same thing. However, with that understanding it is still possible that an arrangement might be made by which members of the Government should know what was being done by their officers.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). When this item was before the Committee last year, I believe the hon. gentleman expected to make an arrangement with the Government of Quebec by which they would pay half the expenses of the ferry between these two points. In Committee the other night some explanations were made, and would the hon. gentleman state further whether it is now the intention to construct this ferry, seeing that the North Shore Railway has been leased to the Grand Trunk Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may not have been present when I spoke on this matter before Recess. I stated that the Government of Quebec made a proposition to this Government with reference to the organization of a ferry. There was an estimate made on the cost of furnishing the necessary steamers and the tug accommodation on the two sides of the river. The Dominion Government agreed, subject to the approval of Parliament, which approval was obtained, to bear one-half the estimated expense of establishing the ferry and the approaches to the two sides, and to share the operation of the ferry, so that whatever the cost might be it should be divided between the two Governments. The work was to be performed by the Government of Quebec or the proprietors of the then Government railway, the road being then in the hands of the Government. It was provided that in case the road changed hands we were to be bound to carry out that arrangement with the new proprietors. We are in that position now, and if we are called upon to carry out that arrangement we shall have to furnish one-half the means and to share in the enterprise. As I stated before, no contract has as yet been entered into for the construction of the steamers.

Mr. ROSS. You cannot compel them to go on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the changed relation of the Government of Quebec towards that North Shore road affect their liability to fulfil their part of the arrangement, or is there a probability of their shouldering it on to the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not in that shape. There is a contract on the part of the Government of Quebec to do it. The Government of Quebec made a certain proposition to us, we considered that proposition, and stated in an Order in Council what we would be willing to do, and that was communicated to the Government of Quebec, and was assumed to be accepted by them. Under that we were bound to carry out one portion of the arrangement either with the Government of Quebec or with the proprietors of the road, whoever they might be, and that is the position to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. But if the Government of Quebec choose to say: "We are not now proprietors of the line, having sold it to a company, which company has practically sold it to the Grand Trunk Railway," and they choose not to go on with the ferry, the Government are not bound to pay any money, and the public will be deprived of the advantages of a ferry unless this Government take upon themselves to assume the whole expense, which, I suppose, they will not be inclined to do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the position.

On Resolution 104,

Survey of Trent Valley navigation.....\$8,000.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I was under the impression the hon. Minister was to give us some further information on this matter on Concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said the survey was still going on, and that in consequence of the extended range of country and the various lines that were proposed, very nice questions arose as to which would be the best line; that the surveys were being elaborately prosecuted, and I expected them to be brought to a conclusion this year. I stated, further, that the Chief Engineer of Canals did not think it would be desirable to make a progress report until he had had the whole subject placed before him by the surveys.

On Resolution 218,

Post Offices..... \$2,238,310.50

Mr. BLAKE. Explanations were promised by the hon. Minister under this head.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Twenty-five additional clerks and letter carriers were appointed last year in the various offices in Ontario. Next year from thirty-five to forty will be required. In connection with the Royal Mail Service, in the Ontario division one additional mail clerk and two additional clerks for the inspector's office were appointed. It is expected that a still larger number will be required during the coming year to meet the exigencies of the service. There were promised details of vote of \$4,000 for service by steamboat and sailing vessel, Nova Scotia, for the year ending 30th June, 1882. The following are the particulars: Halifax and Boston, U. S. (half of postage collected) J. P. Phelan, contractor, \$400; Halifax and St. John, Newfoundland, Wood & Co., \$600; Port Hastings, Port Hawkesbury and Port Mulgrave, Halifax and Cape Breton Railway Company, \$1,600; Sydney and West Bay, now Port Mulgrave, and Sydney via Bras d'Or Lakes, G. T. Troop, Agent, \$300; Yarmouth and Boston, U. S. (portion of postage collected) E. F. Clements, \$202. These items do not cover the exact amount of \$4,000, but a small margin must be left for the extension of the system during the year. A statement was also promised with respect to St. John's, Quebec, and St. Roch's post offices. In 1878 the amount of revenue from the former was \$662, and the salary paid, \$470; 1879, collections \$677, salary \$471; 1880, collections \$1,034, salary \$528; 1881, collections \$1,453, salary \$933; 1882, collections \$2,384, salary \$1,588. It will be seen that the revenue of the post office at St. John's has been increasing for some years and the salary has been increasing also, and the Postmaster-General has determined that the salary shall not be more than 40 per cent. of the revenue as is the case elsewhere.

Mr. VAIL. Do you apply that to city offices?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; in the large post offices in Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, &c., the salaries are fixed, but in the branch offices, *succursales*, in the suburbs, the salaries are paid by fees, which we intend to reduce to 40 per cent. of the revenue until further orders, for if any salary was found to be very large under

this system, we might make it a fixed salary. In the division of Quebec East, the revenue for 1878 was \$1,680, and the salary \$712; in 1879 the revenue was \$1,847, and the salary \$742; in 1880 the revenue was \$2,147, and the salary \$742; in 1881 the revenue was \$2,833, and the salary \$742; in 1882 the revenue was \$2,933, and the salary \$791, while the salary and allowances are now \$840. I remarked when the Postmaster-General handed me this statement, that, in accordance with this system, if the salary was to be proportionate, this postmaster should have more salary; he told me that the same rule would apply to both, all would be treated alike by giving them 40 per cent. of the revenue, so that the postmaster of Quebec East will have a higher salary than the postmaster in St. John's suburbs, because his revenue is larger. I am glad to observe that here also the revenue is increasing from year to year—from \$1,600 to \$1,800, \$2,100 to \$2,600 and \$2,900. The increases are large, and, of course, the postmaster must be paid in proportion.

Mr. LAURIER. As the revenue is increasing so largely I hope that the Government will some day erect a post office in that place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter presents a difficulty. It would be a new principle to erect two Government post offices in the same city, which we have not yet done. I do not know whether my hon. friend was here when I made explanations the other day in this relation, but I will repeat that when the two deputations came to me the other day, as Minister of Public Works, to ask for the erection of a post office there, I gave them the same answer which I have just now made, and I said that if the postmaster sees his revenue increasing his salary must also increase, and if the accommodation is so bad as is represented, if he erects a proper building, which would be accepted by the Government, in a central place, and affords proper accommodation, we will grant him a larger rent for the portion occupied as a post office; and therefore he will thus be recouped for his investment. I understand—in fact I saw a plan the other day for such a building; and it has been sent to the postmaster to ascertain whether it comes from him, whether he agrees to the proposition and what rent he will require;—and if this plan is accepted, I have no doubt my hon. friend will find that a proper building for his constituency; that the public will be attended to and have sufficient accommodation.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to get this information. Of course, I quite understand the difficulty of having two post-offices in the same city; but this geographical division of Quebec is such that there is practically another city beyond the city proper, and for this reason, perhaps, the Government might see fit to carry out the suggestion made.

Mr. BLAKE. I would now like the hon. gentleman to take a trip with me to Belleville, Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Toronto and Windsor, because I specially demanded the particulars as to the increases in salaries at the post offices in these different cities, which ought to have been found on page ninety-seven. The votes are given in detail for 1883-84, but the aggregate sum only is given for 1882-83, the increase being no less than \$20,830. The hon. Minister promised to inform us, with respect to the details, whether they were due to increases in staff, and what additional officers were appointed, and how much were the increases in salaries; part of that, I fancy, is found to be due to the fact that in some instances, postmasters have been transferred from being paid by fees to be paid by salary, but I am not sure about that. However it is, we have the staff and details for 1883-84, but no details either for staff or salaries for 1882-83; the increase of \$20,830,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

therefore, is not explained at all, and I would be glad to have an explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I have already given an explanation of this in the statement which I gave in the first instance. If the hon. gentleman refers to it he will see, that if he adds the salaries, say of these twenty-six clerks, for instance, who have been added to the staff, and of fourteen more who will be added during the year, making forty, at an average say of \$400 each, he will find the total to be \$16,000, and the remaining \$4,000 are left as a margin as I just now stated. The fact is, that we must in this Department keep a good margin, or otherwise the service would be stopped. Every branch of the service is extending with the extension in the settlement of the country, and the opening up of new routes, new post offices, and new railways; and this is the reason the Postmaster-General gave me. Of course you cannot have the figures exactly to the dollar, or even hundred dollars, for there is always a margin kept in all the estimates for the Post Office Department, as can be seen from the Public Accounts when you have the return of the year's expenditure, and compare it with the Estimates, for there is always a balance left, or an excess which is provided for in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has confined his explanation almost entirely, and I rather fancy, entirely, to the prior item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is another matter.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the only one touched upon.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg pardon, unless the railway mail clerks belong to that division also. There are a great many more, and I stated that there were additional mail clerks and additional clerks in the inspector's office. The hon. gentleman knows that the salaries of railway clerks are higher, and therefore we provide for them. If the hon. gentleman will deduct the amount of \$142,720 the excess for last year from the total apparent increase, he will find that the real increase is just \$66,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I am at present only dealing with one particular portion of this increase. The hon. gentleman says that there were sixteen clerks added for this year, and fourteen for next year, or forty in all; and, therefore, he says: "I account to you for an expenditure of \$16,000." But that is on the assumption that not one of the twenty-six were estimated for in the vote for the current year. Now, it is scarcely possible that the hon. Minister should be so short-sighted as to estimate for not a single clerk when twenty-six were necessary. I assume that the estimate was adequate to the expenditure, but if not, then we want to know how far it fell short of the requirements for the year in this particular vote. I am not objecting to a reasonable margin, and the hon. Minister should say that he wanted to be on the safe side; that is one thing; but unless one understands how far with reference to the city officers, the vote of last year fell so far short of the amount required, we cannot ascertain the discrepancy. I would ask the hon. gentleman, whether some portion of this expenditure was, or was not, caused by the substitution of fixed salaries in one or more cases by remuneration by fees?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I think not. The hon. gentleman will find, on looking at the report, that the details are given under the different heads for the different Provinces. He will see that the estimate last year was not high enough by \$142,000, which we have to make up this year, and he will see also that the real increase for next year is just \$66,000. I think the hon. gentleman should be satisfied with this explanation, while reserving to himself the privilege of making enquiry when the vote comes up on the Supplementary Estimates, and when, no doubt, the Postmaster-General himself will be present.

On Resolution 203,

Adulteration of Food.....\$12,000.00

Mr. CASEY. Before the item passes I wish to call attention to what I consider some defects in the existing law with regard to the adulteration of food. There are defects in the method of procuring and examination of food supposed to be adulterated. I would not have presumed to have referred to the matter on my own personal responsibility; but at a meeting of the Sanitary Association, held in St. Thomas, I was appointed on a committee to draft some amendment to the law in this respect, but owing to the shortness of the session of the Association, the committee did not meet and nothing was done. I was asked to call attention to the matter in the House. The present method is roundabout and covered with red tape. The man who suspects that he is being swindled by a dealer has to write to the Department in Ottawa, and the Department may give an order to the Government analyst, and if after an examination is made and adulteration is found to have taken place, recourse may be had. Now, I fancy that no efficient inspection of food or articles which should be classed along with food—articles of general consumption—can be carried out until the initiation is left in private hands, or, in other words, that the party should go direct to the Government analyst and insist upon the suspected articles being examined on the shortest notice. Of course it would be impossible to allow any person having suspicions of this kind to have the food examined without giving some security against the cost of the inspection in case the food should turn out to be unadulterated, but that difficulty could be overcome by requiring the complainant to put up a moderate deposit. I am informed that that is the system, or nearly the system, which is in force in England. A person feeling himself aggrieved can go to a public analyst and have the food examined; but he must make a deposit to cover the possible costs of the inspection. If the food is found to be adulterated, the expenses are paid by the dealer selling the article; but if it is found to be pure, the deposit put up by the person making the application applies to cover the costs. I think something of this kind is necessary here. It appears from the reports already made by the Government analysts—which, by the way, are ridiculously few in comparison with the expense of the Department—that certain kinds of food are almost systematically adulterated, such as coffee, spices, teas, &c., sometimes with deleterious or dangerous matter. For example, it is a common thing to make up paste tea from the refuse or rubbish obtained from the Old Country dealers, and which sometimes is deleterious, and is always less valuable than the tea for which it is sold. In these cases the Government should step in and protect those who cannot protect themselves. It is quite impossible for private parties to say, from their own personal inspection, whether an article of food like this is pure or not; and I think the opportunity of settling the question should be put within the reach of everybody who is willing to take the risk of putting up a couple of dollars or so. When I speak of the smallness of the number of cases, I do not mean to say that the Government analysts do not do their duty, but the method of getting them to work is so roundabout and so uncertain that few care to undertake it. I would urge, not merely with the weight of my own opinion, but the weight of opinion of those gentlemen composing the Sanitary Association of Ontario, who are well agreed on the matter, and the weight of opinion of a great many other medical men having a knowledge of sanitary matters whom I have consulted, that the Government should consider, during the coming year, what improvement they can make in the law, with the view of putting a more speedy remedy in the hands of those who are affected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are of very great importance. Having gone to the expense of providing machinery for the detection of adulteration of food, we should, of course, take every possible means to make the law effective. Of course it would be necessary to provide against vindictive proceedings which might be instituted, if there were any looseness in the law under which the goods of parties might be seized under suspicion of being adulterated. At the same time there should be machinery by which, whenever there is reasonable ground for the suspicion that food of any kind is adulterated, measures could be taken to bring the matter to a practical test, as early as conveniently and as effectively as possible. I will take care that the attention of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is drawn to the observations of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am glad to see that the attention of the hon. Minister, though not the hon. Minister under whose particular charge this is, has been attracted to this matter. It is of great importance that some steps should be taken, as the hon. Minister said he would take, that the Act should be made more efficient in some way. I do not understand thoroughly the machinery of this Act, but have the same impression as the hon. Member for West Elgin, that it is rather complicated, and I am at a loss to know when samples are found adulterated what penalties are inflicted on the offenders, and whether the offence may be charged back from the vendor to the manufacturer. Judging from the report of the analysts nothing follows, and adulteration has been carried on to a very great extent. It appears from the report that out of 1,122 samples analyzed, 288 were found adulterated and twenty-five doubtful. In some of the articles largely in use, ingredients are used for adulteration that are positively injurious to public health; in others the adulteration reduces the value of the article, but does not lead to serious results to health. When flour, for instance, is substituted for sugar, a fraud is perpetrated, and the value of the article reduced to the innocent purchaser, but no injury is done to health. In the article of canned fruits and canned meats, the analysts have called attention to the fact that no adulteration is made, yet by the action of the fruits and the meats upon the tin and solder, a poisonous adulteration is in process produced. A summary of the report of the Department is, that:

"Although many samples of canned fruits and meats have been found to contain traces of tin and iron they have not been classed as adulterated, though in some cases, they are more dangerous to the public than if they were so. The length of time during which they have been packed will, in all probability, indicate to some extent the degree of danger run by their use, as the solder and tin are acted upon by the contents. Manufacturers would consult their own interests if they caused the packages to be stamped with the year when they were filled and sent out. Buyers could then purchase with some security, avoiding the risk of being taken in by goods packed for several years and re-labelled in order to pass them off. Such goods can only be used at the risk of public health."

With regard to the remedy suggested, my opinion is that the manufacturer will not willingly stamp the date of putting up the goods on the cans, as his main object is to get rid of his goods, no matter when put up and what the risk to the buyers. I see one of the analysts, Mr. Best, the analyst of St. John, New Brunswick, reports as follows:—

"Many kinds of canned goods appear to be very dangerous articles of food. Traces of metallic salts in solution have been detected in samples which I have examined for the Department, and for private individuals. In a neighboring town, several persons were lately poisoned by having eaten canned beef. I am informed that dealers are in the habit of placing fresh labels on cans which have been on their shelves for years. Such goods must eventually become quite unfit for food, as the contents of the cans will, sooner or later, act upon the solder and tin. To prevent this, the date of manufacture should be stamped on the tin cans."

By these reports, it seems imperative, in the interest of the public, that the dates should be stamped on the cans, and I

am of opinion that some steps should be taken to compel manufacturers to do this, as they will not do it willingly, of their own accord. In condiments, the report is that the adulteration of that class appears to be going on. You may say that people should know by the prices they pay; but purchasers cannot be supposed to know the value of the goods, or whether they are adulterated or not. A ground article may be sold at one-half the price that the berry is worth; but how is the innocent purchaser to know the relative values of the berries and the ground pepper, ginger, cream of tartar, &c. Through competition in prices dealers have to sell lower grades of goods, and the manufacturers in order to supply the lower grades required, must increase the percentage of foreign matter introduced in their goods, and the adulteration goes on as competition increases. When the adulterations consist of corn meal, flour and articles of that kind, a fraud is perpetrated, but the public health is not injured. But when an ingredient, *terra alba*, which costs one or two cents is used in the adulteration of goods that are sold at thirty or forty cents the fraud become much more serious, and it is almost impossible to be detected in the taste or in the quality, but, nevertheless, it is there. I think the hon. Minister of Railways, with his medical and chemical skill, knows that articles such as that cannot be taken into the human stomach without producing evil results. The fact that one retailer offering his goods lower than another, and compelling an adulterated article to be still more adulterated in order to enable him to compete with his neighbor, is itself a considerable danger in that respect. When analysts all agree in stating that it is going on to that extent, it seems to be time for the Government to take some steps to compel articles, at any rate, to be branded as 1, 2, or 3, and to have it understood by the purchaser what is the degree of adulteration in the articles he is buying; and to impose penalties upon the adulteration or use of any article that is totally unfit for food, and to entirely prohibit its sale. Of course, when harmless matter is introduced in order to cheapen an article, if it is not injurious to the public health, such an article might be sold without a fraud being perpetrated, the article being plainly marked with numbers, 1, 2 and 3, &c., to indicate the degree of adulteration. As it is at the present time, I am not aware that there are any means of indicating an adulterated article to the unsuspecting purchaser, unless he has personal knowledge of the quality of the article. Now, when we read of the article of coffee, that out of sixty-nine samples analyzed forty-seven were adulterated, and when we read that out of eighteen samples analyzed in Montreal not one was found pure, while Dr. Ellis of Toronto reports but three pure out of eighteen analyzed, it does seem that something should be done to protect the public from the fraud that is manifestly being perpetrated upon them. I know it may be said that what is substituted in the place of coffee is harmless—burnt peas, or things of that kind—still there is a fraud being perpetrated, as the customer thinks he is buying pure coffee. But if he wanted an article adulterated with chicory or roasted peas, the amount of adulteration should be designated by numbers, so that he may know exactly what he is buying. I venture to say that the whole trade would rejoice if some such regulation were made, as I do not believe any one indulges in the adulteration of these goods willingly, but they are induced to do it by competition. My attention has been a good deal called to this matter lately. The honest dealer, one who desires to put pure goods on the market, is greatly disadvantaged, the whole trade is demoralized, the health of the people is endangered, and, to say the very least, a fraud has been perpetrated upon the consumer. I therefore, think the Government should consider this subject, with a view to devising some amendments to the Act which would stop what seems to be a dangerous increase in the adulterations of foods and drinks.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

On Resolution 26,

Dominion Police ..... \$15,000.00

In answer to Mr. CHARLTON,

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of the Interior explained that the increase of \$2,500 in this vote arose from the appointment of another chief who receives \$1,200, the late one receiving only \$750; and by the taking over of four men to guard Rideau Hall, that formerly were paid by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CASEY. It is rather peculiar that the new chief should be paid \$500 more than the old one. Is it because the guard is taken over to Rideau Hall that he is paid more than the late Chief of Police, or is it because he is a gentleman of higher social standing and greater personal consequence?

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no; we do not pay a man according to his social standing. The late chief received a gratuity—they all do. If any policeman is retired from ill-health or any other cause he receives a gratuity of one month's salary for each year he has served up to a certain amount.

Mr. CASEY. Why was the late chief retired?

Mr. BOWELL. He was retired because it was thought that his usefulness, to a certain extent, was gone, and it was thought better to have a younger and more active man. The new chief has had a great deal of experience in the police force of Ottawa, as well as having been a long time connected with the Sheriff's office in this city. We do not pretend to say that just as good a man could not have been obtained as the present chief; I think that remark would have applied to any man who might have been appointed. He was appointed from his known ability for the particular service which he had to perform; and the improvement which has taken place in the force since he has been acting as chief, justifies the Department in making the change. The estimated expenditure for 1883-84 is as follows:—Salary of Commissioner, \$400; salary of Superintendent and 22 men, \$12,040.50; uniforms and accoutrements, \$1,350; travelling expenses, \$200; retiring allowances, \$700; sergeant, \$60; printing and binding, \$50; stationery, \$50; revolvers, \$75; telegrams, \$20; car tickets, \$10; ammunition, \$40; being a total of \$14,995.50, say \$15,000. The increase in the estimate over that for the current year is due to the following causes, namely: It is proposed that on the 1st July next, by arrangement with the Public Works Department, the duty of protecting the Governor and Rideau Hall grounds will be transferred from the Public Works Department to the Dominion Police, and men now employed by the Public Works Department, in the capacity of watchmen, to the number of four, will, on that date, come under the control of the Superintendent of Police, and will be uniformed and paid out of the Police appropriation. At present the watchmen employed by the Public Works Department, not having the power of constables, cannot deal summarily with any person found misbehaving on the ground, but have to notify the Dominion Police, by which time the offender has probably escaped and the ends of justice are thereby frustrated; whereas were they constables they could act on the spot and take the delinquent into custody, which would have a very beneficial result. Again, the very fact of the men being uniformed, clothes them with authority, and deters those inclined to misbehave and work mischief. There will also be a saving effected of 25 cts. a day per man, as the present watchmen are paid that much more than the rank and file of the police force. The duties of the force have been added to, and its utility increased, by the introduction of an hourly mail service between the various Departments and branches.

Mr. CASEY. Then, there will be another official besides the chief.

Mr. BOWELL. The Commissioner will have \$400.

Mr. CASEY. The total amount to the two officials will be \$1,600, and the Commissioner will do part of the work formerly performed by the chief.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to say whether the duties performed by the Commissioner were formerly performed by the chief.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the duties of the Commissioner were performed by the Deputy Minister of Justice without additional salary. I do not know who the Commissioner is.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Keefer. The duty was formerly performed by him at a certain per diem allowance; and it is in order to give him more authority that he was appointed at this small salary.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the age of the retiring chief?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know.

On Resolution 27,

Kingston Penitentiary..... \$112,878.23

Mr. BLAKE. Explanations with respect to the grist mill at Kingston were promised.

Mr. BOWELL. In 1880-81, an appropriation was asked for the construction of a grist mill at Kingston Penitentiary. Some discussion took place on that occasion, it being contended by some, that the Government was stepping out of its province in erecting such a building, while others believed that a saving would thereby be effected. A sum was taken for the building of such mill. Orders were given to the warden to go on with the work, and he did so. The grist mill has been constructed at the sum estimated at that time by the warden. It was urged by those who were supposed to possess practical experience, that the estimate would be largely exceeded. The warden informs the Department, that the mill machinery was purchased from Hunter & Ingles, for \$2,300, and the steam engine was bought for \$700. The mill was fitted up by convict labor under the superintendence of a competent foreman, whose services were paid for by the contractors. The warden concludes his letter by saying:

"The whole cost of mill and engine was \$4,158, \$642 within the estimate. The mill is first class of its size, and will accomplish all I claim for it, both as to economy and usefulness."

The mill is ready, and will shortly supply the penitentiary.

Mr. BLAKE. They were reaping the harvest then.

Mr. BOWELL. Having sown their wild oats they are reaping the harvest now.

Mr. BLAKE. It is, of course, unfortunate, but it cannot be expected that the Minister of Customs should pay particular attention to the discussion which took place when this vote was in Committee, because it is not in his Department; but the point which was brought before the attention of the Committee, remains altogether undisposed of by the information given by the warden, and is briefly this: a vote was taken for the construction of a grist mill, it was opposed by several members, including among them, a gentleman who was a rather steady supporter of the Administration, whose voice was against this proposal of theirs—and, I think, I never heard before or since, except on that occasion. I refer to the late member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier), the present postmaster in the city. He pointed out as a practical man, that it would not do, and that it would be a mistake to put up a grist mill for the purpose of grinding the flour required for the convicts. However, the vote was taken, but next year there was no account, in the report, or otherwise, of the expenditure of this vote at all. In Supply, I enquired of the then

Minister of Justice, hon. James Macdonald, the present Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, on that subject, and he said—I cannot give you the exact words, but they are in *Hansard*, and they are something like this: No; we have given up the mill. He used a phrase equivalent to that, though I cannot remember the precise words, intimating that the plan had been abandoned; and there was no more discussion about it at all. There was no indication, as I have said, of the expenditure in that report, or of anything having been done, but the next thing we hear about it is, this year, after the expiration of that long lapse of time, when the original vote must have lapsed,—for it cannot have been in existence at all if the mill is only just now constructed and finished—we hear of the grist mill in the Estimates by being called upon to vote the sum of \$600 a year for the salary of the miller of the mill; and then I called upon the hon. Minister for an explanation as to how it came about, when we were informed, in Supply, a year after the vote was taken, that it was not going on, and when there was no account of when it was built, where it was built, or how it was built, but we find that the grist mill was actually constructed, and with those consequences which we said would follow upon its construction. If ever anybody supposed that \$600 a year can be saved by purchasing wheat and grinding it into flour—that is to say, that the miller's salary can be saved, I think he must be a pretty sanguine man. Now, we have upon this subject no explanation at all. When was the mill built, when was the contract let, when was the money spent, out of what vote was it taken, having regard to the statement and the other matter to which I have referred? Then the other point on which I asked for information was one on which the hon. gentleman's explanation answers, as to the purchases of wheat made, and the results of the experiment; but he says that the mill is not yet in operation, and, of course, the result of the experiment so far, is yet in the future. We are, however, saddled with the mill and the miller's salary; how the thing will work we cannot yet tell, and I think it will be observed, that the explanations which we have a right to expect, have not yet been given.

Mr. BOWELL. I endeavored to ascertain what the exact expression used by the late Minister of Justice was, but I failed to find the answer in the record, in the statements made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. It was something like that.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure, but I remember distinctly, I did find that the member for Ottawa, the present postmaster for this city, spoke in opposition to this vote, holding that no mill could be constructed under \$8,000 or \$10,000.

Mr. BLAKE. That was the year before.

Mr. BOWELL. I find, also, in 1881, that in reply, to a letter of the warden of the penitentiary calling his attention to the vote passed by Parliament for the construction of this mill, in a memorandum on the side of the document, in the Minister of Justice's own hand: "Instruct Creighton that he may proceed with the grist mill." However, it refers to the construction of the grist mill, and I think that those are the words. Then the warden writes on the 28th of last April, stating what he had done in connection with the mill; and I believe, that this will be better than any explanation I can give. He says:

"Having pointed out on several occasions the pecuniary and other advantages of having a small grist mill to grind flour and feed for this institution, I was encouraged to place in the Estimates for the fiscal year 1880-81, an item of \$4,200 to buy the same, and build a steam engine to work it. A good deal of opposition in Parliament was offered to this item when the Estimates were under discussion, but the item was carried; hence it was from that appropriation voted by Parliament, that the cost of the grist mill was paid. Two subjoined letters will explain what took place as to the purchase after the appropriation was made. The first letter is from myself to the then Minister of Justice, the hon. James Macdonald, and the second is his reply, and my authority for going on with the grist mill. I may add, that the mill

machinery was purchased from Messrs. Hunter & Ingles, of Toronto, for \$2,300, and the steam engine was also paid for, \$700. The mill was erected under convict labor under the superintendence of a competent foreman, whose services were paid for by Messrs. Hunter & Ingles, the contractors. The whole cost of the mill and engine was \$4,158, \$342 less than the estimate. The mill is first class of its size, and will accomplish all I claimed for it, both as to economy and usefulness."

Now, as to the work of it, if the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates he will see that there are some guards, four, dropped out of the Estimates for this year, and one of these guards has been utilized to take charge of and to run the mill. I presume he was formerly a miller, and knows the business, or he would not have been selected for the purpose; so that really, if the expense of the miller is added to the running expenses of the mill, it has been saved in the way of a guard. If we have not put on an additional guard, of course we save in that way.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will be pleased to observe that the number of the convicts is very much diminished. We reduce the guard when we reduce the convicts.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure about that. Of course the hon. gentleman has had experience in this Department, as Minister of Justice, and will know; but I am not so sure that the diminution of the number of prisoners in the penitentiaries would necessarily lessen the number of guards, than it would be requisite to keep to place on the walls and at other places.

Mr. BLAKE. Within certain limits it does.

Mr. BOWELL. It does not strike me as being the case. I have a memorandum, sent me just now by the Deputy Minister, saying the mill was bought about March, 1881; and I suppose it was allowed to remain in abeyance until the Minister told him to go on and construct it.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, then, if the mill was bought in March, 1881, and is only just now finished, as I understand in May, 1883—

Mr. BOWELL. Excuse me. The note says, "The vote did not lapse. The mill was bought about March, 1881."

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; perhaps it was, I suppose it was, but I do not know what they have been doing ever since. It is hardly finished now, or it is just finished, and yet it is all taken out of this vote; but how this vote was kept alive in the Estimates of 1880-81 down to 1883, and that payments were made out of it until within a very few months, is a mystery to me. The law is strict on this subject, and I think it would be found that this money must have been chequed or taken out in some way or other for the purpose of keeping it alive. With reference to the late member for Ottawa, and in vindication of his supposed estimate, I think at that time it was imagined by us and by him, that the mill would be built as the hon. gentleman says, and I presume the necessary shell of the structure was included in the \$3,000. We have since learned from the hon. Minister who has taken charge of these votes that the mill has been placed in that very appropriate place for such a mill—at the end of the asylum. Perhaps the hon. Minister will at some future time get a memorandum with regard to how the money was paid.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

On Resolution 196,

Reports and text-books for Library Department  
of Justice..... \$2,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been a statement put in my hands explaining this \$2,000, and I will read it to the House:

The Department has for a great many years subscribed to the English Law Reports and the Reports of the various Provincial Courts, and with the exception of a few volumes which will need to be replaced, we have a very good library in that respect. We have also quite a number of text-books, many of which are of old editions. We wish to sell the old editions and buy new ones.

Mr. BOWELL.

In regard to text-books and those works which are needed for daily reference on some subjects, and especially in regard to those which relate closely to Crown practice and the prerogatives of the Crown our library is very incomplete, and a considerable expenditure is needed in order to make it what it should be in this respect. We are also deficient in Digests and Abridgments.

Besides completing the Library in the respects referred to we wish to purchase the English Reports from the first of this century down to 1836, at which date the Law Reports commenced. This of itself will not be a very large or extravagant expenditure.

While it is quite true that in order to make an exhaustive brief in a case we would have to go to a library which would be more complete than the one we have, yet we would have one which would facilitate our every day work.

You will understand that outside of dealing with cases into which we have to go exhaustively, we have a large legal correspondence, and when a correspondent says that it is so decided in such and such a case in Harlstone and Norman or Weeson and Welsley for example, it is a great waste of time to go to the Supreme Court room to see whether the correspondent has rightly interpreted the case. The fact is the English Reports are almost as necessary for reference as ordinary text-books.

In a word, we want just such a library as a private gentleman who is doing business in a city where he has access to a large library would have for his daily and active work and reference. It is not proposed in the future to ask any further grant for this service. The library will then be a reasonably good one, and by the expenditure of the amount which the Department has been accustomed to expend each year out of Contingencies for the purchase of law books the library will be kept up.

It has happened that you have sent from Council to our library for reference works which, owing to the incompleteness of the library, we have been unable to supply.

On Resolution 197,

To pay one-half the expense of publishing cases  
decided on the British North America Act, 1867,  
collected and edited by John R. Cartwright, Esq. \$1,150.00

Mr. BOWELL. Upon application from the Premier of Ontario the hon. Minister of Justice agreed to pay the amount now placed in the Estimates, as our proportion. The work is to consist of two volumes, costing \$8 per volume. Thirty copies will be furnished to the Dominion Government, and will be distributed by the hon. Minister of Justice among the library and other public institutions. Mr. Mowat, I understand, will also distribute the work among the law libraries of Ontario and various other public institutions. The balance are to be sold by the Ontario Government at the price I have named and the proceeds divided between the two Governments. The whole management has been left to the Premier of Ontario, who has promised to divide the profits.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this vote cover our share of the whole expense, or does it apply only to the first volume? and what number of copies does the edition consist of?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that this covers the full amount asked from this Government. The edition is 250 copies only, of which the hon. Minister of Justice receives thirty.

Mr. BLAKE. I can only repeat my very great approval of the work itself, so far as its execution is concerned, and the utility of such a work, and my regret that some arrangement should not have been made for the publication of a larger edition.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I can say, on the part of the Dominion Government, that they did all they were asked to do, and they gladly acceded to the request.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps it is not too late to have a larger edition of the second volume. There may, and probably will be, a continuation of these volumes. I quite agree that this is a move in the right direction, and something might be done towards the publication of a larger edition.

On Resolution 48,

Patent Record..... \$8,500.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I desire to ask for explanations in regard to the Patent Record.

**Mr. POPE.** In 1878 an arrangement was made with the predecessor of Mr. Burland to publish a pamphlet for \$2.50 a year. Sometimes, at that rate, the amount appropriated by Parliament was not all used, but at other times it was exceeded, this being due to an additional number of patents having been taken out. In 1874-75, under the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the price was increased to \$3.50, and at that rate it has remained. The increased amount asked for is due to the enlarged number of patents issued.

#### SUPPLY—DRAWBACKS.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER** moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee.

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** I desire to take this opportunity of making a few remarks on a subject which is of some importance to myself, and I think of general importance. I moved some time ago for a return of drawbacks that were paid on manufactured goods exported to foreign countries. That return was laid on the Table of the House a day or two ago, and I have only been able to look at it to-night. The House has heard me speak on previous occasions of a difficulty that has been experienced by certain manufacturers in getting the drawback they are entitled to from the Department. The hon. Minister of Customs and myself have had one or two tilts in reference to the matter, and at times he has been willing to say that I have been pressing claims that were not proper, and that the difficulty lay there. I have endeavored to point out that the difficulty lay in the regulations; the claimants who were unable to get their drawbacks being unable to comply with those regulations. Now, Sir, I find by this return that there seems to be one regulation for one manufacturer, and another regulation for another manufacturer; and I find that the very difficulties which have stood in the way of certain manufacturers obtaining the drawback, have been waived in the declaration made by other manufacturers. I confess that I am a little surprised at this; but it is the fact, as evidenced by this return. In the motion I made, I moved for one copy of each of the declarations made by the exporters of manufactured goods. I am told, in the remarks accompanying the return, that the Order of the House has not been fully carried out, but that the name of one party to the declaration is given. For instance, the Order of the House was to bring down the copy of one allowed claim of each exporter of sewing machines, boilers, or other manufacturers of iron, with the sworn declaration attached thereto. The Department have taken the liberty of varying from the Order of the House somewhat; in sewing machine companies, they give the affidavits of one exporter, and say, that the affidavits required from the sewing machine manufacturers are identical. Now, Sir, the difficulty that was experienced by the parties whose cases were brought before the Department, was the difficulty of being able to comply with the regulations of the Order in Council that insists on their specifying the particular entry made at the Custom House of goods on which duty was paid, which entered into the manufacture of the article exported; and these manufacturers found it impossible for them, as honest men, to make a declaration that the iron, for instance, that entered into the construction of a certain machine passed the Customs at a certain day, or was included in a certain invoice, for the reason that they buy iron from different countries and throw it into the common heap, and it is impossible for them to keep track of what particular invoice the iron was taken from which entered into the construction of a particular piece of machinery which they export to a foreign country; and I have, time and again, pressed upon the hon. Minister that he should so arrange the matter that they would be relieved from the necessity of making that

sworn declaration. The hon. Minister took some larger powers to himself, quite with my concurrence, if not at my suggestion, when the Customs Bill was passing the House, in order to enable him in a measure to overcome this difficulty; but the explanation I want from the hon. Minister now, is, how he came to allow certain manufacturers to make declarations, and allowed them their drawback, while he refused other manufacturers their drawback, or did not give them the privilege of making a declaration in accordance therewith. In my motion I did not move for a copy of all the Orders in Council, but I did move for copies of all the regulations in the Department; but I am told in this return, that regulations are not made by the Department, but by the authority of Governor in Council, and as I was unfortunate enough to say, orders of the Department instead of Orders in Council; the Department did not this time, as on a previous occasion, when I moved in precisely the same words, send me the Order in Council, and I presume that it is the same Order in Council that was passed in 1881. If I am mistaken in this, as I can only surmise, then there has been a deviation in the Order in Council in the case of certain manufacturers, while there has not been the same deviation in the case of other manufacturers. Let us, for instance, see the affidavit that is required, and that was made by the Dominion Barb Wire Fence Company. The declaration is:

"I, Frederick Fairman, of Montreal, do solemnly and truly swear that I am a member of the firm of Cooper, Fairman & Company, the proprietors of the Dominion Barb Wire Fence Company, an establishment for the manufacture of barb wire fencing, situate at Montreal, and the claimant for drawback of duty paid on wire, used in the manufacture of the thirty-nine coils of barbed wire fencing, weighing net 4,579 pounds, exported as per copy of export entry as over, and described in the bill of lading attached, signed by the agent of the Credit Valley Railway, consigned to H. Luban, at Guayaquil and shipped for the foreign port of Guayaquil, and that part thereof is intended to be re-landed in Canada; and further, that the said coils of fencing were wholly manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, and that in the manufacture thereof there was used wire which was imported into Canada, and on which duty was paid at the port of Montreal, as follows, viz.: 4,579 pounds, net weight, being a part of the 1,922 bundles entered on the 1st day of September, 1881, as per entry No. 9,043, on which a drawback is claimed on \$160, original value as entered, and on which duty was paid at said date at the rate of 13 per cent."

Now, there is the affidavit made by Cooper, Fairman & Co., with reference to this, and that affidavit is in accordance with the regulations which require that they shall specify the invoice, the particular Customs entry, and the material on which the drawback is claimed. But when I come down to look at the return of Charles Raymond, for instance, a sewing machine manufacturer, what do I find? Do I find a declaration setting forth the invoice, and the date of entry, and the number of the Customs entry on which the duty was paid, and on which his claim was made and allowed? No; but I find the following:—

"I, C. F. Leonard, Attorney of Charles Raymond, of Guelph, do solemnly and truly swear that the following named articles of British or foreign manufacture, viz.: Iron gun wire, brass, needles, thread and screw-drivers, were used as materials wrought into, or attached to the sewing machines named in the accompanying claim for drawback, and that they are of a kind not manufactured in Canada; and that no other articles are manufactured in Canada that could have been substituted and used in the place thereof; and the said articles of British or foreign manufacture so used, were imported into Canada, and duty was paid thereon, at the Port of Guelph, within two years from the date of the exportation of the said sewing machines."

Neither the number of the entry, nor the date, nor the particulars that are required from other manufactories, and that were required from the manufacturer whose case I have brought before the hon. Minister time and again, were required here. They are scored out entirely, and the affidavit is simply that the duty was paid within two years. In the case of the Bell Organ Company an affidavit of the same kind was made, while in all other cases I find here—and the printed form is the same used on each occasion—they are required to do what I understand the Order in Council requires them to do, viz., to give the date and the

number of the Custom House entry. I find no fault with the hon. Minister at all, for I fancy he has guarded himself with the oath required and the declaration made, if he gave the drawback consistent with his duty and had authority to do so; but I do complain of the hon. Minister's refusal to grant the drawback to other gentlemen who complied with the regulations, when he had the authority to do so, which he evidently had. I make no charge, but I am entitled to an explanation in reference to that matter, and I hope he will give it to me.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to discuss this question at any great length, for, as the hon. gentleman has just said, we have already had two or three tilts on this subject. I may state that my desire has been, as far as possible, in every instance, when a drawback was demanded, to go to the very extent to which the law would permit the Department to go, and upon every occasion when I had the slightest doubt as to the power given departmentally to act, I have gone with the recommendation to the Treasury Board, and obtained the necessary authority. In the case of Fairman, Cooper & Co., they have complied with the Order in Council that was previously passed, and with the regulations which pertained to the paying of the drawback on the tin used in the canning of fish and other articles, by stating distinctly and positively the invoice upon which the entry was made and the duty paid. In the case of sewing machines, to which my hon. friend referred, we found a very great difficulty in carrying out that regulation, from the fact that the drawback is a very small amount, as my hon. friend will see by these figures, as also in the case of the drawback upon organs. Having gone into a most minute calculation as to the actual drawback upon the actual amount of duty paid upon the articles which go into the manufacture of these articles, a report was made to the Treasury Board, which was adopted by the Council, saying that they should have a sum which would cover the amount of duty paid on each of these articles. That is the whole explanation I have to give on this question. I concur in the remarks of my hon. friend as to the necessity of making regulations to govern the paying of drawback more liberal than they have been. I was afraid—I may almost use that expression—to ask the power that was suggested to be given to the Minister of Customs, when the Act was before Parliament, a short time ago; under that amended law, the Department will be able to draft such resolutions as will cover all cases of manufactured goods which are exported without confining them exclusively to the invoices upon which the entries were made. It must be borne in mind that the case to which my hon. friend refers is not at all analogous to either of the other two to which he has referred. As I have already pointed out on previous occasions, it is not one in which a drawback can possibly be made until these gentlemen have amended their demands. For what reason they have not done so it was not my particular business to enquire, but they were told distinctly that no drawback could be put upon an article which went into the manufacture of another article which had not been imported, but which was the production of the mines of this country. In the claims made by the firm to which the hon. member for Brant has referred, was included pig iron, and I am not sure but there were other articles, but of the pig iron I am sure. Now, it may seem strange to the House when I say that, having pointed that fact out to this firm, they have never attempted to amend their demand for a drawback upon the articles manufactured by them and which have been exported. I have repeatedly called the attention of the officers of the Department to the fact that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has frequently reminded me of it, and asked if any amended claim had been made by that firm. Omitting the articles to which I have referred,—for without which it is clear

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

that even under the amended law I should have no power to pay,—if the drawback is to be based upon the amount of duty paid on articles that go into the construction of a machine, then there must be an affidavit to the fact that the article was imported and used in the manufacture of the article that was exported. Until that is done the door for—I will not say fraud—but certainly a misappropriation of public funds, would be opened and there would be no safety in carrying out the principles of drawback at all. I quite agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend has said, and I think, that with the power given to the Government under the present law he will have no excuse to complain of the regulations in future. The difficulties in coming to a correct conclusion as to the amount to be paid back, have arisen in regard to the manufacturers, particularly of barbed wire, and also in the case of the manufacture of nails, in which I have every reason to believe a very large trade would grow up with foreign countries by having a judicious and proper mode of paying the drawback. They import the iron at one season of the year and it is put into their sheds, and portions of it may be used at a later period; another importation may arrive and be placed in the same racks along with the other, and they have pointed out to me that it is impossible for them to make the necessary affidavits, and it is the intention of the Government so to frame the regulations in future that an affidavit, when importations have taken place, that the duty has been paid and that the article has been exported, will justify the payment to them of the drawback of the duty, less a very small percentage of it to cover ordinary expenses. Under the law as it existed, we had grave doubts as to the power of the Department to adopt such regulations. I saw the difficulty in making the affidavits, and before it was done authority was obtained through the Treasury Board and the Governor in Council to pay the drawback, upon the calculations that had been made, and that portion of the affidavit was omitted. The hon. gentleman may very properly ask why we do not adopt the same rule in reference to all manufacturers. I frankly state that I had some little doubt as to our power under the law of doing that, but in order to encourage the exportation of the manufactures of this country, I think the Department and the Treasury Board went to the very extreme limit when they adopted the regulations I suggested to them, and, in the future, I think my hon. friend and the House, and the manufacturers will be quite satisfied with the regulations we propose to adopt. But you must remember that when these claims are made, they must cover claims upon goods upon which duties have been paid, and if it be pointed out to any manufacturer that he is making claim for a drawback upon an article used in the manufacture of any machinery that has never paid duty, then he must understand that he cannot receive that drawback, and if he refuses to make an amended entry, we cannot, and I do not think my hon. friend himself would say that it would be the duty of the Department to make it for him. I hope the explanation will be satisfactory to my hon. friend, and that his friend when he amends his entry under the present law, will receive all the drawback to which he is entitled. But at the same time, the House must understand, and so must the manufacturers, that every safeguard must be established by the Department to prevent anything like an approach to fraud. I have no doubt the manufacturers to whom my hon. friend refers are honest men, but the regulations have to be so framed as to meet dishonest men; we have very little trouble with those who conduct their business properly, and who have no desire to obtain from the Government that to which they are not entitled. Hence the apparent strictness of the regulations to an honest man, who claims nothing more than he should have. When my hon. friend comes to administer any Department of Government, he will find that it is absolutely necessary to



make all these regulations as restrictive as possible, so as to enable him to protect the revenue, and at the same time to carry out the spirit of the law.

**Mr. PATERSON.** The hon. Minister invariably, in speaking on this subject, brings in outside matter. The difficulty with this firm was not, as I understand it from them, at all with reference to anything that needed to be put into their entry; the difficulty was the requirement of the Department that they should specify the particular entry that was made of iron or other material that entered into their machinery, and that would not be relaxed by the hon. Minister for them. But that is not the only case, for there is another case in my own constituency, where the same difficulty occurred, and the Minister has not told us that he wished to vary the Order in Council. The Orders in Council stand there in regard to Mr. Raymond and Mr. Wanzer. It is clear that they had the Order in Council varied for them, and that when other manufacturers have had to specify the particular entry, the day on which it passed in port, and the whole price, we find the Minister saying that he went to the Treasury Board for authority—and he suspected that he was stretching his power a little in doing it—but he did give these men this latitude, that instead of having to specify the very day and the very entry that was made, they are allowed to take an affidavit that there was duty paid on those articles some time within two years. And this is refused to others, and it is an unfortunate thing for the Minister that two sewing machine manufacturers, for whom this concession was made, and that was refused to others, happened, for the first time in their life, to cast in their lot politically with the hon. gentleman opposite. When I spoke to the parties who pointed out the difficulty, that they could not make the affidavit that was required, I told them: "Well, I found in the returns that came down to the House, that Messrs. Wanzer, Raymond, and other manufacturers, have received hundreds and thousands of dollars in drawbacks, and they must experience the same difficulties, precisely, as you do;" and they said: "If they are honest men we do not see how they can take the affidavit that the Department says we must take." I said: "I will move, when I go down to Ottawa, for copies of allowed claims and the declarations made by the parties, in order to see whether there is one rule for one man and another for another man." I did not believe it, but when the return came down I found it was so. I find this has been done in the case of one individual, whereas the law has not been relaxed in the slightest degree to others. That being so, it will not avail the hon. Minister to say that they had some foreign matter in the claim. That has not been the difficulty. It was pointed out that they had made a mistake; they admitted it themselves, and wrote down saying that such had been done, and voluntarily amended it before the Department found it out. It was not the difficulty of putting in other matter, but the making of a declaration that caused the difficulty. That was the difficulty with the Waterous Company to whom no favors extended, and with Wanzer and Raymond, in whose cases favors were extended. All the declaration they had to make was, that the duty was paid in two years, while other parties were compelled to carry out the strict letter of the law. I hold that such a proceeding is wrong, and that the facts vindicate the position I have always taken in regard to this matter, that business could not be carried on under the present regularizations; but, at the same time, regularizations should never have been waived contrary to the Order in Council, in favor of one individual, while the law was not relaxed in the slightest degree to others. The whole matter was kept hidden until I was led to make the motion, because many of the firms asked others how they were able to make such affidavits as were required, when they replied that

they were not required to make them; and the documents brought down by the hon. Minister of Customs carry out what I have said.

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

222. Customs Department—To provide for increase of salary for the month of June, 1882, of the Chief Clerk in Statistical Branch, promoted from First Class..... \$16.67

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).** I desire explanations by the Minister in regard to this vote.

**Mr. BOWELL.** This Chief Clerk was promoted and an estimate taken to cover his salary at the last Session of Parliament; but the appropriation was not available until the 1st of July. The promotion took place in June, and the appropriation not being available to cover the extra amount of salary for that month, or portion of the month, of course the Auditor-General was not empowered to pay it, and it is necessary to ask for this amount of \$16.67. This vote was explained last Session, under which Mr. Barry, head of the Statistical Branch of the Customs Department, was promoted to the position of Chief Clerk.

**Mr. BLAKE.** No. I should judge that this was open to the same explanation which the hon. Minister of Customs gave as to the previous vote.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I am satisfied that it is for the same reason precisely.

**Mr. BLAKE.** What about Mr. Doucet?

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** He was an officer at headquarters, but the work there being prejudicial to his health, I understand that he was transferred to the post office in Ottawa, and after being there for a year, he was re-transferred to the Post Office Department, and then the question was to give him the salary to which he would have been entitled if he had remained in the Department; and therefore this vote is to give him that salary.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I suppose that during the year he was there, he got the salary which it was stipulated, or understood which he was to receive during that time?

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** It was a lower salary. His health was not good, and as the work in the office was prejudicial at the time to his health, we thought he should not on that account be deprived of the ordinary increase to which he was entitled.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Will the hon. gentleman explain why he was not paid if he was entitled to it?

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** Because in the post office where he was, if he had got that pay while there, of course this would have created a precedent for other officers in the office, while returning to headquarters he receives only what he would have been entitled to if he had remained there all this time.

**Mr. BLAKE.** It seems to me, as explained, that this is an arrangement by which an officer, for his personal convenience, or owing to his health, is placed in a certain position for a year, and having returned to his former vocation, is paid a higher salary, or enough to make up what he would have received, if he had remained in his former position. This is what is called, putting the devil around the stump.

**Mr. BOWELL.** No, no. You should say: "Flagellating the venerable old Nicholas around the remnant of a decayed stump."

227. Department of Inland Revenue.—To pay E. Chateauvert for performing duties of Mr. Doyon during the latter's illness..... \$336.00

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** Mr. Doyon was and still is a permanent officer in this Department; but unfortunately

he was struck, I think, by paralysis, and under the circumstances, he was wholly unable to perform his duties. The Minister required some one to do this work, and employed Mr. Chateauvert; and we now ask for authority to pay him, \$538. If we had deprived Mr. Doyon of his pay, he would have been deprived of the absolute necessities of life; and as he was so afflicted while he was in the public service, it was thought better and more humane to allow him his salary and to ask Parliament to give an additional salary to Mr. Chateauvert.

Mr. BLAKE. Has Mr. Doyon recovered?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not yet; and I am sorry to say, I think he is sinking fast.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we must speak with reserve regarding a case which involves affliction. I knew nothing of these parties, and never heard of them until now, but it shows that the function which the Executive discharges in this case, is of a very delicate character. Suppose an officer falls ill, and so ill as to be incapable to discharge his duties, this illness may be of a very lingering description, and last a long while. Now, the provisions for superannuation or retirement are properly applicable to such cases. When a person becomes infirm and incapable of carrying on his duties, and if we are to make extensive use of a provision, which, I confess, I viewed with some jealousy and dislike when it was inserted in the Act last Session, the provision practically to retain officers at salaries, and employ some one else to discharge their duties, I think it will be looked upon with considerable disfavor by the public. I am not criticising adversely this particular instance, but feel it my duty, on the first occasion when the Parliament is called upon to sanction a vote of this kind, to point out, as I have said, that this is a very delicate action, which ought to be exercised very rarely, and in every case where it is exercised, this should be done with special regard to the circumstances. If a man is incapacitated by severe illness, from which it is hardly probable that he may recover, of course we do not want to throw him out of the Department, but as far as I know, the character of the illness referred to, it is a kind of illness from which recovery to perform such duties, is not generally the rule. A severe attack of paralysis generally ends in one way, and is met that way ordinarily. Was Mr. Chateauvert in the service, or was he brought in simply for the purpose of being a *locum tenens*, for this person; and is the salary received by him up to this time, at the same rate as the incapacitated officer whom he replaced?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, so I understand. Mr. Chateauvert receives the same salary which Mr. Doyon was paid. I will add this, Mr. Doyon was appointed in the time of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, and the time he has been in office would not allow us to give him a superannuation; he would have received only seven or eight months salary once for all, and, under these circumstances, it was considered such a grave case, we thought that Parliament would not refuse this grant.

Mr. BLAKE. Was Mr. Chateauvert introduced into the service just to do this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. He was in the Department for four or five years, and was perfectly *au fait* with his duties.

228. Department of Agriculture—For allowance for Secretary of the Department for performing, from March, 1882, the duties of Deputy-Head, absent through illness, as provided in Sec. 11, Canada Civil Service Act, 1882. .... \$875.00

Mr. POPE. My hon. friend (Mr. Blake) knows that Dr. Taché is not able to be in the office, and this sum is, under the law, allowed to Mr. Lowe, who has been acting for that gentleman during this time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this allowance the same amount as his salary?

Mr. POPE. It is not quite as much. My hon. friend will see that this is intended to apply up to the 1st of July, before which time Dr. Taché cannot possibly get here.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to apply to the 1st of July coming? At what rate will that be?

Mr. POPE. I think his present salary is \$2,500.

Mr. BLAKE. It approximates to the taking up of his salary to the salary of a Deputy Head?

Mr. POPE. Yes; I think it makes it \$3,000, while that of a Deputy Head is \$3,200.

231. To pay to the widow of the late Judge Mackenzie the amount paid by her husband to Judge Boyd for performing his duties while he was unable to attend to the same..... \$834.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Judge Mackenzie asked for leave of absence on the ground of ill-health, but it was supposed that his illness was not a very severe one, and that he would be able to return to his duties. When it was found that his illness proved fatal, it was not considered a proper thing that his widow should be called upon to pay the amount which he had paid to Judge Boyd for performing his duties while he was laboring under what was supposed to be a temporary illness.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it always looks invidious to discuss particular cases, but I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman, that the precedent which is about to be established—for this is the first time to my knowledge in which this principle has been adopted—is likely to prove an extremely dangerous one. I cannot myself understand the difference between those degrees of severity of an illness, which, on the one hand, would induce the Government to repay the cost of taking a leave of absence, and that in which it would devolve on the Judge himself. I had occasion to advise as to numerous leaves of absence, some years ago, applied for by Judges, and there was no occasion whatever that I could find out, upon which any County Court Judge had any assistance for the discharge of his duties at the expense of the Government. On the contrary, the condition invariably insisted on, was, that provision for a substitute should be made at the expense of the Judge. Ordinarily that discharge is effected at a very moderate, and very frequently at no expense at all. One of the barristers of the county in which the Judge is, is generally found, perhaps partly from motives of friendship, perhaps partly from the local distinction which filling a Bench of Justice confers, to supply the Judge's place. I have, of course, no positive knowledge of the nature of the pecuniary arrangements which existed, but I know that they have not been of an onerous character as a rule, because I endeavored at one time to prescribe what I thought a very wholesome rule in these cases, if it were feasible, namely, to provide that the supply should come, not from the county in which the Judge was, but from another county. You, Sir, will perceive the importance of such a rule. If it were possible to place barristers who, up to the instant of their temporary promotion, were practising in the county, on the Bench where they might have to decide cases for clients to whom they might have stood a few months before in the relation of a professional man, it would not be considered a very proper proceeding. I was met by the statement that this would render it impossible for the Judges to obtain leave of absence at all, from another county to come to theirs, that the result would be that they could not afford to do it. I was obliged to yield and to return to the old practice of sanctioning the supply of respectable barristers even from the county in which the Judge was. I mention this to show that the invariable rule

has been that the public service was not to be called on to meet the expenditure of money in consequence of a leave granted to a Judge, and that whatever might be required to supply that leave was to be supplied by the Judge himself. With reference to the Judges of the Superior Courts, I believe that almost invariably that supply has been obtained, as it ought, from the goodwill and kindly feeling of his colleagues remaining on the Bench. The extra work is cheerfully undertaken by those who are well, knowing, as they do, that their brethren will deal with them as they have been dealt by. The sum, in the present case, is not large, as we vote money—not, indeed, worth the few minutes I have spent in discussing the question; but I feel sure that this \$834 will be the fruitful parent of a great many other demands of the same kind. Grant this, and where will you draw the line? In this particular instance, I know that the former Junior Judge of the county of York has been hard worked for many years, and that he performed, it seems from this paper, during the illness of Judge Mackenzie, the additional duties of the Senior Judge, involving a considerable amount of labor. Whatever arrangement was made, however, was made between these two judicial persons; but I must repeat that the precedent which is about to be set is one which will be productive of considerable inconvenience to the Government in the way of pressure, and considerable demand, from time to time, on the public purse.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think that this case is quite so objectionable as the hon. gentleman would seem to infer. Why should you deal with Superior Court Judges in a different manner from County Court Judges.

Mr. BLAKE. You do not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that it is the invariable practice, when persons holding the highest judicial positions in the country require, in consequence of failing health, a change of air or rest, to give them leave of absence, and they are not called upon to devote their salaries to the provision for the discharge of their duties in their absence. I have known particular instances myself, in which, I think, the hon. gentleman himself gave lengthened leave of absence to the Superior Court Judges without their being taxed, or their salaries reduced in the slightest degree.

Mr. BLAKE. I have explained how.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but that does not affect the case between man and man. I can understand that a County Court Judge, who desires to have a little rest or change, should provide for the services of a Judge to take his place; but the cases will not be very frequent in which leave of absence is asked by a person whose illness proves to be a fatal illness, and whose case, I am satisfied, if placed before the hon. gentleman, as Minister of Justice, would not be met by him with the remark: Before you can get this leave of absence you must make provision for the supply of your place. I fail to see why so broad a distinction should be made between those who are receiving larger salaries and the Judges of the County Courts. Looking at the matter as a simple act of justice, I do not think this precedent is likely to be a dangerous one.

Mr. BLAKE. The course pursued in my time, and I presume now, with reference to Superior Court Judges, was, that the opinion of the Chief Justice of the court was taken as to whether or not leave could be granted without detriment to the business of the court. That resulted in an arrangement among the gentlemen of the Bench themselves, by which the administration of justice was fully attended to. The Government had nothing to do with that arrangement, and paid nothing for it, and I believe it was agreed to by the Judges without pecuniary payment. Instances have occurred in my own time in which I have been obliged to postpone the leave of absence for a con-

siderable time, until I should receive a favorable report from the chief of the court. Therefore, there is no distinction whatever; the leave of absence is granted in both cases with the understanding that the administration of justice is to be provided for. I make that explanation in order that it should not be inferred from the hon. gentleman's remarks that I am favoring one rule for the rich and another for the poor. That, of course, would be a totally unjust thing.

232. To supplement vote for contingencies of the Supreme Court of Canada by the amount paid for books purchased from Mr. George Duval..... \$820 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the purchase of 562 volumes from the library of the late Chief Justice Duval, selected by the Judges of the Supreme Court and delivered to the Supreme Court library.

231. To provide for the payment of expenses incurred in the case of Russell vs. Woodward, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom on appeal from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, revote, \$5,500..... \$8,500 00

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad this account has come in, so that hon. gentlemen who are so enamoured of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council may see that it is a pretty dear blessing. Can the hon. gentleman say how this sum is divided?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot give the exact figures, but about \$600 were the expenses of the liquor interest, and \$2,000 the expenses of the temperance interest.

237. Library..... \$2,607.15

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why are so many of the *Annual Register* purchased? thirty copies costing \$90.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are for the purpose of exchange.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). That is a bad precedent. Only official documents should be exchanged.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is the annual one.

Mr. ROSS. Besides, the publisher of this book is in the service drawing \$2,000 per annum, yet I see every year, since 1878, he draws a large sum for this work, 300 copies for the use of members, and so on.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He uses his leisure time in this work, and I think such men deserve encouragement.

Mr. CASEY. All the leisure time that Mr. Morgan gives to the work is to put his name on the title page, and he pays others to compile it, and I must say the Department in which he is engaged cannot lose much of his services on this ground. I think almost invariably Mr. Morgan's works have been published by somebody else, and he has only compiled and edited them. I think it is a bad precedent to pay a public servant \$1,000 a year for books which have been compiled in his name while he is in the public service.

Mr. ROSS. There is another question of exchange that comes up here. I notice ten copies of the debates of the Legislature of Quebec paid for, \$50. Now, why not exchange the debates of the Parliament of Canada for those of Quebec?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These debates of the Legislature of Quebec are published by private enterprise, and the Legislature of that Province have subscribed for so many copies. I think ten copies is a moderate number for us to subscribe to and put into our library.

Mr. BLAKE. That is all right. But the number of copies of Garneau's History of Canada is much in excess of the number taken of these other books.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the first edition was published, some time ago, the Parliament of Canada took 250 copies. I think that fifty copies is a very moderate number for us to take now, of this great work. It has been very carefully revised by Mr. Garneau, jr., and will be a great acquisition to our library.

Mr. CASEY. I think the purchase of books for our library should be done through the ordinary channels—either by the Librarian or by the Committee, and that to choose a certain number of books by Order in Council has the appearance of favoritism.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Library Committee could not purchase these books on account of the money put at their disposal being insufficient to purchase all the books they want. Therefore, when a book of that kind comes out, and the Librarian desires to have it, he writes to the Secretary of State, asking that a certain number of copies be purchased.

20. To pay the Winnipeg General Hospital for patients, not being residents of Manitoba, between 8th April, 1880, and the 31st March, 1883 ..... \$14,387.10

In answer to Mr. BLAKE,

Mr. POPE. We made an arrangement by which we paid 60 cts. a day to Manitoba for the care of those people. Our agents enquire carefully into the matter of where these people come from.

21. To provide for further expenses to 30th June, in view of the large increase of immigration not estimated for..... \$25,000.00

Mr. POPE. I think this amount will all be required during the year. The increase of immigration to this country is expected to be very large during the coming year. The expenses are very heavy in England in one way and another.

22. For payment to Mrs. Edward Duckett, the amount short paid to her late husband on account of superannuation..... \$1,200.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This matter has long been a subject of controversy between this Department and Mrs. Duckett. Mr. Duckett was in the service of the Customs Department and was superannuated, and in the arrangement made for the amount that he was entitled to on account of superannuation this sum of \$1,200 was in question. On careful investigation of the whole case it has been found that she was entitled to this amount, over that which she had previously received.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we have no proper information as to how this sum is arrived at. This is not a grant. As the hon. gentleman has put it, it is a claim of rights, that the officer was short paid, and that restitution was a simple act of justice. Under these circumstances the Government will be obliged to pay his estate and not pay his widow.

Mr. VAIL. In this case there will be no creditors, and I hope the Committee will not refuse to grant it to the widow.

Mr. RICHEY. In making the allowance, which was done by the late Government, they overlooked the arrears. The superannuation allowance was based upon \$600 instead of \$1,200, which was the right amount. That was explained by the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the representation of Halifax, but there was a mistake in following it up.

23. For pay and maintenance of a guard at Government House..... \$3,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is an exceptional vote, and it is not intended to continue it.

Resolutions to be reported.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:55 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 11th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the fourth and fifth reports of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the House. The fourth report relates to the appointment of four gentlemen as French translators of the Debates, which hitherto has been done by contract. It is thought better by the Committee to have the translation done by a body of translators, directly responsible to the Committee for their work. The four gentlemen named, are Gelinas, Beaulieu, Tremblay and Vanasse, and their salaries are based upon the cost of the translation last year, so that the assumption is that there will be no increase in the cost of translation, while the arrangements made will allow the work to be more efficiently performed. The fifth report relates to the purchase of caligraphs whereby the Debates may be transcribed in a more legible manner than is at present generally the case. The suggestion has been made that the reporting staff should be increased; but the Committee think that they can accomplish the same object practically, by not increasing the number of reporters, but by affording greater facilities for the transcribing of the reports. At the present time, each reporter is permitted to employ an amanuensis, and the presumption is that the amanuensis will write out each note taken at the table before the reporter goes in again; but experience has shown that, owing to the very hurried work, the reporter is unable to read over the copy before it goes to the printer, and for that reason the suggestion is made by the chief reporter, based upon his own experience, and on that of one of the other reporters during the present Session, that if caligraphs are obtained, the report could be written out, and still leave time enough for the reporter to revise the reports, by reading over the manuscript—and it gives this additional advantage, that perfect copy would go to the printer. One of the great difficulties in the past has been due to rapid writing, and to the carelessness of the proof reader, I am bound to say, and consequently the reports in many cases have not been at all up to what they ought to have been. I believe that under the arrangement made, or proposed rather, we shall be able to overcome this difficulty, and afford very much better and more accurate reports in the first sheets presented to the House. The other part of this report relates to the resignation of his position on the staff of Mr. Lumsden, who, I believe, proposes to go, like many other young men, West. The gentleman named in his stead is well known to the House. He was formerly the head of the reporting staff, and, in fact, had the contract for *Hansard* at one time. His skill as a reporter, is I think, thoroughly known to every member of the House—I refer to Mr. Richardson. These are the two reports, the adoption of which I have the honor to move.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that the arrangements made for the French translation of the Debates will not increase the expense beyond the existing expenditure, and I would ask whether the Committee has

been able practically to carry out with reference to the French edition of *Hansard*, the suggestion which was thrown out at the time that a second French reporter was authorized, namely, that the services of the French reporters should be partially utilized in effecting the translation, because it is very obvious that they have a great deal of leisure time on their hands, and that it would be an economy, a very considerable economy, if the skilled shorthand writers kept only for the purpose of being used when French speaking was going on, were so employed, as they must have a great deal of slack time. I am very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman believes that the result of these labor-saving machines will be to produce increased efficiency on the part of the reporters, and more accurate reports than those which at present—I will not say disgrace—but which at all events do not adorn the pages of *Hansard*. I would ask him to say—after all this has been done—after getting caligraphs, and adding to the reporting staff, and altering the system and giving an increased number of copies to members—what the hon. gentleman thinks will be the cost, say of next year's *Hansard*, supposing that it has no more than the average number of pages?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should have mentioned that there is a recommendation in one of the preceding reports of the Committee that the French reporters should be employed in assisting the translators of the Debates. It was absolutely necessary that there should be two French reporters. We could not get along without them, although, taking the volume in the aggregate, there is not really anything like work enough for one; but if a debate takes place in French we must have two reporters—the measure of the efficiency of the French staff being the ability to meet an occasion of that kind. The French reporters are to be employed in assisting the translators, the intention being—as the translators' room is near that of the reporters—that they can be sent for to the Table at any time when they are required. As to the other point, my impression is that the cost of *Hansard* next year, with the additional number of copies, will probably reach about \$25,000—I do not think it will go beyond that. A report was adopted providing that five copies should be given to each member, and I am, perhaps, somewhat to blame for not explaining that point when I moved the adoption of the report. On consideration, however, I am bound to say that I am not, myself, very much enamored of that provision, and for this reason: That if each member has five copies of the bound *Hansard*, he will be enabled to give one to each of four influential constituents, or he may put them in the libraries of his constituency, if there are any libraries in it. But the misfortune I see is, that if there are no libraries and you give a copy of *Hansard* to a few influential friends and not to others, the chances are that there will be a disposition to impute favoritism.

Mr. BLANCHET. There are the colleges and academies.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes; and, of course, there will be no difficulty where there are academies and colleges. It has occurred to me that it would be better on the whole if, instead of giving five copies to each member, we were to send copies to each of these colleges and academies, or to libraries where libraries exist, direct from the distributing office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the subject of condensing the reports has been brought before the Committee. With the exception of the few members of this House who use refined and correct language, it is very difficult for the reporter to put down precisely *verbatim* the language of the speaker so as to get what you may call a photograph of the speech, though it may be given in substance. Very often when a speaker speaks very correctly, as some of us do, you

will find his language very correctly reported. There are very few hon. members who would care to sit down and write an article, and have it as correct as he would wish to have it without afterwards revising. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who is himself a very able writer, would very often desire, after he has written an article, to have the opportunity of correcting and revising it, and it is not to be expected that hon. members, who speak, I may say, *ex abrupto*, would be able to exercise such oversight over their language as would fit it for reproduction in *Hansard*. Therefore, I maintain that it is impossible to give the exact words of the speaker, and therefore that the substance only should appear in *Hansard*; and that the form should be reduced as much as possible to the form of the English *Hansard* by eliminating any repetitions that may occur. I think, if this suggestion were acted upon, it would improve the quality of *Hansard* and reduce the size of the volume.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask the Chairman of the Committee if he has deemed it worth while to consider a suggestion which I made when this subject was under discussion before, namely, that the sheets supplied to the newspapers throughout the country should be the revised sheets, instead of those first issued. Though the work of the reporters is very well performed, indeed, by the present staff, taking into account the difficulties under which they labor by frequently being unable to hear the remarks of speakers, owing to the other noises in the House—though as I say the work is very correctly done on their part—yet as it has subsequently to pass through the hands of the printers who are liable to make errors, the advance sheets received by members are not such, on the whole, as they may implicitly trust. Even if the reports were such that they might be implicitly trusted, and no errors could be found such as the dropping of a figure making hundreds of thousands instead of millions, there is the difficulty that the daily sheets are not paged consecutively, and those who receive them are unable to pin them together, and so they are worthless for future reference. It seems to me that there might be some scheme whereby the revised sheets could be sent to the different newspaper offices consecutively numbered, so that at the close of the Session, after receiving the index, they could have the volume bound at their own expense, and thus have a book which it seems almost impossible to get otherwise, and quite impossible to get otherwise, without great expense.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the suggestion of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) with regard to the condensation of the reports, I am afraid that would be impossible. The difficulty would be that the reporter would be left to judge of the merit and value of the speeches he reported. The press does a good deal of condensing, and from the nature of things it almost condenses out of existence the speeches of all but the more prominent members of Parliament; and the misfortune of attempting to condense in *Hansard* would be simply that the same process would be repeated in the Official Report, so that I fear we can only manage to have the Official Report by having a full report. I can understand that occasionally, indeed always, a speaker is very much indebted to the reporter; and the difference between the skilful reporter and the unskilful reporter, consists in the fact, that the skilful reporter anticipates what the speaker desires and means to say, and puts it in the best possible form. That really is what distinguishes good reporting from the process of nearly photographing a speech. As to the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), it is well worthy of consideration, and though it would involve extra expense, I do not think the additional expense would be very great. It would mean that one copy would be sent to each hon. member to correct; that the corrected sheets would be sent

back within twenty-four hours; and then, that three copies would come to the hon. members and be sent to the press all over the country. In that case, of course, the sheets would be consecutively paged. I think this is a suggestion which we may be able to carry out, and at all events I will bring it to the attention of the Committee at the meeting we purpose holding before the Session closes.

Mr. AMYOT. I have no intention of presenting an amendment to the report; but, in justice to my language, I ought to say that I do not believe the number of translators will be sufficient. We will be exposed to the inconvenience of having our French copy issued five or six months after the Session closes. I think the experience of next Session will prove that I am correct. As to the suggestion of the report that the French stenographers should be employed as translators, I strongly protest against it. We have a right to have our stenographers here, always ready, when we choose to speak in French; and if they become wearied by the work of translating, they will not be fit for their regular work. They are very able stenographers; but they are not translators; and I do not think, in justice to them, that we should put that suggestion into practice. This year the translation of the *Hansard* has been done very well; it is very creditable to Mr. Gelinas, the chief, and I am glad to see that he is to be steadily employed in that work. As to the other translators, I know one of them, Mr. Beaulieu, to be very well qualified; I do not know the others. As to the number of translators, I believe they are not sufficient, and as to the stenographers being employed as translators, I think all the French members object to it.

Mr. BÉCHARD. In reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse, I would say that the question he has just raised was discussed in the Committee, and the opinion unanimously expressed there was that four translators would be sufficient with the assistance of the French stenographer. As has just been said by the Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), there is but little work to be done, and at long intervals, by the two French stenographers; and it was thought proper, in the interest of the House, that they should be employed otherwise during their moments of leisure. The reporting will not suffer on this account, for it has been understood that one of the reporters should be here at hand, at the sitting of the House, so as to be ready to take any speech that might be delivered in French; and if the presence of the two should be necessary, then the services of the other could be secured. By this new system of translating, we think that it will be done more perfectly than it has been since our proceedings have been reported; and I think every French member of the House will support me when I say that the translation in the past has been very poorly done. It has certainly not been such as to bring glory to the French members or to our language. The *Hansard* is a monument, designed to pass to posterity, and it is in our interest, and in the interest of the whole Dominion, that the work should be well done. To that end, we have come to the conclusion to recommend to the House the appointment of a permanent staff of translators, who, having always the same work to perform, are likely to acquire great efficiency; and we, therefore, think that the translating will be much more satisfactory in the future than it has been in the past, under the contract system. The contractor did not always employ the same men; each year there were new hands to help him, and as they had not always sufficient training in the work, it was not always well done. The hon. Minister of Public Works last year complained, and I think with good reason, that a speech he had delivered in the House sometime in the previous Session had been very poorly translated; and to obviate such difficulties we have thought proper to recommend a change of system. Now, I would say to my hon. friend from Bellechasse, that we had

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

better wait and try this new system. We have four experienced men; they are all competent men, because we have taken care to nominate men known to be very competent, who can do more work than double the number without experience; and we think that, with the assistance of the two French stenographers, they will be sufficient for the work. At all events, let us try the system, and if, in another Session, experience proves that the number is not sufficient, it will be easy to remedy that deficiency.

Mr. CASEY. I merely rise to urge still more strongly the suggestion of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in regard to having the corrected sheets, instead of the uncorrected ones, sent to the press. I do not speak so much on my own account, because I do not suffer very much from the condensation that some hon. gentlemen complain of, for the simple reason that I do not make very long speeches. I may make them oftener than the House sometimes cares to listen, but I speak more on behalf of the public generally who are interested in getting, at the earliest moment, the most correct reports of the long and important speeches delivered in the House. Under present circumstances it is necessary occasionally for a member, or some one for him, to go twice over these long speeches—once for the bound volume of *Hansard*, and once for the press, which involves a vast amount of labor. The consequence is that many of these speeches have to be published in the crude form in which they first appear.

Motion agreed to.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Government Orders have precedence on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

#### SUPPLY.

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

Mr. CHARLTON. In reference to the expedition east of James' Bay, can the hon. leader of the Government give me an idea as to the expenditure proposed, the proportion to be borne respectively by the Government of Quebec and the Dominion Government, and the field and duration of operations?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This subject is not yet before the House in the way of an estimate. It will only appear in the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84. As I understand it, the Geographical Society of Quebec have undertaken the exploration of that important division extending north of Quebec and James' Bay, and north-east to the Labrador coast. The Government of Quebec has granted \$300, and it is proposed to ask this House to vote \$300 more. Before asking the vote we shall be prepared to lay all necessary information before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. A grant of \$300 by each Government would be totally inadequate, unless the resources of the Geographical Society of Quebec are so considerable as to render them independent of aid. If this exploration is to be taken in hand, I hope greater liberality will be shown than that indicated by the hon. Minister.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works give the information promised me as to the place in the Estimates in which Mr. Fabre's salary is to appear, and the kind of work he is called on to perform?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was right, yesterday, in saying the item there was not to be found in the Estimates before the House. When the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84 come down there will be something in them for this,

and then will be the time to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

**Mr. CASEY.** In regard to the exploration of the territory east of James' Bay, does the Government contemplate making any exploration of Hudson's Straits with the view of ascertaining how many months of the year they are navigable? This will be a work of some cost, and I think the Imperial Government ought to contribute to it, as it is of great importance to them that they should have access to the Dominion independent of the River St. Lawrence and Intercolonial Railway, in case of any complications with the United States. The Government might well ask the Imperial Government to assist by a grant of money, and, perhaps, by sending out some naval officer or scientific man to accompany an expedition of that kind. The whaling vessels of Newfoundland would be the proper vessels for the exploration, as they are specially fitted for navigating amongst ice, and the whaling season is over about the time this exploration should begin.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** The Government are not insensible to the advantages of ascertaining finally and thoroughly what that route is, whether it is available for commercial purposes for the North-West. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is right the Imperial Government should, for various reasons, share in the cost of the enquiry. The hon. gentleman knows there have been two railways chartered to run from the North-West to different points on Hudson's Bay. These two companies have amalgamated. The Government offered some inducements in order to get these companies—both promoted by men of rank, standing, and wealth—to amalgamate and unite their forces, and build one railway through this new country. All new countries are supposed to be more or less inhospitable, but it may prove, as it has proved in other places in the North-West, that on more thorough exploration that country will be found to be not so inhospitable as general rumor will lead us to believe. Those two companies have united in a strong representation to Government as to having a thorough examination of the Hudson's Bay, and the Hudson's Straits especially, to see whether that country can be opened up for commercial purposes and navigation by sailing vessels, and by steamers principally. Before the amalgamation the Government had opened negotiations with Her Majesty's Government, which are now going on, and subsidies in the way of a grant of land to carry out this project will be submitted to Her Majesty's Government immediately, and we will endeavor by every means to induce members to join in promoting the schemes. Perhaps the most advantageous way in which the Imperial Government could assist us would be by giving us a ship thoroughly equipped and manned by men accustomed to Arctic navigation, and who thoroughly understand the various phases and appearances which the ice takes under the various circumstances of currents, winds and alterations of temperature. At all events, the Government will press on Her Majesty's Government the importance of this subject, and will state the earnest desire of the people of Canada, as represented to this House, to have this exploration take place; and that they are willing to make a very liberal grant of land for the purpose. We hope that during this summer we will be able to induce Her Majesty's Government to aid us in the matter. If we fail in that, then we will have to consider how far we can ask Parliament to take that burthen on its shoulders.

**Mr. VALIN.** I did not understand the hon. Minister to state what kind of vessels would be required to navigate Hudson's Bay during the winter months. I believe that in Hudson's Bay the winter is six or seven months long, and the question is, what kind of vessels would be required in view of the ice existing there? I am afraid that the cost of establishing such a line would be so great as to render it

a question of some importance as to whether the Government should undertake it.

**Mr. CASEY.** I did not speak of establishing a line of steamers, but merely of having an exploring expedition to navigate the Straits. I am very glad to hear the Government have opened negotiations with the Imperial Government in the matter, and I think, with the right hon. Minister, that there is a probability of them granting a ship or something of that kind.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I did not go so far as to say there is any probability. We will press the matter on the Imperial Government.

**Mr. CASEY.** I still adhere to the opinion that the Newfoundland sailing vessels, which are accustomed to navigate those waters every season, would be the most fit for the purpose, and in case negotiations with the Imperial Government should fail, this is a matter which the Government would be justified in taking up in the interests of all the Provinces of Canada. There are great portions, not only of the North-West, but also of Ontario and Quebec, that could be opened up if Hudson's Bay were found to be navigable. It was stated this Session, before the Immigration and Colonization Committee, that there was a strong probability that these straits have been more navigable in winter than in summer, as being more clear of ice, on account of the floating ice being tied up by the frost.

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

(In the Committee.)

244. Canadian Pacific Railway—Georgian Bay Branch ..... \$3,000.00

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** This item is for the purpose of paying legal expenses in the suit of Smith & Ripley, in the Exchequer Court. The amount is not known, but it will take at least this sum. There is an Order in Council for a special warrant for \$750 on the 19th August, 1882; for \$750 on 26th December, 1882; and for \$251 on 21st January, 1883. Of course, no more will be expended than is absolutely required.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That seems to be a very objectionable way of doing business. There is a vote for the same matter in Miscellaneous, and here is another vote under the Georgian Bay Branch. There is no system. Either the whole costs should go under Miscellaneous, or the whole under Georgian Bay Branch.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** This is a mistake. This is the only vote, and when we come to the other it will be dropped. Part of it has been paid already, and it is well to include the whole. The Order in Council was to place it in the Supplementary Estimates.

**Mr. BLAKE.** How does the case to which I have referred stand; has it been adjudicated upon?

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Judgment was given against the Crown in the Exchequer Court, and we have appealed to the full court. The amount of damages is placed at \$271,000.

245. Canadian Pacific Railway—West of Red River... \$4,000.00

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I will explain this item in a moment; but I wish to take advantage of the consideration of this vote relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to make a very brief statement to the House in connection with a point in the speech which I delivered a few days ago with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find, upon looking carefully into the question, that the hon. leader of the Opposition had some reason for stating that the ground I had taken with respect to stock was rather obscure, that, as stated by me, the matter was treated as a question of bonds, rather than as a question

of stock. I take this opportunity of saying that, upon looking at that point in the hon. gentleman's speech, and in my reply, I feel bound to say that I concur in the soundness of the view taken by the hon. gentleman. I think where a company are obliged to raise any portion of the amount required to construct the railway by the issue of bonds, and they sell their bonds in the open market and obtain the highest price they can, it should be regarded as a legitimate charge to capital account, to charge the discount as well as the amount they receive, provided all the amount is honestly placed in the work. I believe the hon. gentleman is correct in drawing the distinction he did draw between stocks and bonds. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement that, whereas a company are obliged to pay par for the bonds, whatever bonds they may have issued, irrespective of whatever amount may have been received, the case does not stand in the same position in regard to stocks, and they are not entitled to charge discount, but simply the amount of money received by the sale of the stock, and absolutely placed in the work. I take this opportunity of admitting that the view which the hon. member propounded was a sound and correct view, and one that, upon reconsideration, I am satisfied is the position which the Government must hold in relation to this question, especially taken in connection with the fact that it is upon the capital put into the work by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, over and above all the subsidies they received, that the 10 per cent. profit on their capital must be calculated.

Mr. BLAKE. I receive with very great gratification the statement of the hon. gentleman, for I felt, as I expressed at the time, very great apprehension in regard to the statement he made on the former occasion. I cannot join in the ill compliment which he paid himself, that his statement was obscure. It was very clear, but, as he agreed to-day, it was very wrong. The hon. gentleman will have observed that I also called his attention to a defect, the importance of which is now admitted, in the return which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made to an Order of this House, in compliance with my last demand. They entirely omitted to give a statement with respect to the increase in capital stock, and the amount realised from it, and so forth. They left the return incomplete in that particular, and did not afford any explanation. It is of great consequence that we should contemporaneously with the creation of the stock, obtain a record of the result of these transactions, because at a later date, as has been shown by the experience of the United States, it will be impossible to obtain it. In treating this subject, I treated it as if the stock had been issued at 60, but later advices confirm a rumor, which I had heard before, that the stock had really been issued at 50, and it was a syndicate, composed to a considerable extent of members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which issued it at 60, their gross profit being the intervening 10 per cent.—and a very handsome profit it is—and any profits they may make from selling it at a higher price than 60. The first information which was endorsed by the hon. Minister with great confidence, thus proves to be incorrect; and the stock, so far as the Company is concerned, represents half its nominal amount. I also call attention to the desirability of obtaining a return, which is now considered to be important, in respect to the acquisition of eastern branches, in order to ascertain whether they were paid for out of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, and also to the extent to which the holdings of the original proprietors were enlarged in order to place them on a par with outside proprietors who might be acquiring stock at the rate of 50 per cent. Suppose the original proprietors had \$10,000,000 paid up, and the Company issued other \$50,000,000 at 50, the first thing the original proprietors would do would be to double their own stock, or they would be at a disadvantage, as compared with those entering the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Company who were taking stock at 50; and operations of that kind have probably taken place. At the opening of this Session a return of this kind was moved for, and the hon. gentleman stated that he had the authority of the Company to state that they would furnish information fully and early, and yet we have not got it up to this time. I think it is of great consequence we should know what the inner history of the Company is, so far as the public interests are concerned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say I do not remember stating to the House in very positive and exact terms what the hon. gentleman has just placed in my mouth, pledging the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with reference to these returns. The House passed a resolution requiring certain returns from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but it is only down to a certain date, and the House has no authority, no grounds, and no means of compelling the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from day to day to give information with reference to their business that is not required from any other company with which we have anything to do. What I stated to the House was, that I would endeavor to obtain from this Company as full information as I possibly could, and I may say that they have expressed great readiness from time to time to supplement the wishes of the House in furnishing returns which they are not obliged to furnish except at stated periods in the year. It is quite impossible to expect any company to constantly give voluminous information with reference to all the transactions with which they may be connected. I may say, however, that I drew the attention of the Company to the absence in the returns they made of the information that was asked with reference to this particular point, and expressed the desire that we should have as full information as they could possibly supply and would furnish. Now, I may say with reference to the point which the hon. gentleman raised—he is dealing I presume with rumor, for I presume he has no authority for saying that the price which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company receive for their stock was only 50 per cent.—if the hon. gentleman has any authority for that statement he is in possession of information of which I am ignorant. I do not hesitate to say that I have no such information, although I do not at all think it unlikely that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should have resorted to the means commonly resorted to, and most important means, to secure the best possible price for their stock, and that is to get it under-written by a certain number of parties who would secure, when they put stock upon the market, the realization of a certain amount for it; that I believe to be not only a common proceeding, but a very wise proceeding, and that it is in the public interest as well as in the interest of the road, because it was desirable that they should secure and take the best possible means that lay in their power of realizing as large an amount as possible, and of securing themselves against the possible contingency of having great discredit thrown upon their enterprise by a very low price being offered by the public for their stock when placed on the market. I can truly say that the hon. gentleman has more information than I have if he has any authority for stating that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has only received 50 per cent. on the stock they have issued.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say I have heard of it; and as I stated to the hon. gentleman, it has appeared in the papers. It has appeared in a New York paper, and the statement is practically this: Confirming the information circulated and which I suppose has reached the hon. gentleman and the Committee—that a syndicate composed of J. Kennedy & Co., one of the houses incorporated in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and another house whose name I forget at this moment, had a contract for \$30,000,000 of stock, in three blocks of \$10,000,000 each; the first \$10,000,000 firm



at 50, the rest at options, to be taken at a time to expire not long hence, and the other a little later on. The first issue at any rate is at 50, which Kennedy & Co. have paid for the first \$10,000,000, which they place with the public at 60, or at as much more as they can get. The statement does not give details as to the price of the other two blocks of \$10,000,000, which has been agreed to be given at the option of the syndicate to the Syndicate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may now say, with reference to this vote now before the Committee, that this amount of \$4,000 is to pay for a claim for land taken in the parish of St. Clement's, Manitoba, and other lands, in very small amounts, connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Red River, when it was in the hands of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. These were lands which were expropriated, I suppose?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. On the line which has been located?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; not on the line. This was expropriated when we expected to cross Red River at Selkirk. There was an expropriation then made of Mr. Taylor's land, which has been the subject of a long dispute.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the old Taylor claim.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the old Taylor claim; that is, a portion of it, and other small matters, land claims, connected with it; but the bulk of it is the old Taylor claim.

Mr. BLAKE. And how was the amount ascertained for the Taylor claim?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps I had better read the Order in Council, a copy of which I hold in my hand:—

*"Certified Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Administrator of the Government in Council, on the 23rd January, 1883.*

"On a report dated 18th January, 1883, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting that in June, 1875, certain lands, the property of Mr. James Taylor, forming part of Lot No. 65, in the parish of St. Clements, county Lisgar, Manitoba, and lying on the west side of Red River, opposite Selkirk, were expropriated for the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that this land in anticipation of the passage through it of the main line, Mr. Taylor had had surveyed for town lots, and in subsequent negotiations for a settlement claimed the sum of \$20,300 for the property,

"The Minister represents that the Government Land Valuers' report, under date the 28th September, 1878, the value of the land at \$1,155.26, and that in March, 1880, a special agent appointed for the settlement of right of way claims, reported that the sum which should be paid to Mr. Taylor was \$1,737.50; and Mr. Taylor having by a letter, dated 18th November, 1880, intimated his willingness to accept this sum, an Order in Council authorizing its payment was passed under date 25th of November, 1880.

"The Minister observes that the policy of the Government in respect of the line having, thereafter changed, and the land being no longer required, Mr. Taylor was notified accordingly, under date, 20th July, 1881, but the Minister deeming it but just that some compensation should be made him for the prolonged retention of his land, had certain claims advanced by Mr. Taylor, amounting to \$4,160.79 referred to the full Board of Official Arbitrators for examination and report, and their report, received on the 28th of November last, awarded the sum of \$1,498.60 together with interest at the rate of 6 per cent., from the 1st of October, 1882, until the time of final settlement, upon a certain item of \$783.00.

"The Minister concurring in the above award, recommends that the Order in Council of the 25th of November, 1880, be cancelled, and that authority be given for the settlement of these claims upon the basis laid down by the Official Arbitrators, and that an amount to cover this item be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1882-83, to be laid before Parliament at its forthcoming Session."

Mr. BLAKE. \$4,000 are not required for that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but it includes other land claims that require to be dealt with, and which were disposed of at the lowest rate which could be obtained.

Mr. BLAKE. Then as I understand it, the land is relinquished to Mr. Taylor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And the other claims included, were they settled by arbitration or by convention?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They were settled by valuation.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they cases in which the land is also abandoned or retained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that they are principally abandoned.

246. Canadian Pacific Railway—Dawson Route: to pay James Dick the Official Arbitrators' award...\$4,423.92

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This claim is on the part of Captain Dick, who was a contractor with the Government of Canada, with the Railway Department, for the construction of steamers for the Dawson route, between Thunder Bay and the Lake of the Woods. Captain Dick undertook this work, and lost heavily, owing to his having gone to a large expenditure to carry it out, when he was obliged to abandon it in consequence of the Indians interfering with the operation in which he was engaged. This claim has been pressed on the Government for many years, and finally one of the Official Arbitrators, Mr. Buchanan, was instructed to investigate the matter and report upon the claim. The following is the conclusion of his report:—

"I think that the evidence shows that the case of Captain James Dick deserves consideration, unless it be held not to be the duty of Government to furnish the means of enforcing law and order wherever public works are going on. But I think that even if the principle for which he contends is admitted (which, of course, it is not my business to decide), he will be sufficiently remunerated by the payment by the Government of \$4,423.92, being the first and fourth items of his claims, \$5,533, less \$1,109.08, the balance against him in the account current made up, as it has been, on the strict terms of the contract taken by Messrs. James Dick & Co. In all the circumstances, however, I do not see that he should be entitled to interest further back than the date on which Government decides on the principle."

That report was referred to the Board of Official Arbitrators, consisting of Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Simard and Mr. Cowan, and a majority of the Board gave their award in favor of Captain Dick for the amount mentioned in Mr. Buchanan's report.

Mr. BLAKE. Who were the majority of the arbitrators?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Simard and Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Compton was absent. They made the following award:

"In this case we have the honor to report: That the Board having heard read in the presence of the counsel for the claimant and Government the evidence taken before Mr. Buchanan, and having also heard the arguments of these gentlemen, take the same view as that contained in Mr. Buchanan's report. They, therefore, recommend the case to the favorable consideration of the Government to which they infer that Captain Dick is fully entitled in justice, inasmuch as this loss sustained by him in the execution of his work was caused by the absence of any organization or protection, either civil or military, which Captain Dick should have expected from the Government during the execution of his contract."

As I said before, the men were intimidated by the Indians, and driven out of the country, and the stores which Captain Dick had accumulated for carrying out the contract were destroyed, and the only course the Government could take was to refer it to arbitration.

Mr. BLAKE. When did this occur?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the time the Dawson route was being carried out under the late Government. The claim has been steadily pressed by Captain Dick from that time, until it was decided that it must be disposed of in some way or other. At the Board of Arbitration, the Government was represented by counsel, and every pains were taken by the Department to place the position of the Government in the most favorable light; and the majority having found that Captain Dick was entitled to the money, this sum was placed in the Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is extremely to be regretted that the Supplementary Estimates for the service of the current year, brought down at a late period of the Session, and discussed in its dying hours, should contain these old, stale claims. It appears that payment of this claim has repeatedly been refused, we cannot tell whether justly or unjustly, but importunity affects—I will not say the unjust Judge—but it affects the Judge, and an arrangement is made of some kind or other, and instead of Parliament being supplied with the papers early in the Session we are told that if we want information we can dig into the large pile of papers which the hon. gentleman has before him. In the extract which the hon. gentleman read from Mr. Buchanan's report, it was stated that there was a question of principle, and the recommendation of the report is based upon the settlement by the Government of that question of principle. The Government did not refer this question of principle to the full Board, but they referred the report which was dealing with an amount which should be paid to Captain Dick assuming the principle to be decided in his favor. Now, there should not have been much difficulty a long time ago in deciding this question of principle. Whether or not Captain Dick, under the peculiar circumstances of this contract, is entitled to be supplied with military or civil protection we cannot now discuss, because we have no information about it. Is this matter connected with some actual building of steamboats?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was an attempt to build them.

Mr. BLAKE. There were some boats built there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Captain Dick's attempt failed.

Mr. BLAKE. There were some boats built there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Later on—yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That must have been in 1868, or thereabouts, because there is a large expenditure on boats up in that region which hon. gentlemen have, since that time, made famous.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the date of the contract and other particulars on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. We understand from recent experience what that means. I find, from the Public Accounts, that in the years 1869-70, 1870-71 and 1871-72 there was an aggregate sum of \$286,000 expended for boats for mail service, and I believe they were constructed principally upon the waters which pertain to and are closely allied to the famous locks which hon. gentlemen have at a later day been impugning as works which should not have been attempted. I do not know where the hulls of these boats are, but I presume it is in connection with, or as the hon. gentleman now says even prior to these years which resulted in the spending of \$286,000 for steamboats in these waters that Captain Dick's contract took place. If so, I say that a claim of that kind demands from the hon. gentleman a most searching enquiry. These stale claims I am afraid of; and if this claim has been before successive Governments for the last fourteen or fifteen years, and they did not find that there was a principle under which they could assent to it, it is extraordinary that at this time of day that principle should be sanctioned and recognized; and I do not think, without further information as to the facts, and as to what occasioned Captain Dick to invoke this principle which for fifteen years has been ignored, that we ought to be called on to pass this item. Although the amount is small we are dealing with a principle, to establish which may lead to very serious consequences. The basis of the item is the recognition of the proposition that in an unsettled and unorganized country in which everybody knew there were no white inhabitants and no police, a contractor who undertakes to perform a work there is entitled to demand that the Government with

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

whom he contracts will place a civil or military force to protect him in the fulfilment of that contract. I am not yet prepared to assent to that principle in ten minutes, which it took the hon. gentleman fifteen years to recognize.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the oldness of the claim is any ground for ignoring it. I would remind the hon. gentleman that there is an older claim than that in connection with the same work—a claim against the old Parliament of Canada, which since Confederation has been pressed upon both Governments, and which both Governments have resisted. I am referring to Mr. Moffat's claim. Although every Government since Confederation has refused to pay him a single dollar, he got leave to bring his case into the Exchequer Court, and that court has given him judgment for a very large amount, notwithstanding the fact that his claim was a great deal larger than this one, and was not supposed to be nearly so strong. I may say that we rejected this claim when it was pressed upon us before; we took very much the same ground that the hon. gentleman and former Governments have taken, but we did not feel warranted in refusing to allow the claimant an opportunity of substantiating his claim, if he could, by testimony under oath; and, under these circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that we are wrong to appoint an official arbitrator with power to take testimony under oath. That arbitrator came to the conclusion that the Government honestly owed Captain Dick this amount of money. Still we refused to pay it, although the report of the arbitrator set forth what I think will be regarded by most members as good reasons why we should pay it. A person contracted with the Government of Canada to do a work which they considered to be very important, however mistaken they may have been, in the interest of Canada; the contractor entered upon his work in good faith, and spent his money in purchasing supplies and employing a force of men, and in taking them into a wild, inhospitable wilderness; and he found that the place where he was to build a vessel, under contract with the Government of Canada, was in the possession of Indians, and he was driven out of the country, and his stores taken from him. Suppose he had no legal claim; suppose you take the ground that he had entered into a contract to do a certain work, and did not do it; after this matter has been enquired into under oath, the Government taking care to have engineers and counsel to carefully scan everything; after it has been substantiated under oath that this loss was really incurred in an effort to carry out a contract with the Government, and only failed because the Government had not provided due protection to life and property; after the whole question has been submitted, not to an arbitration in which Captain Dick was represented, but to an arbitration appointed wholly by the Government—I do not think the hon. gentleman himself, if a member of the Government to-day, would refuse to pay, or submit to the Parliament for payment, such a claim. I do not think we had any other course, as honest men, desirous of doing justice between man and man, between the weak and the strong, than to come down to Parliament and ask them to pay this claim as one which we have satisfied ourselves is an equitable one.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman having made a great deal about having submitted this matter to the Board, I would just say that Mr. Buchanan is a very respectable old gentleman; but I do not think a person at his time of life is likely to be very highly qualified to decide a matter of this kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We did not pay it on his report, but on the report of the full Board.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Buchanan first decided in favor of the claim, and then the Government referred it to the Board. Of the three before whom it came, Mr. Simard

took one side and Mr. Cowan the other, and it was left to Mr. Buchanan still to decide it. So the full Board part of the case does not add very much to its strength.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We did not refer it to the three, but to the full Board. As the hon. gentleman knows it constantly happens that one man may not be available; he may be a thousand miles away; and then we have to send the claim to the majority.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting, but when the hon. gentleman places great stress upon the circumstance that it is the decision of a full Board, I state, as a matter of fact, it was a decision of the majority of the three members of the Board present, and not of the full Board, as one member was absent. Out of these three, of which Mr. Buchanan was one, one dissented, so that really the decision was simply Mr. Buchanan's own judgment. I do not know whether the dissenting member gave his reasons or not; but I say the circumstance, as stated by the hon. gentleman, throws doubt upon, instead of adding strength to, his views. The hon. gentleman says that because it is an old claim is no reason for rejecting it. I never said it was, but that it should be carefully scrutinized.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You would not ask us to look back longer than fifteen years.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but I would ask the hon. gentleman to look at it fifteen years ago, when it arose, and decide the question of principle which these judicial investigators did not decide, which they expressly say they remitted to the Government to decide. Supposing that relief should be given, the hon. gentleman's duty was to have come to that conclusion long ago, and having come to that conclusion to have remitted the question of fact to those competent to investigate the facts. The difficulty of investigating matters of this kind becomes very much greater as years roll on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That would go against Captain Dick.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so—not before an arbitration, according to my slight experience of these things. The difficulty of sifting facts and of getting at the bottom of the stories told by witnesses, the color that may be placed upon matters by those who come forward to aver that there was such a loss and who are generally friendly to the claimant, grows greater and greater by the lapse of years. The hon. gentleman makes rather a virtue than otherwise, of having listened so late to this call for justice. However, the hon. gentleman said that he would bring down all information before Concurrence. We should see the claim that Captain Dick made, the dates of the transaction, the evidence of the contractor, Mr. Buchanan's report and the evidence on it, that was referred to the Board of Arbitration and their report, so that we may have some opportunity of dealing with this matter with more knowledge than we now possess.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. Minister to say that the principle of the case is that the Government was liable to damage to the contractor for damage caused him through the lack of protection on the part of the Government. That was decided by the Government itself, and not by the Dominion Arbitrators.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that. I do not want to say that; I do not want to go any further than is absolutely necessary. I have stated the facts as they existed—the report of Mr. Buchanan and that of the Board of Arbitrators—that the contractor failed in carrying out his contract through the lack of that protection. But I do not think it is at all desirable to pronounce what may not be at all necessary, in order to deal with this case and establish a principle which, it appears to me, is not absolutely necessary in the case.

Mr. CASEY. Then it appears that the arbitrators decided that the contractor had lost a certain amount of money in trying to carry out his contract on account of the Government not protecting him. The question whether he should be paid was referred to the Government, and the arbitrators reported it was only on the ground the Government was responsible for such lack of protection that the amount should be paid. Subsequently the Government decided to pay the money, but the hon. gentleman says he does not want to commit himself to the principle. At all events, the Government have agreed to pay an amount which the arbitrators held could not be paid on any other facts than the basis of that principle. Whatever reservation, mental or otherwise, the hon. gentleman may make, this action of the Government will be taken as establishing that principle. The hon. gentleman asked the House whether they would insist on sticking to the legal technicalities of the case, and deprive this poor man of the money he had lost in attempting to carry out his contract. I do not know that this House is disposed to insist on that. I do not know but what the hon. Minister has made a very strong case in this respect, but I do not see that he is very consistent in putting such a case to the House. I do not think it is at all consistent with his treatment of other cases in which damages have been suffered owing to lack of protection by the Government. He says it is the duty of the Government to protect the life and property of all its subjects, especially of contractors in the wilderness as in this case; but it was only the other day, in the Supreme Court here, that the Government—I presume by the advice of the hon. gentleman—took advantage of the legal technicality, in which the court sustained them, that the Government was not responsible for damage inflicted upon the life and property of persons whose money they had taken for carriage on a public railroad belonging to the Government—that the Government were not responsible as common carriers. The hon. gentleman who is almost pathetic now in urging the claim of this contractor, because the Government did not keep the Indians away from the place where he was conducting operations was then in a different mood, and resisted the appeal of this man who was maimed for life, rendered useless for life through the carelessness of Government officials conducting the Government railway, on the ground that the Government were not liable for damages as common carriers. Was the hon. gentleman pathetic then? Did he say this was a case between the strong and the weak, between the Government and an individual, and that he should not stick too strictly to the law? No, Sir; but he said: "I will insist to the last on the legal technicality. We will not give this man any damages for the hopeless injury that has been inflicted upon him through our carelessness; we will insist on the technicality, and vote this man nothing." Is it only in the case of contractors that the Government is to be merciful? Is it only in the case of political friends, such as Captain Dick, that they are to be considerate and look at the case as between the strong and the weak, between the Government and an individual? On what other ground does the hon. Minister draw a distinction between these two cases? Here he has set up a purely technical ground for reimbursing a contractor who suffered loss in carrying out a contract with the Government; in the other case he set up a purely technical ground for refusing to pay damages to a man who was admittedly and seriously injured through the inefficiency of the Government road.

247. Canadian Pacific Railway—To pay Joseph Whitehead, contract No. 15, the difference between cost of work and contract prices. ....\$86,200.00

Mr. CHARLTON. Can the hon. Minister give us some information in regard to this case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may state, in reference to this matter, that it is a somewhat unusual case, I think, to

come before Parliament. Mr. Whitehead was a contractor on the Canadian Pacific Railway. He made a contract to perform certain work for a certain sum of money, and in the progress of that work he became incapable of carrying it on vigorously; he incurred heavy liabilities and became financially embarrassed, and ultimately it was found that serious loss to the country was going to take place and a great obstruction to other contracts, as well as the completion of the work on which he was engaged, from his inability to carry on this work. Under these circumstances, Government interposed and took the contract out of Mr. Whitehead's hands, and completed the work directly by the officers of the Government as the law provides. The result was that the work was vigorously prosecuted, the Government having the means for doing so, and the work was not only completed, but it was found that, contrary to most cases of this kind, it was completed largely within the amount of the contract price for the work. Then the question arose as to what course should be taken as to the contractor. It was not simply a question of furnishing the contractor with the amount he would have been entitled to if he had been able to carry his work vigorously to completion, but it was a question whether the parties from whom he had obtained the money, and whose money had gone into the work, and by whose means the work had been carried on and placed in a position that enabled it to be completed at a profit, should be allowed to remain unremunerated. The Government came to the conclusion that it would not be right, as the country had got the advantage of the money that had been expended at the sacrifice of the creditors of Mr. Whitehead, and, under these circumstances, they determined to ask Parliament to pay the amount of money that Mr. Whitehead would have been entitled to at his contract prices if he had been able to complete the work. The cost to the country is no greater than it would have been had Mr. Whitehead been able to carry out his contract to completion. I am afraid his liabilities exceed the amount that will be provided for by this vote; but the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway having reported that the work, if completed at contract prices, would have cost the country this \$86,200 more than it has cost, we have decided to ask Parliament to vote that money in order that the creditors of Mr. Whitehead may be, at all events to that extent, repaid the advances which they had made to him, and the money which they had really contributed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Was any intimation made, when the contract was taken off Mr. Whitehead's hands, by which, if it cost more than contract price, the Government would be reimbursed the excess?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. There was this: That if it cost more we had the security taken by the late Government—by whom the contract was made—of, I think, over \$100,000, all of which would have been liable, as my hon. friend knows, for the amount that it would cost the country in excess; and that security, of course, has been released. But it would have been held, and the Government would have been entitled to use that if the work had cost more than the contract price.

Mr. BLAKE. When was the application made on behalf of Mr. Whitehead for payment of this sum of money—for which he has no claim, that I can see at all, either legally or equitably—and when was the decision arrived at by the Chief Engineer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Whitehead made the claim at the time the work was taken out of his hands. Mr. Whitehead was constantly claiming that we should give him the benefit of the contract which he surrendered, to a certain extent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. BLAKE. What answer was made to him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was informed that under the contract he would not be entitled to it, but that it would be a subject for future consideration by the Government and by Parliament, as we have no power.

Mr. BLAKE. When was it considered?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This matter was reported upon by the Chief Engineer on the 13th March, 1882, after the completion of the contract—because, of course, until that we were unable to say what position the work would stand in.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the 11th of May, 1883, the paper on the Table says.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am giving the hon. gentleman the facts as they are stated. The report of the Chief Engineer gave the facts, showing how much remained to the credit of the work at contract prices, and this report of the Chief Engineer I have in my hands.

Mr. BLAKE. When was the Order in Council made, or the decision arrived at?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Order in Council was passed on the 24th July, 1882, and a report to Council on this case was made by me on the 22nd of March, 1882, and the Order in Council was passed on my report.

Mr. BLAKE. Why was this not brought down in the Supplementary Estimates last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because a decision was not arrived at. My report was made to Council, but a report of a Minister often remains a long time in abeyance before the Council take it up and deal with it, and that is especially the case during a Session of Parliament where there is so much pressing business to be attended to. I have given the hon. gentleman the dates just as they occurred.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a sort of suspicion which may be a very unjust and unworthy one, that there were more people than Mr. Mack—I apologize and retract—than Mr. Whitehead interested in this matter. I ask whether this was the contract about which a great deal of evidence was taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission; whether this is the contract which was the subject of transactions between the Department and the contractor, and between the contractor and those who had been going surety for him and assisting him, and intervening with the Department; and whether this is the matter in respect to which divers notes were given by Mr. Whitehead for large sums of money? Is this the same contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the same contract; and I can only say that the hon. gentleman has the sworn testimony in relation to this matter, taken after the most exhaustive examination in every shape and form, under his hands. He has the report of the parties who made the investigation; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am quite prepared, if he wishes to throw out any insinuations, to meet him, and, with the sworn testimony obtained after the closest investigation into every matter relating to the contract, to discuss the matter here or elsewhere.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not throw out any insinuations against the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not against myself; but the hon. gentleman, by implication, by the very way in which he asked the question, showed he intended to convey an impression that the Government were influenced by the connection of certain parties with Mr. Whitehead.

Mr. BLAKE. In what?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In connection with this matter—in bringing down this vote,

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is chargeable with that. I thought the hon. gentleman believed I had insinuated that there were some improper dealings between Mr. Whitehead and the Department. Such was not the fact. I said nothing to indicate that such was in my mind. But that there was impropriety on the part of others appears by the testimony, speaking from a memory of it, which is not so fresh as it would have been if I had known this item was coming up, and would be vindicated, and that it would be said that it was for Mr. Whitehead's creditors the money was being voted. I must say that, according to my recollection, there was a very considerable amount of impropriety, a suspicious mass of dealings with respect to certain persons who were intervening between Mr. Whitehead and the Department, and there is a good deal of not very edifying reading in the evidence upon that phase of the transaction; and if the proposal of the Administration is based upon the view that the country ought to very favorably consider some of the claims which have been mentioned in the course of that evidence, it is in order that Mr. Whitehead may be able to recoup demands which have been obtained against him in the course of these transactions, I think we will be very much indisposed to vote the money, much less disposed than we otherwise would be. It is impossible at a moment's notice to engage in these enquiries without having referred to the two volumes of evidence and ascertained what parties engaged in this particular transaction; but this once again shows the impropriety of bringing down a vote for a very large sum of money, not \$4,000 or \$5,000, but \$86,000 in this instance, to be voted at this stage of the Session. And upon this scanty explanation, I would ask if any request has been made on the part of any of Mr. Whitehead's creditors; if so, what creditors; if any arrangement has been made as to the disposition of the money; if the money is to go unreservedly into Mr. Whitehead's hands; has the order in Council been made available; are we going to pay Mr. Whitehead or his creditors; and if so, what creditors?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every possible care the Government can take that any money coming through the hands of the Government should go to the creditors of Mr. Whitehead, whose money had been put actually into the construction of the work, has been taken. When we took the contract out of Mr. Whitehead's hands, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Government took all the plant, and they disposed of a very large quantity of it as it was disengaged and could be disposed of, and I made a report to Council recommending that the then deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Lash, should be the party to designate how the money should be expended, and into whose pockets it should go. Not a single dollar of money which came into the hands of the Government in connection with the sale of a very large amount of plant—and which, under the contract, Mr. Whitehead was to have the benefit of—was disbursed by myself or the Department. I looked upon it as important, under the circumstances, to have the matter thoroughly guarded, so that the parties whose capital and credit had been used to furnish the plant necessary for the construction of the work, should be reimbursed, and no possible grounds for supposing at any future time that there had been the slightest misappropriation; and I asked the Government to pass an Order in Council directing Mr. Lash to designate who the parties were who should receive anything. The whole papers and claims were placed in his hands, and down to the period that gentleman left the service of the Department, he alone was the party who gave the instructions under which the Department of Railways and Canals has acted and through whom alone a single dollar was given. I am not aware of any money having been expended. Mr. Whitehead has made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and everything the Government can do will be done, in the event of this vote

passing the House, to see that the money goes, not to Mr. Whitehead to be squandered by him, but to those whose money was placed in the work, and the benefit of whose money has been received by the public, shall receive the payment so far as the vote will go. I am a little surprised at the ground which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has taken in connection with this vote. When was there a case where stronger ground could be shown for the appropriation of public money? A contract was let, and the country was bound under it to pay a certain amount of money for the construction of this public work. That work, which was one of very great magnitude, has been completed, and the country has not been called on to pay, as is the case in ninety-nine cases out of 100, a large sum over and above the contract price. Mr. Whitehead became hampered with liabilities, and incurred hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of debt, and yet was unable, with all the Government aid—and I do not hesitate to say that the Government went as far as a Government was justified in going in strengthening Mr. Whitehead's hands—to complete the contract. I found when I came into the position I now occupy, that my predecessor had again and again advanced large sums of money to Mr. Whitehead for the purpose of enabling him vigorously to carry on this important work. I adopted the same principle, and while I had reason and hope to believe, that by being sustained and supported in the strongest way in which we could sustain and support him, he would be enabled to carry on the work to completion, it remained on his hands. It was only when the time came that he was so hampered by his creditors and obstructed in the prosecution of the work, that it was likely, not only that the contract would break down, but that unless it was taken hold of at that particular time, a year would be lost and we would have been a year later in opening up the road from Thunder Bay to Red River instead of having it opened now for traffic, as it is to-day—that this would have been the position, and that not only would we have been obstructed there, but we would have very large contracts beyond him obstructed and embarrassed, and that it would be utterly impossible to complete their work, that we took the work off his hands. In fact a claim has been made as it is—I do not say that it is well founded, but the hon. gentleman knows how these claims are made. Contractors assume the contracts made by the Government will be carried out, and that they will have access, which the completion of a previous contract will give them, to get to their own work; and every person knows that the success or failure of a contractor often depends upon the facilities which he may have to reach a work of that character and difficulty—an important work in a remote section of the interior of the country, and in an inaccessible section—until this work is finished. Under these circumstances, I think my hon. friend will see that the Government exercised a wise discretion when they found that this contract would inevitably break down, and that unless they took hold of it at once, a year would be lost. In taking hold of it and securing its prompt execution, and it is a very rare thing—in my experience as a public man, I hardly know of an instance—in which the Government have, under these circumstances, taken the work out of the hands of a contractor who has broken down, and been enabled not only to complete it within the amount which the Government were bound to pay and had agreed to pay, but as in this case to come out with \$86,000 on the right side. I have no hesitation in saying that had it not been for the vigor and energy thrown into the work by the Chief Engineer, who made it specially his business to vigorously prosecute this work, and for the able assistance which he had the good fortune to obtain for its immediate supervision, I do not believe that any such result could have been obtained. This work was promptly and rapidly pushed to completion, with the advantage, as I say, of finding that

instead of being out of pocket, as is usually the case under such circumstances, and being called upon to pay a large sum of money in addition to the contract price, we had the good fortune of finding that the account footed up \$86,200 on the right side to the country, which we had saved by taking the work out of the hands of the contractors. Now, I say I do not know what the hon. gentleman's sentiments are. He says that this money ought not to be asked for, and ought not to be voted; but I ask the hon. gentleman whether he thinks that the Government of Canada would be entitled—knowing as they do that these \$86,200 have been contributed by men who in good faith took money out of their pockets to furnish the contractor, Whitehead, with it to carry on this work, and having saved this amount under the contract price—to withhold that sum? and if he thinks it would be equitable and fair, and just for them to keep this money in their pockets and out of the hands of the men whose money enabled the work to be completed under the circumstances in which it has been finished? I do not think so; and if those are the hon. gentleman's ideas of what is just, and honorable, and fair on the part of the Government, I can only say I differ from them. I believe there was no stronger claim placed before this or any other Parliament in the world, than this, when we come here and ask that this money, which has been saved to the country by the Government, in taking hold of the work and finishing it themselves, should be appropriated so far as this profit goes, not to enrich the Government of Canada, but to repay the men who honestly and in good faith lent their resources and money to this contractor for the purpose of enabling him to carry this work to completion.

Mr. CASEY. There is no doubt that the hon. Minister is correct in one point. It was no doubt good policy, or it appears so at least on the face of things, for the Government, when they found this contractor unable to finish this contract, to take it off his hands and finish it in a shorter time, and cheaper than would otherwise have been the case. There is no dispute, as far as I can see; but when this is done and we save \$86,000 made, as the hon. Minister correctly states, by the efficient care and attention of the engineers in charge of the road, perhaps through a little saving here and there, &c., the hon. gentleman stands and contemplates something unheard of, unexpected and unendurable. He says: here is a saving; we have actually got the road done for less than the contract price, something which never occurred before and something we never expect to occur again, and which should not occur; and we will take these \$86,000 saved to the Government by the care of the Government's own officers, and hand it over to the creditors of the man who was unable to carry out the contract. I do not know that this is very good reasoning, but it seems, perhaps, the readiest way to dispose of something which unexpectedly came into the Government's hands. The idea of a surplus arising in the conduct of a Government work, and of having something unexpected in their hands, is a matter with which no tradition deals. The Department of Railways has no tradition whatever bearing on the case of a surplus remaining on hand after the construction of a work. They do not know what to do with it. It would occur, perhaps, to some people to put it into the Treasury and to save it, as the saving was due to the efficiency of the officers of the Department; but no. The first thing that occurs to the hon. Minister of Railways is to give it away to somebody, and he gives it to the creditors of the contractor. Well, he says, it seems the most natural thing to pay it to those who were honestly out of money by this contractor. Why, since when did the Government of this country constitute itself an assurance company for the creditors of contractors? Since when has the principle been established, that anybody lending money to a contractor—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman case after case—in which my hon. predecessor took the public money and paid it—where there was nothing saved, to pay the honest and just claims of men who had put their labor and money into public works.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the hon. gentleman's predecessor had to pay money which was payable to contractors, if it was not paid to their creditors; but he never took money in this manner to pay it to the creditors of contractors. The hon. gentleman cannot show such an instance at all; and he knows very well that he has introduced a totally new principle: that when the Government takes a contract off the hands of a man who admittedly could not carry out his contract—with assistance advanced from the Department—and it is shown that the contractor was wholly useless and inefficient and not up to his business, then in that case having taken the contract off his hands and by the efficiency and care of trained servants of the Government made a saving, the Government shall take the money which has not been earned at all, and for which no work was done on the road, and hand it over to the people who made the mistake.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The work was done.

Mr. CASEY. Not the work for these \$86,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; for the \$86,000, and it was done by the money of private individuals, who had given Mr. Whitehead their money to put into the work;—and it was there.

Mr. CASEY. No. The work was done on the hon. Minister's own statement, without using these \$86,000; and this is just the point—without spending these \$86,000 at all. So the work was not done for the \$36,000. The creditors in question merely advanced money to Mr. Whitehead on the faith of his business reputation and ability as a contractor to make money out of a job and pay it back. They took, then, risks of his being able to pay, and it turned out that he was unable to pay—at least it is assumed that he was unable to pay them, and so the country is asked to pay them. I say again since when did the Government make itself an insurance company for the creditors of contractors. This new precedent; this unheard of precedent, will make it extremely easy for Government contractors to borrow money. They will be able to say to those from whom they borrow, you will never lose anything by lending to us, because no matter whether we are good business men or bad, no matter whether we complete the contract or not, no matter whether it is taken off our hands or not, we will get the money from the Government. This precedent the hon. gentleman asks us to adopt, on the ground of simple justice. Well, Sir, it may be justice, but it is not simple justice; it is the most complicated justice I have ever heard of. He says there was a security for \$100,000 taken for the completion of the contract, and this security was released. Why was this security released? What was the security taken for unless to indemnify the Government? Why did they not keep the security in existence?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They did.

Mr. CASEY. I do not understand that the Government kept the security alive until the contract was finished. They found that it was not necessary to collect the money from these sureties, or to confiscate the security if it was not of a personal nature, but \$86,000 they have saved to pay the creditors of the contractors. Now, if they had to pay the creditors at all would it not have been more reasonable and more rational to recoup them out of the security than out of the money which the Government had saved?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The security did not belong to us—it was not ours. The only ground upon which the Government could have a dollar of the security was provided

the work cost more than the contract price. The moment the work was done within the contract price the Government had no claim to a dollar of it.

Mr. CASEY. That is true, provided the work was done under the contract price by Whitehead; but if he turned out to be unable to complete the work, as was the case, if that security was given on the terms on which security is ordinarily given, the Government were entitled to claim it the moment they took the work off his hands. Whitehead turned out to be unable to complete the work at any price, and that is the ground upon which they took it off his hands. This security was a security that he would be able to perform the contract within a limited time, and at the stipulated prices; but he did not perform it at all, therefore the security was forfeited to the Government, but the Government threw it away as they threw away the saving they afterwards made in the work. The hon. Minister said the Government would take such pains as lay in their power to see that this money would be paid only to such creditors as advanced money to go into the actual construction of this work; but I do not know how they are going to distinguish these creditors. How are they going to tell what Whitehead did with Jones' money, or Robertson's money, or anybody else's money—how are they to tell which money went into Whitehead's pocket, which went into other speculations, or how much he may have had on hand? The creditors could not tell anything about it, and I know of no one else who could, except Mr. Whitehead himself. The fact that the hon. gentleman says that the money shall be repaid only to those whose money went into the work would seem to leave it open to the supposition that there are other claimants, and we do not know whether this amount would satisfy all the claims of those whose money went into the work or not, or whether there will be a balance to go to Mr. Whitehead after these amounts are settled. I think we should know the names of these creditors, when the debts were incurred, and whether there was any guarantee given by the Government to them that they would be recouped. We want to know when the money was advanced, and whether this amount will satisfy them or not. If the item passes in its present shape I do not see how they can take any pains of that kind. The item is to pay Joseph Whitehead and not these creditors, and I do not see how the Auditor-General can, under this vote, pass a cheque to pay any of the creditors of Joseph Whitehead, and you will simply have to trust Whitehead to pay that money himself. If it is to pay the creditors it should be so expressed in the vote. In short, it seems to me as if either this money will go to Whitehead, or else there is an arrangement between him and those who have worked up influence on his behalf with the Government to get the money to pay them and pay the other creditors. It would seem that there was a little angel perched aloft, and perhaps two or three of them to look after poor Jack—to look after his interests and bring them before the great potentate who rules the Railway Department. And perhaps these little angels may have some interest in the disposal of these funds. If the hon. Minister will tell us who are the creditors we will be able to see whether this is so or not. It may seem a little uncharitable to assume that there was any such influence used with the Government; but when so extraordinary a proposition is made, when so new a precedent as this is laid down, it is certainly open to people who are not particularly uncharitable to suppose that there must have been some strong pressure on the subject before the hon. Minister of Railways could have been induced to take such an unusual step.

Mr. BURNS. It is quite apparent that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows very little of the subject under discussion, and that in order to cover up his lack of

knowledge on the subject he has found it necessary to indulge in all sorts of suppositions. To my mind the matter is very clear. In reply to the hon. gentleman's statement as to the vote being to pay Mr. Whitehead instead of the creditors, it is sufficient to say that if the Government could or should avail themselves of the security in the event of the non-fulfilment of the contract they are quite justified, by the same rule, in handing over to Mr. Whitehead any amount which they could save in the execution of the contract. It was not at all necessary to hand it to Mr. Whitehead directly, because by means of an assignment they would be made just as much entitled to the money as he would be. The hon. gentleman wants to know when the Government of the country became underwriters or insurance agents against losses made by persons making advances to contractors. I beg to remind the House that under the late Administration when certain sections of the Intercolonial were taken out of the hands of the contractors the Government of the day paid the liabilities which had been incurred in connection with those sections. The Government of that day paid the liabilities on that section when it was handed over to them, and it cost them a large amount of money to complete it, over and above the contract.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not at all approve of the principle upon which this payment is to be made to this contractor. The amount is the full amount of the contract, which represents the profit that would have accrued to the contractor if he had done the work himself. This is preposterous, because the Government are substituted for the contractor and are doing the work in his place, and, therefore, if he is to get anything, he should not get the total amount of the contract. There might be a certain sum allowed to him, but the value of the work done by the Government, as representing the earnings of the contractor if he had done it himself, should be deducted.

Mr. McCALLUM. There has been a good deal said about this vote, but it appears plain enough to me. The hon. Minister of Railways says that Mr. Whitehead would have been liable in case he could not have finished the work at contract prices, and if his securities should suffer all the losses he ought to have all the benefits. If the Government took the contract off Mr. Whitehead's hands they did so at their own risk; if they thought he could not complete the work in time they were perfectly right to take it out of his hands; but if he had done the work he would have been entitled to receive this amount. The Government could pay the money on Mr. Whitehead's order, and I do not see why there should be any discussion on the question. The country has received value, and we would not have paid any more if Mr. Whitehead had completed the work.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister did not state what the stipulated time for completing this contract was, and the time when it was actually completed, and who the contractors are who are making claims for losses by reason of delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The contractors who are making a claim for losses on account of delay are the contractors on section B. The grounds they urge are the impossibility of reaching their work, and the cost at which they were obliged to carry their supplies in consequence of this contract not being earlier completed. Of course we do not recognize any such claim, for the simple reason that we had not undertaken that the contract would be completed at a particular time; but it was of vital consequence in our judgment, that, in order to enable them to carry their work to completion, the work which provided the access to it should be pushed, and should not be allowed to remain in the position which it was. In order to show the House the ground on which this money was asked, I will just read

a portion of the Order in Council authorizing the placing of this vote on the Estimates. After showing the state of the account, it says :

"That by the fourteenth clause of the contract the Government retained the power of assuming such works. That the contractor is indebted to various parties to a considerable amount of money which has been put into other works to the benefit of the Government. That the Order in Council of the 5th of April, 1880, authorized the immediate assumption of the works comprised in Mr. Whitehead's contract. This course was rendered necessary through the fact that the laborers were on strike for arrears of wages, and that the Government supplies in store were in danger of being seized. That the importance of obtaining the completion of the works on the earliest possible date, and of avoiding their collapse then imminent compelled the Government to take this prompt action without according further delay to the contractor for the adjustment of his affairs. The hon. Minister, under the circumstances, recommends that the powers conferred by the aforesaid clause of the contract be not exercised, but that Mr. Whitehead and his creditors be allowed the benefit of the amount, which in the certificate of the Chief Engineer would have been payable under the contract, had the work been completed by the contractor, measures being, however, taken to secure the payment of the money to the parties who furnished the means of executing the work.

"The hon. Minister further recommends that the security held by the Government for the due performance of this contract be released."

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

### After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Have you the answer to the question I asked before Recess ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not the information, but I think I am quite safe in saying, from memory, the contract was not completed for a very long time after the period provided in the contract. The date at which the works were taken out of Mr. Whitehead's hands was very long after the time provided for the completion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. The impression also is that in arranging for the letting of some of these other works, tenders were submitted, in one or two cases, based upon the proposition that this particular section would be built at a particular time, and that there was difficulty in consequence of its not being certain whether it would be completed in that time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's memory is confounding that contract with the letting of this identical contract. When tenders were asked for this section fifteen, the Whitehead section, tenders were put in by parties who required that the Government should undertake that the preliminary section to that would be completed, as the hon. gentleman says, at a certain time, and my predecessor properly refused to guarantee that the other work would be completed within the time stated in the contract; but I do not think there was any such stipulation in any of the tenders in relation to this work being completed within the time provided.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose a considerable delay ensued in the completion of the other works, in consequence of the delay in this work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The other work would have been completed earlier, certainly, but it is practically completed within the time stated in the contract.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are told by the hon. Minister of Railways that the Government, in this matter, are actuated by a desire to pay certain creditors of Mr. Whitehead. Some of these creditors may possibly be in a position to exercise influence on the Government in securing the payment to Mr. Whitehead of \$86,200, the sum saved by the Government in taking the contract off his hands. This is undoubtedly a most unbusinesslike transaction. If Mr. Whitehead was not able to complete his contract, and the Government took it off his hands, he has no claim on the Government for any sum the Government might have saved in the completion of this work. I find, on referring to the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

evidence taken before the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, some evidence which I think has a bearing on this case, and I will take the liberty of reading some extracts from his reports. This is the testimony given by Mr. Whitehead with reference to certain transactions between himself and a gentleman who had aided him in various ways with the Government in reference to this contract. Mr. Whitehead was asked :

"3673. Have you at any time had any negotiations with the Government, or with any of the Departments of the Government, in which you paid other persons for their influence or assistance?—No; I do not know that I had. I assisted Mackintosh in the paper. He was my security in one instance or two in making tenders, and getting my other tenders along with myself, and I assisted him with his paper or he would have gone down. That is all the influence I paid for in Ottawa, or in the Government, or to anybody else.

"3674. Do you mean that you assisted him with money?—Yes.

"3675. In supporting the newspaper do you mean?—Yes; he was in very difficult circumstances, and he was likely to burst up. He had been very kind to me, and got me assistance once or twice in securities in making up tenders; and I was a stranger there, and did not know any person, and he got them for me, and that is the way I assisted him.

"3676. Was it ever understood between you and him that you were to compensate him for any influence that he had used with any member of the Government?—No; not at all. Whenever I was wanting anything he used to see after it for me in Ottawa.

"3677. Did you ever make any gifts or payments of money to any one connected with the Departments of the Government?—No; not one that I know of in any shape. Mackintosh is the only one that I ever assisted in Ottawa that I know of."

I have then the evidence of Mr. C. Whitehead :

"5004. Did you at any time attend to work for him at other places; at Ottawa, for instance?—I did not do much for him at Ottawa.

"5005. Did you have any transactions for him at any time with Mr. Mackintosh, on his account?—I do not know anything about the Mackintosh affair, only from hearsay. I do not know anything of my own knowledge.

"5006. Did you assist in dealing with Mr. Mackintosh as to the return of any money or paper, or anything of that kind?—Yes; I did not go to Mackintosh myself, but I had my father's attorney go to him.

"5007. Who was that?—Mr. Bain.

"5008. Was Mackintosh here?—No. Mr. Bain was in Ottawa.

"5009. Was that Mr. Bain of the firm of Bain & Blanchard?—Yes.

"5010. Did you know Mackintosh personally, at that time?—Yes, I have seen him. I think I saw him when I was down there, but I never mentioned about the transaction to him.

"5011. Was it done entirely through your attorney and Mackintosh?—Yes; it was done with Mr. Bain.

"5012. What was the result of the transaction?—I think he got back my father's acceptances for about \$11,000.

"5013. Did you see those acceptances?—I think I have, but I would not be certain.

"5014. Where they got back by Mr. Bain at the time that you were there?—Yes; they were got back in December last.

"5015. Had they matured before that, or were they running?—I would not be sure, but I think they were running.

"5016. Did you say you do not know whether you saw them then or at any time since?—I think I have seen them here at Mr. Bain's office, but I would not be sure; I know he got them.

"5017. Who was it retained Mr. Bain at that time?—I think it was a great deal through myself.

"5018. Did you take any part in the instructions to Mr. Bain?—Only in this way: I felt that my father had been— I do not know how to put it exactly. He went and got the acceptances back. I knew that the acceptances had been given in this way: when my father was away some of those acceptances would come up here; some of them I would pay, but others I would allow to go to protest. I wanted to know from my father if Mackintosh had other acceptances, and he said he had, but he did not know how much. Mr. Bain and I had talked the matter over as we would say of my father's business transactions, and Mr. Bain, as well as myself, thought it was only right that we should endeavor to get the acceptance back. I do not know that my father said that we were to get them back. Those were matters I very frequently said nothing to him about until I got them made right.

"5019. Then you did what you thought was in his interest, sometimes without his authority?—Yes, when I felt that he had been swindled. That is the idea.

"5020. Did you say that those acceptances would sometimes come up to be paid by you?—Yes, when my father was away; otherwise I would never know of them at all.

"5021. Can you say what all the acceptances given by him to Mackintosh would amount to, judging from what you have seen?—I would not be quite positive; I should say over \$30,000.

"5022. Have you any means of knowing how much of them has been paid from your knowledge of your father's business?—I could not say how much has been paid, but I think something over \$20,000 in round numbers. I may be mistaken; it may be more, it may be less, but I have that idea from what I have seen.

"5023. Do you know, or have you any reason to believe, that any gift, or promise, or advantage, was promised or made by your father to any



one, on account of this transaction: the contract for section 15?—I do not know of any. Remuneration do you mean?

"5024. It may have been a bonus; I am speaking of gifts as well as remuneration, or any kind of advantage?—I do not know. I cannot say that I do.

"5025 You are aware that he has given something to Sutton & Thompson and something to Charlton?—Yes; from what he tells me.

"5026. And 'his amount to Mackintosh?—Yes; from what he tells me I know that he has given to Mackintosh, and from those acceptances coming forward to him when I was acting for him.

"5027. Did you ever have any conversation at all upon the subject with Mackintosh?—No; I did not wish to have. The only conversation I had about the matter would be with my father, and that was not of a very pleasant character, as I was exasperated at him doing anything so silly.

"5028 Was there anything else about this matter upon which you wished to give evidence?—No; I do not know that there is."

Then upon page 614 we have testimony of Mr. Bain who states that the book-keeper of Mr. Mackintosh had visited Winnipeg for the purpose of collecting certain acceptances, and returned to Ottawa. Mr. Bain afterwards had an interview with Mr. Mackintosh at Ottawa, and the result was that Mr. Mackintosh agreed to return these acceptances if Mr. Whitehead would sign a letter exonerating him from all charges in this matter with reference to improper transactions and improper use of influence. Mr. Bain's testimony was that the letter was sent to Mr. Whitehead and signed by him, and returned, and that then the acceptances were returned by Mr. Mackintosh to Mr. Whitehead. But Mr. Mackintosh, when he is called upon the stand, gives a testimony of quite a different character. He goes on to make a written statement, and in that statement he informs the Commission that he was to have a certain share in the profits of this contract by virtue of his services to Mr. Whitehead; and with reference to the balance of the acceptances, Mr. Mackintosh gives this testimony:

"I returned him \$11,000 undiscounted, and have retired from the bank \$13,000, and paid interest charges and other costs and discounts, closely approximating \$750, leaving a very small remainder as representing the total amount received by me in excess of the sums returned or repaid by lifting the discounted paper; I paid the protested draft—I do not know exactly when it was protested—of \$4,082.

"13041. Is that part of the \$13,000?—Yes, part of the \$13,000. I paid in January last, \$3,950.

"13042. Was that also part of the \$13,000?—Yes, part of the \$13,000. I paid in February, \$2,500.

"13043. Still part of the \$13,000?—Yes, still part of the \$13,000; and on March 16th, \$2,500, making \$13,034, I think.

"13044. Do you hold these notes now against Mr. Whitehead?—Well, I have never given that consideration. I have held the notes. I had to hold the notes. If Mr. Whitehead is not able to settle them in any way, of course I will lose. I had no intention of proceeding against him.

"13045. Do you mention this retiring of paper amounting to \$13,000, to show that it is entirely given up as a claim against Mr. Whitehead, or merely its transfer from the bank to you of the sums mentioned?—Its transfer to me to show I never got the money.

"13046. You still hold the notes?—Yes.

"13047. And you still hold that as his liability?—Yes; it appears so on the face of it, but I told Mr. Bain when he was here I would not press him unless he was able to pay.

"13048. It would not be wise to do so if he could not pay it; but you mean if he could you would collect it?—I did not say I would.

"13049. We only desire to know if the amount still remains a liability?—It is in every respect a liability on his part. I only mention that, of course, because I retain the greatest friendship for Mr. Whitehead, and would assist him if I could.

"13050. But with this friendship you retain his notes?—Yes, I told Mr. Bain to use the notes as he pleased. I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that this agreement with Mr. Whitehead with reference to releasing, given for an agreement entered into with me, has been in my possession ever since that time, and the date there is the date he gave it to me."

And I have here a copy of the letter furnished by Mr. Whitehead to Mr. Mackintosh. Now, Sir, it appears from the evidence that Mr. Mackintosh still holds Mr. Whitehead's acceptances for \$13,000 and interest and protest, amounting now probably to \$14,000. Mr. Mackintosh is in the position of a creditor to Mr. Whitehead, he holds these acceptances and can enforce payment, and I think the circumstances of the case point quite plainly to the supposition, at least, that among the creditors who are to be paid out of this allowance of \$86,000 to Mr. Whitehead for profits

that he never realized in carrying out his contract, is this same Mr. Mackintosh. I think there is something very peculiar about this matter, something very suspicious about it. I do not think it is in the interest of Mr. Whitehead that this allowance is made. We have this suspicious circumstance, that \$14,000 of this money is very likely going to a friend of the Government, and we may fairly infer, if we could lay bare all the transaction, that there are other friends of the Government who are creditors of this same Mr. Whitehead, and, I think, that the inference the country will draw is that the notice of the Government in introducing this vote is to reimburse those friends of theirs who are creditors of Mr. Whitehead in this matter. I think we must condemn this transaction as a very peculiar one, a very unjustifiable one. As my hon. friend from West Durham pointed out, if the Government, in taking this contract from Mr. Whitehead and completing this work, had been unable to complete it within the limits of the contract price, they would have been the losers. In taking this work off Mr. Whitehead's hands the Government assumed all the responsibility of doing the work and relieved Mr. Whitehead from all responsibility, and Mr. Whitehead certainly had no claims upon the Government. And now a vote of this large sum is something that I think this House should not agree to, and if it does I believe the tax-payers of this country will condemn the action, and justly condemn it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is laboring under a very mistaken view on several important points. He says that the Government assumed all the responsibility of finishing this work, and that if it had been finished at a loss the country would have had to bear it. The hon. gentleman knows that that is in direct contradiction to the statement I made. The hon. gentleman knows that my predecessor took security to the extent of what he supposed to be \$100,000 from Mr. Whitehead, and that we held that security down to the time of the completion of the contract; therefore, if there had been any loss we had that security, and we were bound to make the country good out of it. In the face of that statement, the accuracy of which the hon. gentleman does not venture to question, he declares to this House that we assumed all the responsibility, and that if there had been any loss Mr. Whitehead would have been entirely exempt. Now, I give that to the Committee as a specimen of the candor of the hon. gentleman, and as an evidence of the position in which the hon. gentleman finds himself; that in order to make a case at all he is obliged to assume that to be true which he knows to be untrue, and to base his argument entirely upon a statement of that kind. I do not think I need to say more upon that point; but there is another very important point in relation to this. How were we enabled to save the money to close this contract? Has the hon. gentleman given that a thought? Does he know anything about the letting of contracts, and as to the condition of section 15 in 1877, when he (Whitehead) took that contract? If he does he will know that Mr. Whitehead was obliged to expend tens of thousands before he got an estimate for \$5; he had to expend his own or other people's money, and it appeared that he had not his own money to spend, in order to obtain plant. He expended an enormous sum of money in constructing roads in the wilderness, as he was called on to pay \$100 to carry a ton of material a few miles, and he had to encounter difficulties which hon. gentlemen, who know nothing of such work, would be appalled at the mention of. The result was that considerable expenditure had been made by him with other people's money in order to be able to get an estimate. The result was that when the work passed into the hands of the Government every yard of the work carried out was covered by the contract price and the margin of profit there was in it; but that would not have been the case if

there had not been this enormous expenditure of money made in order to obtain an estimate. The hon. gentleman must know that, and, therefore, there was a distinct equitable right that Mr. Whitehead should be recouped \$86,200, which he expended in order to obtain plant for the work, to construct roads and carry in supplies in the face of great difficulty, and get the work into a condition to be proceeded with. Everybody knows that the cost lies in the initial operations. Assuming you have a price that will pay as applying to the whole work, you are only able to obtain an estimate by expending enormous sums at the outlet, in order to prepare for construction. The hon. gentleman must be aware of that, and he must therefore see that, to take advantage of all the preliminary expenditure made, not with Mr. Whitehead's own money but with other people's money, was to place the Government in a position by which they could complete the work at the contract price, but this could not be done if the preliminary expenditure had not been made by Mr. Whitehead with his own and other people's money. It is not possible to present a stronger case in which the parties who had in good faith invested their money in the work. If this vote were to be applied in the way in which the hon. leader of the Opposition has insinuated, for the purpose of repaying parties who had not *bona fide* put their money into the work, then I should say at once the case would stand on a very different footing; but the amount proposed, I am informed, is not sufficient to pay 50 per cent. of the just legitimate claims of parties who advanced money, and without which he would not have been able to have carried on the work at all. So far from there being the slightest ground for imputing any influence on the part of any friend of the Government, the evidence which the hon. gentleman had under his hand shows the very reverse. The hon. gentleman has been running his eye over the evidence. I have not seen it since it was first taken, but if my memory serves me, the hon. gentleman will find that I, under oath, stated to the Commission that the moment I learned Mr. Whitehead was advancing money to parties under the impression that they could aid him with the Government, I told him he was a fool, and that he was throwing away his money; that all he had to do to secure all the favor and support desired from the Government was vigorously to push on the work and carry out the contract, and that every dollar he expended on any person was wasted. There could be no doubt that what his son said was to some extent true, that he acted in a very foolish manner, and he was led to believe that by expending money in certain directions he would advance his interest with the Government. But I went out of my way, as Minister of Railways, the moment I learned from Mr. Whitehead that he was using money that way—the statement was made in the newspapers—to say to him: “you are throwing money away; every dollar you spend under the impression that it will assist you with the Government, is money wasted; you require no such expenditure; all you want is to get sufficient financial backing, either from a bank or some person who is able to assist you, in order to enable you to carry out the contract and relieve you from your embarrassment.” The Government comes before the Committee with an honest desire to recoup the persons who have honestly put their money into the work. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that, had the object of the Department and the Government been to favor our friends and repay them, the first step I took would have been, when I was able to place my hand on Mr. Whitehead's money arising from the sale of plant—always obtaining his consent to the same, but not allowing the money to go into his hands, not to have met the claims of friends—to have recommended to Council that Mr. Lash, the late Deputy Minister of Justice, should be entrusted with the expenditure and payment of every dollar of Mr. Whitehead's money? Why did

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

we adopt that course? Because the principles of law and justice should be brought to bear, and the undoubted and unqualified claims should have the sanction of a man of high station and acknowledged legal attainments. I say that, in the face of facts of this kind, the hon. gentleman is not justified in making the slightest insinuation, which I pronounce as baseless and foundationless as it is possible for any insinuation to be.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask whether the contract was for a lump sum, or by quantity?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By the yard.

Mr. McMULLEN. What percentage of money was kept back for the completion of the contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is usual to keep back 10 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then that was retained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say that. When a contractor makes vigorous efforts to carry out his contract, the Government strengthens his hands as much as possible; and in this case, before the present Government came into power, my predecessor advanced a considerable sum, and, I think, properly so. Advances were made on plant, and everything was done to assist Mr. Whitehead. It was ascertained almost at once that he was obliged to borrow capital, and that his friends were pressing him for money; both the late and the present Government did everything they could to strengthen his hands, so long as there was a hope that he would push the contract through, because it was feared that, what usually occurs when contractors break down, the work could not be completed except at an increased price.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the Government take possession of all the plant?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; everything.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has that been sold?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the proceeds handed over to him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a dollar of the money was handed over to him, but to Mr. Lash, the Deputy Minister of Justice, to be paid out to the people whose money had been borrowed to carry out the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the balance of the percentage handed over?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I am safe in saying that he did not himself receive, directly or indirectly, a single dollar.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it under the supervision of the same engineer who located the work that the work was completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was finished under another engineer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had this engineer overseen the completion of the work, the original survey, and the field notes, &c.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and everything belonging to it.

Mr. CASEY. Then, the supposed saving of \$86,200 is a mere saving on the original estimate of what the work would cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows he is stating the very reverse of what I have stated to the House. It has nothing to do with the estimate. It is the margin between the contract price, at which the work was let, and the cost of it; it is not upon the estimate at all.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has stated exactly what he said; and I am stating exactly what he stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman stated that the contract was let at so much the yard.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did.

Mr. CASEY. It was not a lump sum; therefore, the only way to arrive at the amount is to estimate the number of yards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken again. It is accomplished by measuring the work when it is done, not by estimating the work, but by measuring every yard of it. It is not an estimate, but an actual ascertained fact. The contract contains the price to be paid. There is no reference to an estimate, and when the work is done, we proceed to measure, and the money is paid on the result. This is something which has nothing whatever to do with an estimate, but it has merely to do with the contract price of so much per yard, and the work actually performed.

Mr. CASEY. I understood that some things were to be completed in this section yet. Are not some fillings to be done? Is everything completed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, everything.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister then means to say that no changes have been made in the quantities, in the gradients, or in the alignments. The hon. Minister has stated very correctly that advances had been made to the contractor, out of the drawback and out of other funds. He said that this was done because he understood that the contractor was pushing on the work as energetically as possible, and needed the money at the time. In his evidence he states the same fact, and goes on to state in the next paragraph:

"The money we gave him in his estimates we found he was compelled to use to pay off pressing creditors. We found he was heavily involved in debt, that his creditors were pressing him, and that he was, therefore, unable to apply the money received for the work for the purpose of carrying it on. He came to me for a further advance, and I said: 'No, Mr. Whitehead, we have given you every possible aid and assistance while we found the work was vigorously proceeding, but it is obvious to me that you have a heavier load on your back than you can conveniently carry, and I do not think it safe to go on asking the Government to make further advances under the circumstances. What I think you will be obliged to do will be to either get some bank to come to your support and strengthen your hands financially, or you will be compelled to get some contractor of ability and resources to come in and share your contract with you. It is impossible for the Government to become your banker. You have got a good contract, and I will give you every assistance in my power. It is financial strength which you require. Get a bank to come to your aid and give you the financial strength, without which, in my judgment, it is impossible for you to carry on the work.' Mr. Macdougall came with Mr. Whitehead to see me in relation to the matter—the Hon. William Macdougall. I told him exactly what I had told Mr. Whitehead, that for the purpose of facilitating Mr. Whitehead, to get the assistance of a bank to give him the financial strength he required, I would give him a statement of Mr. Whitehead's position, which I considered a very good one, and one that would warrant a bank in coming to his assistance. Mr. Macdougall subsequently telegraphed to me to say that if I would communicate that the Ontario Bank, with which he was negotiating for Mr. Whitehead, would give him the assistance he required and enable him to go on. I gave him a memorandum showing the amount of the drawback we still held in our hands, showing the amount we had advanced to him which at that time was reduced by his payments (both these advances were reduced to \$45,000) and showing the way the account then stood we had only advanced on his rolling stock and plant \$45,000, all the rest having been repaid, and that there was so much drawback. I don't remember now how much, but it was about \$20,000 of drawback then due him. On the representations I had made, Mr. Macdougall or Mr. Whitehead was able to make an arrangement with the Ontario Bank, which went on for a short time, and then the bank refused to continue to sustain him."

So that it really appeared as if there was then a very shaky condition of things, during which the advances were continued. At that point the advances stopped, or very soon afterwards, when it was found that Whitehead was in a very shaky position; and I find that they came to this con-

clusion: after stating a few sentences above, that Whitehead was heavily involved, that his creditors were pressing him, and that he was using money advanced to pay off pressing creditors and he was still prepared to represent to a bank that his position was a good one;—but all this does not bear on the question of these creditors, and I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would tell us who these creditors are? Does he know? I am not asking for the names, but whether he knows who they are.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know a great many of them; I know that a number of gentlemen have filed in the Department a statement of claims. A large number of people have done so.

Mr. CASEY. Against what might be coming to Mr. Whitehead?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. In that case the Government, of course, would be able to give us a statement of who these claimants are, that the Government knows, that their claims are for money which actually went into the construction of the work. The hon. gentleman bases his whole argument, mind you, on the statement that the money advanced by these gentlemen has gone into the construction of the work. Has he a record of it, or has he asked any proof of this fact from the gentlemen who filed these claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and I have Mr. Whitehead's own statement, confirmatory and explanatory of how the money was obtained and for what purpose.

Mr. CASEY. It rests then really on Mr. Whitehead's statement that the money furnished by these gentlemen was put into the work. Of course, creditors cannot know for what purpose their money was used. They only know they advanced it to Mr. Whitehead, and that he did something with it afterwards. I suppose the Government will be able to give us a statement of what these claims amount to, on Concurrence, and will also inform us as to whether this \$86,000 will cover them or not. It has been stated that Mr. Whitehead may have made an assignment, but I do not see how he can assign money which has not been paid to him, and if he makes it afterwards he could assign money to such creditors as he might choose.

Mr. BLAKE. A statement was made that Mr. Whitehead had made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and I gathered the impression that the money was to be paid to the assignee on trust.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Whitehead deposited with the Department a document to say that he had appointed an assignee to whom, if any money was voted, it might be paid, and applied to the discharge of his debts.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman kindly put us in possession of the papers, across the floor—the Orders in Council, the engineer's report, and the memorandum he has now mentioned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

248. Canadian Pacific Railway—To pay Messrs. Purcell & Co., for Rolling Stock transferred to Government, under the terms of their contract.....\$93,400.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is an amount required to pay Messrs. Purcell & Co., the contractors on section "A," the sum of \$93,337.80, the value of their plant. When the contracts were let for that section, it was provided, as was usual in these contracts, that the plant should be taken over at a valuation at the conclusion of the work. The Government were engaged in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was believed that a large amount of

money would be saved if they provided—seeing that a large sum had to be invested in obtaining plant for the construction of this work—that the rolling stock, at the conclusion of the contract, should be taken over at its value. This has been done in some instances, and this contract contained such a provision. When the contract was completed the locomotives, flat cars, tools, materials, and plant on hand was valued by the Chief Engineer, as provided by the contract, and he selected Mr. Heney, under whose immediate management section 15 had been completed—a very able and intelligent man, who had previously been employed by the Government in the valuation of the plant and property transferred by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and with whose knowledge and integrity we were quite satisfied—to make this valuation, the contractors also agreeing to accept his finding. There were six locomotives, valued at \$42,985; 97 flat cars, \$43,972; tools and materials, \$6,397; or in all, \$93,337.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman mentions tools and materials, whereas the vote speaks of rolling stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The tools and materials are in connection with the rolling stock.

Mr. BLAKE. What is to be done with this valuable property; and when was it taken over?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The engineer's report is dated 13th March, 1883, and the Order in Council ratifying the valuation and giving authority to pay the amount is dated 27th March, 1883. We expect to sell the property to the Canadian Pacific Railway if we obtain what we consider it is worth.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not considered to be embraced in the original agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway as to what they were to hand over?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; that was the rolling stock and everything connected with the Pembina Branch and the line west of the Red River.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any negotiations been opened with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the disposition of this stock?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are now discussing that question.

249. Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at St. John..... \$37,150.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This vote is for the following works:—Over-expenditure on works under execution, \$22,000; grading yard, \$750; lowering the grade, \$1,800; repairing the wall, \$4,000; extension of the flour shed, \$8,600. This vote is taken because the vote of last year has been exceeded.

250. Intercolonial Railway—Halifax Extension.....\$74,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This money is for the following works:—Over-expenditure on works under construction, \$4,500; rebuilding dock-yard wall and gates, which we obtained from the Imperial Government, \$10,000; building boat-landing from the sea, which was also part of our engagement with the Imperial Government, \$2,500; removing a mass of boulders, \$15,000. These are the details of the vote, with the exception of \$40,000, which is to build an arch over the track. The late Government, when carrying the line from Richmond into the present station at Halifax, undertook, in consequence of the line running through a portion of Imperial property, to protect the powder magazine, when required, by building an arch over the track, and this is an estimate—no expenditure has been made yet—of the amount of money that will be required for that service. We are now called upon to carry out that part of the contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

251. Intercolonial Railway—Construction account (old) to pay Intercolonial Commission, staff and other expenses..... \$20,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us some details of this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is, as the hon. gentleman knows, to meet the expense of the Commission which is now sitting upon the Intercolonial Railway claims. I explained to the House last Session, I think, the circumstances under which this Commission was appointed, and this vote is for the payment of the Commissioners, the Secretary, legal expenses, witnesses, and all expenses that are connected with an investigation of that kind, extending over a number of years, and involving a number of very large and important claims.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman give us some idea of how long that Commission has been sitting, and how long it is likely to be engaged?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This estimate is to provide for seven months which have been occupied this year, and we shall ask in the further Supplementary Estimates for an equal sum for the coming year, which I hope will be the outside of what will be required.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the scale of salaries paid to the Commission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$300 a month to each of the three commissioners, Judge Clarke, Mr. Broughton and Colonel Belton; and the Secretary, Mr. Jones, who is a first-class clerk in the Department, receives \$3 a day in addition to his salary.

Mr. BLAKE. This salary of \$300 a month is continuous all the year round; it is, in effect, \$3,600 a year, paid monthly?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Commissioners are supposed to be continuously at work—to be either sitting or engaged in the investigation, wherever they are.

Mr. BLAKE. I have to make an objection, which I conceive to be a very grave objection, to the course which has been pursued with regard to one of the members of both the Pacific Railway Commission and this one. I allude to the plan of taking a Judge from the discharge of his judicial duties, and appointing him to continuous and long-enduring work of this description. I hold that to be objectionable, from two distinct points of view. First of all, I hold it to be an objectionable relation to subsist between the Executive of the country and the judiciary of the country, that there should be a plan by which a sum so very large as this should be placed at the disposal of a Judge by favor of the Executive, who determined whether they shall appoint him or not, and how long his commission shall continue. This Judge, when first appointed, was a Junior Judge, if I remember rightly, at \$2,200 a year. His remuneration as Pacific Railway Commissioner was \$3,600 a year, or half as much again as his judicial salary, for which the public expected his whole time and service. After concluding his duties on the Pacific Railway Commission, and after no long time, he is appointed on the Intercolonial Commission, upon which the hon. Minister says there has been one year's work. For the current year the grant is now being voted, and the hon. gentleman proposes subsequently estimates to be voted for the future year. The hon. gentleman said seven months in the last year and seven months in this, and he pointed out that these were the actual sittings, for the Commissioners were supposed to be continually engaged. Thus you will find the whole term for this year and a smaller vote to be taken for next year, making two years more for the occupation of a Judge. You find a Judge depending for an occupation involving a remuneration much larger than his judicial remuneration, on the will of the Executive. That is

not in accordance with the principles which should regulate the relations of the Executive to the judiciary. If I remember rightly, there is in the Provincial law of the Province of Quebec a statutory determination which prevents the Executive from appointing Judges to any office at the will of the Executive. When we passed our Supreme Court Act, we inserted a clause expressly precluding the Executive from appointing members of the Supreme Court to any other paid employment. If that was thought a proper course to adopt with reference to the highest Judges of the land, of how much more consequence is it that, with reference to members of the Ontario Judiciary, the Government should not place themselves in such relations as that. There is no office in respect to which it is more important to the people of Ontario that the judicial duties should be thoroughly and efficiently discharged, than the duties of a County Court Judge. The counties of Northumberland and Durham comprise a population of between 80,000 and 90,000 souls. It is well known that the late senior Judge of these united counties was a gentleman of very advanced years, who could not take a very active part in the discharge of his duty, and of whom it was thought by many that the time had arrived when he could, in the interests of the public, accept a retiring allowance. At that time the Junior Judge, of whom I have been speaking, and who is a man of considerable capacity and quickness for work, discharged the bulk of these judicial duties, but he was taken off for the Pacific Railway Commission. On the retirement of the Senior Judge the Junior Judge was appointed to his place, and another very estimable gentleman from the town of Port Hope was appointed Junior Judge. A better appointment could not, I think, have been made. But that appointment was proper to be made under the circumstances, or it was not. It was not, if a Junior Judge was not required; it was, if the services of two Judges were required. And if they were, it was not fitting that continually for this long period to which I have referred, the Senior Judge should have been removed from his proper sphere of operations. I have received statements from persons in Cobourg complaining of this matter, and have no doubt that some sort of arrangement will have to be made; but it is utterly impossible that the county seat can be without a resident County Judge for so long a time, without great inconvenience being caused to the community. It is an evil example, an unfortunate relation between the Executive and the judiciary, and is productive of public loss and inconvenience. I deem it my duty to protest against it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps this is not the most proper period to bring up this question. As far as the Commission is concerned and the payment, I take the question to be whether the Commission was a well-selected one and did their duty, well worth the money they received. As to the question of the propriety of employing Judges, this is the first time I find this question raised on any constitutional or legal principle in England, Ireland or Scotland.

Mr. BLAKE. On paid Commissions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and I will call the hon. gentleman's recollections to a Commission in which a very high Judge in Ontario—a man in whom I had the greatest confidence—was selected specially as being a Judge to sit on the Post Office Commission, on which he was paid.

Mr. BLAKE. He was a retired Judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, I was very glad to support the appointment of that Judge. I say the same thing has been done in England continually, and I see no objection to it when public interests are to be considered.

In appointing a Commission of this kind, in which evidence was to be taken and weighed, it is necessary we should have a person of judicial standing as a member. Objection might indeed be raised in the case of a member of the Bar, who was in a fair way of promotion as a Judge, and might be influenced by a feeling of that kind; but such an objection cannot be raised if a Judge is employed. It is of the greatest importance in the public interest, as regards the Public Treasury, that all these cases should be sifted, and I do not know what better expedient could be found in this end than to appoint a Judge on the Commission—a man of integrity and legal experience. On the Commission are also two experienced railway men. This body was carefully selected, and I hope they are doing their work well. In England, from a Chancery Judge down to a Judge of the lowest rank, Judges are continually employed on Commissions and some on permanent Commissions. The very important duties of managing the British Museum, calling for continuous life-long watchfulness, are performed to some extent by Judges. You will find in Ireland and in England—on all the great questions connected with the Land Laws and with amelioration of the condition of Ireland—Judges sitting on these Commissions. I grant the hon. gentleman that if there was any proof, any foundation, for the allegation that the judicial business of the counties of Northumberland and Durham were permanently injured by the appointment of Judge Clarke, then there might be something to say about it. But I have not heard any objection, any complaint that has come to the Department of Justice. Judge Clarke, as Senior Judge, can well sit on a Commission, as it is well understood that the Junior Judge does the Division Court work, the smaller business which requires a Judge itinerant in the county. The Senior Judge sits in the chief courts of the county and attends to the work generally. It is true that he lives in Cobourg, and Mr. Benson, the other Judge, lives seven miles off, but a railway runs between the two. There is no difficulty, no delay, no trouble, that I have heard of in consequence of the appointment of Judge Clarke. In the meanwhile I would say that it would be extremely unfortunate if we had not on this Commission, as a protection to the public interest, a gentleman of the judicial ability and discretion which the hon. gentleman admits Judge Clarke possesses.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says this is not the opportune place to discuss this; but I do not know of a more opportune time than when we are called upon to vote a sum for a Commission and the salary of the Commissioner. The hon. gentleman next referred to cases of the appointment of Judges on Commissions. I did not choose to bring in the name of Chief Justice Draper, to whom he has referred, because I did not wish to say anything deprecatory of the appointment. I had not forgotten the precedent, and the hon. gentleman remembers very well that public opinion was divided on the question of this appointment. I suppose the hon. gentleman has not forgotten that the man who was leader of the party in Upper Canada, and who was a life-long and unswerving supporter of the hon. gentleman, felt himself called upon, in his place in Parliament, to denounce that appointment and condemn it. I refer to the late John Hillyard Cameron, who denounced it as a thing improper to take a Judge from the Bench to act on a paid Commission like that. There was a divergence of opinion, irrespective of party lines, and that prominent supporter of the hon. gentleman felt himself constrained, by a sense of duty to the public and of regard for the judicial office, to condemn the precedent which the hon. gentleman set. The other precedent the hon. gentleman alluded to was that of a Judge who was retired at that time and had nothing to do with the administration of justice. Now, the hon. gentleman alludes to English and Irish cases,

But they do not at all apply. These are not paid Commissioners; they are not paid employments. These high functionaries, if they have leisure at their disposal, occasionally surrender a portion of it to the public service in gratuitous trust. We know the trustees of the British Museum comprises one or more of these persons, and we know that occasionally Commissions are issued with reference to improvements in the law and other things upon which we find a Judge or two sitting. But this is quite a different thing. If the hon. gentleman could show that the Lord Chancellor of England, with his salary of eight or ten thousand pounds a year, had been employed on a Commission for three or four years—but I will not take the Lord Chancellor, because he is a political officer, he holds his place as a political tenure, but I will take one of the other Judges who holds office upon tenure of good behavior, a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, or the Queen's Bench, with a salary of from £2,000 to £5,000 a year—if the hon. gentleman could show that for two or three years continuously that Judge had been receiving a salary of several thousand pounds a year in addition to his salary, for serving on a Commission, performing extra judicial functions at the will of the Executive, then he would bring forward a precedent that would apply. But a casual discharge of a gratuitous office, quite capable of being performed consistently with the discharge of the judicial function, and without any emolument, is brought forward as a justification for an appointment which the hon. Minister of Railways has acknowledged exhausts the time of the Judge for the whole year round, for which he is paid at the rate of \$300 per month for the whole year round, while his judicial salary is still going on. There is no analogy, no precedent, no justification. If Judge Clarke can be employed for five months in the year in an investigation like this Commission, and the judicial business of the counties can be effectually discharged, then it is quite clear that those two counties do not want two Judges. If Judge Clarke is able to devote a considerable portion of his time to the discharge of his judicial duties, then it is clear that he ought not to be getting \$300 for every month in the year for other services, while he is paid \$2,600 a year for judicial services which are supposed to take up his whole time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman has rather changed his ground. He commenced with an attack on the impropriety of employing a Judge in the public service at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I said a paid office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman cannot get out of it that way. The hon. gentleman stated that the relations between the Government and a Judge, who attended to such matters, were altogether unconstitutional and inconvenient. He was attacking the independence of a Judge; and when I mentioned that in England, and Ireland, and Scotland, and elsewhere Judges were thus employed, the hon. gentleman says, "but they are not paid."

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, that is what I said before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What difference does that make? The question is, whether a Judge shall be employed or not, whether there is any inconvenience or unconstitutionality in employing him. The public interest should be thought of first; and if it is the opinion of the Government that without constitutional impropriety Judge Clarke could be employed here to guard the Treasury to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and absent himself during the time he was so employed in a very high and important trust, when the work was being done in the county sufficiently well, and without complaint, I think the Government were quite right in employing him. The hon. gentleman says, that the Chancellor of England is a political officer,

Mr. BLAKE.

and therefore, ought not to be counted. Sir Alexander Cockburn was not a political officer, and he settled the Alabama claims.

Mr. BLAKE. Was he paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will venture to say he was paid.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we will see whether he was or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I will venture to say he received his expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and the hon. gentleman will find that these expenses were paid to him, as well as a very substantial addition to the high salary of the Chief Justice of England. The hon. gentleman knows that the infallible Government of Ontario employed Chief Justice Harrison on the Boundary Award. Was that a political question? Why, how the independence of the Bench of Ontario was shaken!—shaken to its very foundation, by employing the Chief Justice in that matter. Was that not a most inconvenient relation between the Government and the Judge? I will venture to state, speaking on the nonce, and without an opportunity of reference, that the Judges in England sit, without any objection, and have to sit, on important Commissions, and that the allowances of so much a day that are made to them, are substantial allowances, so that they can keep up the dignity of their office, and the dignity of the special office as well.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not changed my ground at all on this subject. I stated in the first instance that the objection was to the paid relation at the will of the Government, and I gave statutory instances. I cited the prohibition in the Statute of Quebec against the paid relation; I said the provision in our own Statutes constituting the Supreme Court was against the paid relation. That was the gist of my argument. The hon. gentleman said: "What difference does the question of money make?" It makes all the difference. If a Judge accepts a gratuitous commission and discharges a duty towards the public without reward or hope of reward, he adds to the burdens of his duties without receiving any consideration, except the consolation of having performed a public duty. But if a Judge receives an amount half as large as his judicial salary, he occupies quite a different position. The hon. gentleman says the public interest should be thought of. It is because I believe that the public interest demands that no such relations shall exist between the Executive and the judiciary, that I object to this item as not being in the public interest. Then the hon. gentleman says: "Look at the Government of Ontario, who appointed Chief Justice Harrison to be a Commissioner." Perhaps they did. He says they paid him. Perhaps they did. But it neither makes this transaction right or wrong. It must be remembered that the Ontario Government did not appoint Chief Justice Harrison, they did not fix his salary, they could not remove him, and the Ontario Government had not such relations with the Chief Justice as would bring his case within the application of this principle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us consider the facts. The hon. gentleman tries to get out of the difficulty by saying that Chief Justice Harrison was not appointed by the Ontario Government. True, but when he was appointed, it was during good behavior; he was quite independent of the Local Government or of the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government have no control over the Judges of the Superior Court, or over the County Court Judges; and, therefore, the hon. gentleman's argument has no force or weight. The hon. gentleman said he cannot defend the conduct of the Ontario Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said, whether it was right or wrong, it was a matter of no consequence.

Mr. BLAKE. Exactly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will quote another case with respect to the Ontario Government. It may be said that Chief Justice Harrison, on a great issue like the Boundary question, might be allowed to sit upon a Commission; but there is a County Judge in Ontario, a gentleman of Reform proclivities, and appointed by the Reform Government, who neglects his county to the extent of two, three or four months of the year, to take part in a long and protracted litigation between Mr. John Elliot of Brantford and the Province of Ontario, which is going on now, and has been going on for some years. The hon. gentleman must either condemn the Ontario Government for employing Judge Senkler, or Judge Senkler for accepting employment in connection with the arbitration.

Mr. BLAKE. I know nothing about the case referred to. If the Ontario Government be right or wrong, it has nothing to do with the case under discussion; but it must be remembered that Ontario did not appoint this Judge, cannot remove him, did not fix his salary, and cannot increase it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Ontario Government have given some Judges \$1,000 a year extra. I refer to the Superior Court Judges; and they were alleged by some outsiders, who do not know the independence of the Judges, to be influenced by the fact that the Ontario Government added \$1,000 to the salaries voted to them by the Dominion Government.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite true that in the earlier life of the Ontario Legislature, the Government of Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald introduced a measure of that kind. It is quite true that it was opposed by myself and my friends. It is also true that, in the first instance, it was disallowed by the hon. gentleman, now the First Minister, on the ground that it was beyond the purview of the Local Legislature to take such action, and indeed, the hon. gentleman disallowed the Supply Bill, because it contained this obnoxious clause. But the Judges were granted this additional salary in another form. "A rose by any other name may smell as sweet." Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald carried the Bill through the House, also against my protest and opposition, and the hon. gentleman, now the First Minister, did not oppose the establishment of this improper precedent, so far as to disallow the second Bill; but by that Local Government this Act was committed, which the hon. gentleman now says some people outside have been bold enough to declare to have unduly and improperly influenced the Government.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to refer to the complaints mentioned by the hon. member for West Durham. I wish to say that the residents of the riding which I represent have not made any complaints in my hearing with respect to Judge Clarke, and I believe the hon. gentlemen associated with me in the representation of the other portions of the counties will also testify that no complaints have come to their ears in regard to neglect of duty by that Judge. It is very remarkable that complaints did not come from his own riding to the hon. member for West Durham, but that he only heard them as coming from a riding which he does not represent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told that Judge Senkler is also employed in enquiring into the defalcations of the Treasurer of Molton, for which he receives \$30 per day from the Ontario Government. The hon. gentleman said, with respect to the additional payment made to Judges by the Ontario Government, that the Government of which I was a member disallowed the Bill, and very properly so. I am very glad to have the admission that on some occasions

it was proper to disallow a Bill. In that case, at all events, there was no attack on Provincial rights. The hon. gentleman further mentioned that subsequently a Bill was passed, and that I waived my opposition. He insinuated that it was for the purpose of assisting the Government of the day that the second Bill was disallowed. Such was not the case, because it could not properly have been disallowed. It was admittedly a means by which the Government of Ontario could pay the Judges additional salaries, to appoint them to perform special duties under the Ontario Land Act, which they could not be forced to perform; but the hon. gentleman will see that if we had disallowed the Act we would have acted improperly. If we had done so the hon. gentleman would have declared that we were interfering with the independence of the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I desire to ask the First Minister how long the services of the Commissioners will be required. I think that sometime ago, early in the history of the present Administration, Mr. Shanly was appointed to adjudicate on these claims, and he was enabled, I think, to settle all the claims submitted to him, during his lifetime. Now, we have three Commissioners appointed to do the work which I think Mr. Shanly was engaged upon, and I have very great fear that those Commissioners, receiving the handsome salary of \$300 per month, will prolong this agreeable task beyond reasonable limits. It seems to me as if the present Government were disposed to carry on a large proportion of their Executive functions by Commission. We had the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission employed for nearly two years, at an expense of something like \$35,000, and various items composing the bill indicate that the Commission was used for the purpose, not only of getting evidence, which, I suppose, the Government required, but was made the occasion of contributing to deplete the Exchequer for the benefit of some friends of the Government in more than one instance. I do not think that the present Commission is going to be used for that purpose; but if we are going to have Government by Commission, it is well to know how long this parallel adjunct of the present Administration is going to continue its functions. These men, I am told by the hon. Minister, were appointed seven months ago; and it may last seven or seventeen months, for aught we know. The expense is going on, evidence is taken, witnesses are examined, reports have to be printed, and the expense, which looks so innocent in this item of \$20,000, may be doubled or trebled before the Commission closes its work. I think it is well that the House should give attention to this form of carrying on the Government. Why cannot the Dominion Arbitrators do this work? Perhaps it is beyond their sphere and a weightier responsibility than the Government wish to impose on them. Perhaps they have so many other claims to settle, that they cannot divide their time between those other claims and these; but I must ask the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to this adjunct to his Department; and, no doubt, it will become, not a little modest item of \$20,000, but \$40,000 or \$50,000 before the work is completed. How long will the Commission sit?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am, of course, unable to state how long, but I expect that the \$20,000 which will be asked for in the Supplementary Estimates for the coming year, will entirely cover the expenditure.

Mr. ROSS. We have a little hint in advance from the Minister that this \$20,000 to be voted now, is a first instalment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated so at the outset.

Mr. ROSS. \$20,000 are yet to be voted?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. ROSS. I am not sure that next year's Supplementary Estimates will not contain \$20,000 more.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope not.

Mr. ROSS. And I too. This is not the only Commission. There is the Civil Service Commission besides, and there may be a great many more, before the Government sees fit to vacate those benches and leave them to other occupants, who, perhaps, may manage our affairs without employing so many Commissions. This is a serious matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have resisted so far the pressure of the leader of the Opposition to appoint another Commission.

251. Intercolonial Railway—To refund to Mr. H. G. C. Ketchum, amount of an over charge for the conveyance of rails, &c., in 1866-67-68, over what is now a portion of the Intercolonial Railway..... \$1,637.70

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This claim comes under the category of old claims. Mr. Ketchum was a contractor for the construction of a railway in New Brunswick to the boundary of Nova Scotia, previous to Confederation; but this railway was not completed until after Confederation. The contract that the Government of New Brunswick made, bound them to carry materials for this contract at cost. The railway was owned and operated at that time by the Government of New Brunswick, and at Confederation it came into our hands. The contractor complained that a portion of this contract had not been carried out, and that he had been charged more than cost, entering this claim. It was pressed upon the Government of New Brunswick, who virtually admitted it, but said, that as the receipts of the road had gone into the Dominion Treasury, this charge ought to be paid by us. This claim had been pressed and discussed for some years. I referred all the papers to Mr. Shanly, who found that Mr. Ketchum was entitled, under the contract, to the amount stated, the payment of which he recommended. This report I referred to the Chief Engineer, Mr. Schrieber, the manager of Government Railways, and he confirmed Mr. Shanly's conclusion, considering that this amount ought to be paid, being an over-charge, and consequently it has been placed in the Estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the date of the reports of Messrs. Shanly and Schrieber?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Shanly's report was made on the 5th of May, 1882.

Mr. WELDON. When was the claim made?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has always been made since, and immediately after the work was performed.

Mr. WELDON. I believe that Mr. Ketchum was a sub-contractor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said that Mr. Ketchum was the contractor who constructed the road.

Mr. WELDON. Of course he was a contractor, but he was a sub-contractor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The contract virtually passed into his hands, and the settlement took place between him and the Government of New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON. The Government of New Brunswick had nothing whatever to do with him, in my recollection. Clark, Major & Co. had the contract, and they sub-let it to Mr. Ketchum. Clark, Major & Co. settled with the Government of New Brunswick; and the latter made a claim in this connection on the Dominion Government. I think that, as far as my recollection goes, I never heard of such a claim as this being made on the Government of New Brunswick in any connection; nor did Mr. Ketchum have any connection whatever with the Government of New Brunswick. He was simply a sub-contractor on account of Clark,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Major & Co., who had to pay him, while the New Brunswick Government settled with them. This matter was finally and conclusively settled between Clark, Major & Co. and the Government of New Brunswick.

Mr. BLAKE. It is utterly impossible for the Minister to expect us to pass an item of this kind with this information. Why is this matter brought forward in the Supplementary Estimates without having previously laid all the papers on the Table? Here is a claim, which he says has been made ever since the work was constructed; that is, ever since Confederation, since 1867-68. It has been pressed on the Government for fifteen years, and yet it has never been communicated to Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that. I said it arose out of a contract made before Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. But to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, the hon. gentleman said it had been pressed ever since the work was done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was not done until some time after Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I find the statement here to be 1866-67-68—that is, partly before, partly during, and partly the year after Confederation. Here we have a claim of that age which, according to the statement of an hon. member for New Brunswick, was a contract made with the Province of New Brunswick by a particular contractor other than the one whose name appears in the vote, that his contract was settled and now we have it started up in this Parliament while no correspondence is before us. Why was this claim not made against the Government of New Brunswick?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was, and the Government of New Brunswick practically admitted the soundness of the claim. But meantime the road passed into the hands of the Dominion, and they thought this Government should pay.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a cheap admission, and I dare say we would all be willing to admit that our neighbors should pay our debts. When did they turn over Mr. Ketchum to the Dominion Government with this valuable admission, and how long has the Dominion Government had the matter under their consideration, and how is it that it comes up now? We now learn that in a particular instance, a portion of the Intercolonial Railway was run at a large profit, because it appears that this claim arose out of the fact that the contractor stipulated that these rails should be conveyed at cost, and it turns out that they were conveyed at a profit of \$1,637. Of course no more was charged for them than for other freight, and therefore the whole freight of the road was carried at a great profit. I think perhaps it would cheer us, and perhaps teach the hon. gentleman how to make money out of the road to-day, if he would give us the particulars of how it was managed that the Intercolonial was run at so large a profit in those good old days, when this gentleman was charged so much over cost for transporting his rails. I never heard so old a claim brought forward before, or a claim having such slight foundation as this one. The hon. gentleman admits that it was the New Brunswick Government which was liable, but he says we have taken over the property, and therefore we should pay the profit. Not so. We took particular railways at an understood price from the Province of New Brunswick, and having done so we had the right to run them at our own terms; and if there was some opposition on the part of the New Brunswick Government to Mr. Ketchum, though, as I understand from the remarks of the hon. member for St. John, there was none,—but if there was such an obligation it was an obligation which the Government of New Brunswick had to implement themselves,—and if that Government chose to charge more than the regular rate, it should be settled by those who made the bargain and not by this Govern-



ment. Surely if this claim had a foundation at all it would have been made long ago; surely we have had Mr. Ketchum remonstrating at the time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So he did.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, why were the rates charged—if they were; and how is it that only after fifteen years have elapsed we find out, for the first time, that there was an over charge? If he did not convince you then, how does he convince you now? This is just another instance of these claims being brought forward after they have become antiquated, and the Government bringing down votes for claims which I do not think will commend themselves to the good sense of the people or the good sense of the country; and I repeat that, if these claims are to be brought forward at such a period of the Session, the least the House can expect is that they should have all the material documentary evidence upon which they could form some opinion, and arrive at some judgment, upon the *bona fides* and merits of the case, laid upon the Table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that I considered this case was so plain and clear that it was quite unnecessary to take any such course, and if the hon. gentleman had, on the day when the Estimates were put in his hands, asked for these papers, they would have been on the Table now. The contract was made between the Government of New Brunswick and the contractor previous to Confederation, for the construction of a portion of railway, which is now a portion of the Intercolonial. In that contract it was provided that the materials used by the contractor should be carried at cost price. That is a very plain, simple matter. In the meantime Confederation takes place, and the fixing of the charge for the carriage of these materials passed into the hands of this Government, and Mr. Carvell, then manager of the road over which the materials were carried, fixed the rate. He was remonstrated with, but he insisted on the particular charge which he made. The sub-contractor made his contract on the basis of the original contract, which was that the materials were to be carried at cost price. He brings forward his charge, and it is presented to me as Minister of Railways. I cannot say that it is too old to entertain; I cannot plead the Statute of Limitations; I am obliged to deal with it in a businesslike manner. I ask the hon. gentleman, if he had been in my place, what he would have done. The Government had appointed Mr. Frank Shanly Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, and they appointed him to deal with all claims connected with that road. I said, here is a man of experience in railway matters, an able engineer, a most capable man in every respect; let him take this claim, get the evidence, ascertain if the charge is well founded or not, ascertain what is the cost of the carriage of these materials, and whether it is due to the rights of Mr. Ketchum that the money should be refunded to him. Mr. Shanly was charged with those duties. I hold his report in my hand, and having it in my hand, and having referred it to the manager of the Intercolonial Railway to verify Mr. Shanly's figures as to whether the claim that an over charge had been made, was well founded or not, what could I do? Mr. Shanly made a report that we owed this gentleman so much money, and that, after taking all the evidence that could be obtained on the subject, that, I think, would have been considered sufficient by the House; but I was not satisfied. I placed the report in the hands of the gentleman in charge of the Intercolonial Railway, and asked him to state whether or not he coincided in the statement that there was an over charge, and he said there was. Consequently, what could I do? I could not do anything else than I have done—recommend to the Council that that amount should be put in the Estimates, and that Parliament should be asked to vote it. These papers were placed in the hon. gentleman's hands on Wed-

nesday last, when he could have seen the date of the claim, and if he had then asked for and seen the papers, he would not have seen any reason for disagreeing with this vote.

Mr. BLAKE. This does not state that this was an old claim of the sub-contractor. I saw that it was an ancient, stale, and fish-like smelling thing; but I supposed that the Intercolonial Railway had been carrying rails for somebody, and had charged too much. Once again he says the claim cannot be rejected because it is old. But the claim is fifteen years old. During ten years of that time hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office; the rails were carried while they were in office; if it was so clear and plain and distinct, I want to know why it was not paid during all those ten years—why it was not settled in a businesslike manner? Is it businesslike to allow a plain, clear and distinct claim to remain unpaid for fourteen or fifteen years? No, Sir; the very circumstance that it has been pressed ever since the time of the conveyance of the stuff, up to this time, is an indication that it could not have been, in the words of hon. gentlemen opposite—a plain, clear and distinct claim; but that they must have thought that there was nothing in it until this time, when something was conjured up and it was put in the Estimates.

Mr. WELDON. My recollection of this matter is that the Government of New Brunswick had nothing whatever to do with Mr. Ketchum. Messrs. Clark, Major & Co. were the contractors, and Mr. Ketchum was a sub-contractor under them; and if Mr. Ketchum has any claim, it is against them. But before the work was finished, a dispute arose between Mr. Ketchum and Clark, Major & Co.; and in order to get that property into their possession, so that it might be sold to the Dominion Government and made part of the Intercolonial Railway, Clark, Major & Co. made a complete and final settlement with Mr. Ketchum and finished the work. I, therefore, contend that Mr. Ketchum has no claim either on the New Brunswick Government or the Dominion Government. Assuming that he has, eighteen months of the claim would be against the Province of New Brunswick; and I ask the hon. Minister if he intends to make this a charge against the Province to that extent, and whether he has had any communication with the Government of New Brunswick to ascertain whether or not this is the case. If there is any claim against the Government of New Brunswick, or against the Government of the Dominion as the assignee of the Government of New Brunswick, it should be by Clark, Major & Co., or by their creditors, whose money was put into that road and has not yet been paid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman is extremely anxious that we should make the charge against the Government of New Brunswick, I shall be very glad to consider that question on the special pressure of the hon. member for St. John. As I stated before, Mr. Shanly examined the entire question and found that the money was due to Mr. Ketchum; therefore, I took it for granted it should be paid, after taking the best means to arrive at the facts. But, as I said before, if it is found that we can do so, I shall be glad to meet the wish of the hon. gentleman, and make it a charge against the New Brunswick Government.

Mr. WELDON. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to make a charge against the Government of New Brunswick. I simply say that if Mr. Ketchum has a claim against the Government of New Brunswick, the Province is prepared to meet it, but not to make a settlement with a person with whom they have no contract whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Interior, a few moments ago, pointed out the importance of having a high judicial authority to conduct these investigations, and to see that the Government are not improperly mulcted. There are several important questions—the question whether the

Government of New Brunswick should pay, if anybody should pay this claim; the question whether the Government of New Brunswick should call for indemnity from this Government; the question whether there is any claim of any person against this Government, and the question whether it is a claim of Mr. Ketchum or Clark, Major & Co. The hon. gentleman says he submitted the claim to Mr. Shanly, who, he knows, was not a lawyer; he says he submitted it to Mr. Schreiber who, he knows, is not a lawyer either. Did he ever submit it to the hon. Minister of Justice or any legal officer of the Government, or was any legal opinion obtained on any of these questions of law which are mixed up with the facts, and from which the facts derive their importance?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware, but I presume that Mr. Shanly had the assistance of the Department of Justice, and that whenever he was in any doubt upon a legal point, availed himself of that assistance, on this occasion as he did on others.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has no knowledge, however, of any opinion having been obtained, and the matter was not submitted by him to any legal officer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will not say that, because I do not remember.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I must say, I think further information on this subject should be put into the hands of hon. gentlemen before they are asked to concur in this vote.

Mr. WELDON. Was the Government of New Brunswick furnished with a copy of the Commissioner's report?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will promise the hon. gentleman to supply it with the claim when we make it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was Mr. Shanly charged with merely deciding whether Mr. Ketchum was entitled to the money here asked for, and who should pay him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman ought to know that I have again and again stated—I cannot find intelligence for the hon. gentleman to appreciate the plainest possible statement. If he paid any attention to this discussion he would know that I have said again and again that the whole question, with all the papers and the whole discussion between this Government and that of New Brunswick as to who shall pay and what shall be paid, should be referred to Mr. Shanly. It is somewhat irritating to find, after a statement has been reiterated again and again, that the hon. gentleman should still wish it to be repeated.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not hear it before; I have heard it now.

253. Intercolonial Railway—Land and other claims. \$10,255.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a vote for paying claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, which continually arise and require to be dealt with, and are only paid after a most full examination as to their character.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these not old claims?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are claims some of which are in connection with the original construction of the road.

Mr. WELDON. Are any of them on the portion between St. John and Shediac?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, on every portion of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think we can agree to vote this money on that statement. If these are old claims in connection with the original construction of the road, some in connection with the European and British North American road, we ought to know what they are before voting the money.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman every information on Concurrence.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can give the hon. gentleman some information on this subject. I have had several claims from my county to present and cannot say I met with much satisfaction. Several claims have been made by parties, arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial, for damages, which have only arisen, probably, within the last few years. Under the Mackenzie Administration, I know from experience, that but little attention was given to such claims. I recollect in the instance of the poor widow's cow, it took me a whole month before I could prevail on that Administration to pay her loss. I find great difficulty in getting claims for damages caused by the Intercolonial, considered, but in several instances in which the hon. Minister has given his attention to them they have been referred to the official arbitrators. I was flattering myself that this \$10,000 for railway and other claims, was intended to cover these just claims, not of much account, but yet claims which I know to be correct. I have no doubt the official arbitrators will shortly report to the Government, and I hope it will then be dealt with, and that the result will be as satisfactory in getting out of this Government the just payment of these small amounts, as was my attempt in getting out of the late Liberal Government the claim to which I referred. If there is any money paid improperly on these accounts, we will have an opportunity of investigating them before the Public Accounts Committee next year. I believe the arbitrators are now on their way to enquire into a number of these petty claims that have arisen out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. In the case of one of these claims, a farmer's land is overflowed every spring from the want of sufficient drains to carry off the water. I know this is a just claim, I have pressed it for some time, and at last the Minister has very properly stated that he would refer it to the official arbitrators. Another claim is about a mill property, the approach to which from the river has been very seriously interfered with. It is difficult to get logs to it, because the gravel pit which was dug out let the water from the ditches flow into the mill dam, and filled it up with gravel and sand. I presented that claim when I represented Northumberland in the former Administration, and subsequently it was presented by my successor, but with no better results than I had met with. I hope, now that those gentlemen have come to Parliament, and asked for a sum of money to cover these claims, that we will not refuse to grant it, so as to enable them to pay the claims without delay, if the arbitrators report favorably. I take this opportunity of coming to the rescue of the Minister of Railways, and at the same time to impress upon him the desirability of making prompt payment.

In answer to Mr. CASGRAIN,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have a vote of \$2,000 for the Rivière du Loup Branch, to pay land claims awarded by the arbitrators, and among these is that of Lucien Morin. In addition to the full amount allowed him by the arbitrators, there is also the amount of his costs as taxed by the hon. Minister of Justice, \$244.21.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a mistake, because the Judge has taxed the bill himself at \$444, according to the Statute.

Mr. WELDON. Are there any claims now before the Department for lands on the European and North American Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. I hope those claims will be examined with great caution. I have reason to believe that some of these claims were satisfied by the original Commissioner, Mr. Robert Jardine, and I think they were all settled. Some of these claims are now ten years old.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Although the late Government set the bad example of entertaining these old claims, I am systematically refusing them.

255. Intercolonial Railway—To pay legal expenses in the matter of the Western Counties Railway Company and the Attorney-General of Canada, vs. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.....\$589.90

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the legal expenses for contesting the case against the Crown, on the petition of right which was granted to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me to be an extraordinary charge to be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must know that the Windsor Branch forms no part of the Intercolonial Railway. It is not in our hands, the property is virtually out of the hands of the Government, and yet we are in that position, that we are obliged to defend the action brought against us by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. I could not charge this to the operating expenses of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not venture to suggest to which road he should charge it; that is another consideration. I venture to suggest that this has nothing to do with the Capital Account of the Intercolonial. It is a suit which is brought against the Government in regard to the Windsor Branch. Why should it be charged to Capital Account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because the Windsor Branch is technically a part of the Intercolonial and there are no operating charges.

Mr. BLAKE. I never heard of such a proposal as this, that the costs of law suits, occurring long after the construction of the railway, should be charged against Capital Account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know that technically, it is properly charged. But I say this, that if a party claimed a foot of the Intercolonial Railway to-day and we were obliged to resist the claim, under what head should it be charged? I say, to Capital Account. We own the road and have built it, and such a charge would have to be placed against Capital Account. In this case it cannot be placed against running expenses, and I am not particular under what other heading it is charged.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is particularly anxious that amounts should not be charged against the running expenses of the Intercolonial. In the Tichborne case a special Act had to be obtained to charge the cost of the defence against the estate because money could not be obtained in other quarters. The Intercolonial Railway, however, is not in such a deplorable condition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The late Government took the Windsor Branch out of the hands of the Windsor and Annapolis Company, by force, and handed it over to another company. The first-named company has filed a petition of right. This money is paid for the defence, if damages, to the extent of \$100,000, are given in consequence of the action of the late Government. I ask the hon. gentleman whether it could legitimately be charged to the working expenses of the Intercolonial, of which the Windsor Branch technically forms a part.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Windsor Branch belongs to another company, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, what has it to do with the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because it is still, technically, part of the Intercolonial.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said it was handed over to another company. Then, it was not part of the Intercolonial.

256. Intercolonial Railway—Rivière du Loup Branch  
—Repairs and improvements, land claims, &c...\$2,000.00

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have repeatedly demanded that a small station be built at Elgin for the accommodation of the travelling public. The only accommodation there at present is furnished by a private house, the Government paying for the use of part of it for the use of passengers. The owner is licensed to retail spirituous liquors, and it is understood that on the railway the Government are anxious that liquor should not be sold at any of the stations. Some abuses have occurred at this place on account of persons being drunk at the station. Suitable accommodation should be provided for from \$800 to \$1,000. This expenditure is necessary in the interests of travellers, and should be made without delay, especially in view of the fact that no less than \$420,000 have been voted for accommodation at other points of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be very glad to make the closest enquiry into this matter, and will be only too glad to find that the traffic of the locality will warrant the expenditure necessary to provide the accommodation which the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. LAURIER. Does this include anything connected with the expropriation of land for the St. Charles Branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it the intention of the Government to take an appropriation for that object?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have done so already.

Mr. BLAKE. How does this come out of Capital Account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a provision to pay accounts constantly coming in, with relation to work that was done, when this road was put in order. It is not for any current repairs at all, but for old accounts that were incurred under an appropriation for that purpose.

257. Intercolonial Railway—To pay claim of C. H. Mann.....\$3,162.19

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to settle a claim arising out of a contract with Mann, for the construction of snow-sheds and fences along the line of the Intercolonial. On the 12th of May, 1881, the arbitrators awarded him \$3,821, which included \$829.23 as interest for six years; but the hon. Minister of Justice stated that, according to law, interest could not be paid, and Mann accepted the principal by letter, dated 4th of August, 1882. An Order in Council, August 25th, 1882, recommends the placing in the Supplementary Estimates, of the principal, \$2,895.60, and interest at 6 per cent. from the 4th of August, 1882, the date of Mann's letter, notifying his acceptance of the offer to the date of payment; say eleven months, \$166.59.

Mr. BLAKE. When was this contract finished?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the end of 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. How came it to be so long unsettled?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is not so very long for such matters. These claims are pressed and resisted until finally, as the hon. gentleman sees, they are disposed of by being referred to arbitrators. The latter made an award, and, of course, there is nothing but to pay it.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that it is not so very long in connection with a Government, but if money were owing to you or me, we would think it a very long time. For seven years it is pressed and pressed, and resisted and resisted, until it is at last referred, and then paid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sometimes these claims are referred and refused. I may take this opportunity of saying, that I have watched very closely the awards made by

the official arbitrators, and I believe it would be impossible to find any board or any officers who will scrutinize more closely and resist more determinedly any extravagance in payments. I think that these gentlemen do their duty, and discharge their duty very efficiently in scrutinizing with the utmost care all payments of public money. I have taken a good deal of pains to examine the testimony upon which they find their awards, and I do not think that they err on the side of being over-liberal towards claimants.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

258. To pay Mr. B. Walsh, of Halifax, for damages to his property..... \$525.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This claim arises out of the construction of a double track, provided in the Estimates of last year, and a deep cutting made for the line separating one portion of his land from the other; and the amount is arrived at by the valuation of the officers, who considered that it was reasonable and wise to settle on that basis.

Mr. BLAKE. There seems to be a difference of opinion between the hon. gentleman's view and the opinion of the newspapers, regarding the official arbitrators. I saw the other day that the Government offered \$100 for property for which \$19,000 were claimed, and the arbitrators awarded the sum of \$72; so certainly they are just towards the public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that this confirms my statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I say so. I give it as a remarkable instance.

259. Railways—General..... \$25,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This arises in this way: The House will remember that an appropriation was made for a bridge at Emerson at the last Session of Parliament—an ordinary passenger bridge; and the Government agreed, in case that it was made into a railway as well as a passenger bridge, to ask Parliament for an appropriation of \$20,000 additional. There was a great deal of anxiety in that section of country to obtain an extension from the Canadian Pacific Railway Junction, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to construct this branch of some twenty-two miles, provided that the towns of Emerson and West Lynne would build a bridge. These towns agreed to provide additional expenditure to construct a bridge, if we would raise our grant from a common highway to a railway bridge—from \$20,000 to \$50,000; and these \$20,000 are to supplement our former grant.

Mr. BLAKE. What is it expected that the whole cost of the bridge will be?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not be certain, but I think about \$150,000.

Mr. BLAKE. So much?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a large amount, I know.

Mr. BLAKE. What will this bit of railway, twenty-two miles, cost apart from the bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is a very expensive section, I think. The approaches to the bridge involve a large amount of expense; but I am not able to say at this moment how much. I should imagine, however, that the cost will be something, at all events, like the average.

Mr. WATSON. Who will own this bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The towns of Emerson and West Lynne. I understand they agreed to construct and furnish the roadway through those places.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose they also bind themselves to keep the bridge in repair?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so; but I do not know what arrangement is made under this head.

Mr. BLAKE. This additional allowance makes the salary of Mr. Schreiber, \$6,000 for the Intercolonial, and \$2,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or \$8,000 in all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is only \$6,000 in all. All Mr. Schreiber received as Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition to his salary as an officer of the Department, as General Manager of Government Railways in Operation, and as Chief Engineer, was \$1,500; and this is raised to \$2,000, or \$6,000 in all.

Mr. BLAKE. And what is his salary exclusive of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was \$1,000 originally, and has been that since 1873.

260. Grenville Canal—To pay award in favor of Heney, Stewart & Co., contractors, for works at Greece's Point..... \$17,270.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this vote?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the award of the arbitrator. The contractors were not making sufficient progress with the work and the contract was taken out of their hands. They put in a claim for the amount of work performed and the materials on hand, and it was agreed that this should be referred to Mr. Page as sole arbitrator, and this was his award.

Mr. BLAKE. Were they entitled to a claim of this kind under the terms of the contract? Had they originally claimed some sum?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that it has always been the practice with regard to the canals, that when the work was taken out of the hands of the contractors they should be paid for the work done and the materials on hand at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the contract be completed having regard to Heney, Stewart & Co.'s tender or not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid not. Their prices were too low, and that was the reason they broke down.

Mr. BLAKE. Had they given security?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They had made a deposit.

Mr. BLAKE. And that has gone too?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The deposit has gone, the Government has got nothing, and the execution of the work costs more than if the contract had been completed. When was the work taken out of their hands?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The 1st of November, 1881.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the contract sum of Heney, Stewart & Co.?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be able to give the hon. gentleman that information on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to get the amount of the contract, the security given for the contract, the amount and nature of it, the payments made on account of Heney, Stewart & Co. during the progress of the contract, the disposition of the deposit or other security, and the estimated loss to the Government upon the completion of the works by the new arrangement. It seems to me that this is hardly an illustration which the hon. gentleman would quote in the arguments he was addressing to the Committee in an earlier portion of the evening.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to that, in my judgment it is not possible to get public works constructed at the cost of private individuals. The hon. gentleman will not find, in the management of contracts under the Govern-

ment of which he was a member, any evidence showing that to be the case. He will not find that that Government was any more successful than the present one in securing the construction of public works at private expense. I believe it is simply impracticable to do it, and yet our system of letting contracts is such that if parties come forward, however unable to do the work, however little confidence we may have in them, the hon. gentleman knows the difficulty of refusing the lowest tender, provided the party is prepared to make the deposit.

Mr. BLAKE. If his cheque is properly marked.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If it is not properly marked I do not think we would make a great deal of public money by letting the contract to parties whose prices would not enable them to do the work. These parties took the contract; they were not skilled contractors; they carried it on for a time, but their prices were not high enough, in the judgment of the chief engineer, to enable them to perform it at all and the simple fact was that the work was being impeded, the time was being exceeded, and there was no chance of their completing the contract. They stated that the price of labor and material had risen so greatly after the time of taking the contract as to make it utterly impossible for them to go on—and it was quite true that they had advanced—and under these circumstances they surrendered the contract. The chief engineer made an estimate of the work, but they were dissatisfied and they applied to the Government. They made a claim for \$20,382, and it was agreed that the claim should be referred to Mr. Page as sole arbitrator, and he arrived at the conclusion that it would be right to pay them \$17,370.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall not enter into a discussion of the question of whether it is possible to obtain money from sureties under public contracts. The reason I made the remark I did make, but which the hon. Minister seems to have misapprehended, was, that in the earlier part of the evening he laid great stress on the fact that the Government had a security with respect to the Whitehead contract, which would have been available had the work cost more than the contract price. Now he says the work cannot be constructed at the expense of private individuals.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said, and I repeat, and I will sustain it by evidence which the hon. gentleman cannot confute, that the Government of which he was a member settled a score of large contracts in which they took the work out of the hands of the parties and paid a large sum of public money over and above the amount of the contract, and yet they were not able to obtain a single dollar of the securities. If that is the case, why should the hon. gentleman raise this question as a question of impropriety on the part of the Government; why should he wish to intimate that there has been an injustice to the public, if we have only followed the policy of his Government, though I believe they acted from a sincere desire to promote the public interests, and conserve the public money. But no fault was found with them, either on account of their contracts on the canals or their contracts on the Intercolonial Railway; and I think the hon. gentleman will not find one dollar in the Treasury of Canada placed there by taking the security which parties had given when it was found that the prices were inadequate. That would simply have been taking the money of private individuals.

Mr. BLAKE. If that is the invariable rule, why was it said this afternoon, that if the Whitehead contract had cost more than the contract price, the Government could have recovered it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said they could do so.

Mr. BLAKE. And would. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman would say that they could do a wrong thing if it would not be done.

261. Williamsburg Canal—To pay to the owners of the titles of certain lands taken for the construction of the Rapide Plat Canal ..... \$1,434.59

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to pay for the titles of certain lands for the lock of the Rapide Plat Canal taken in 1844, and not yet paid for.

Mr. BLAKE. It is hardly time to vote that money yet. Will the hon. gentleman not want half a century more?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, after these people have had to wait so long, it would be very unreasonable to ask them to wait any longer.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it comes that this very ancient claim was not pressed, and if it was, why it was not satisfied, and how he has ascertained the value of these lands as they stood thirty-nine years ago?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had better, perhaps, read the Order in Council, which contains the information, and as it was sufficient to satisfy the Government of the justice of the claim, I have no doubt it will satisfy my hon. friend. The Order in Council is dated October 28th, 1882, and states:

"On a memorandum, dated 24th October, 1882, from the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that, in the year 1844, certain lands were taken for the construction of the Rapide Plat Canal, being parts of lots Nos. 4 and 5 in the first range of the Township of Matilda, also lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the sixth range of the Village of Mariatown.

"That, owing to the fact that rival claims have been set up by Mrs. Isabella Findlay Farlinger, and Mr. Samuel Nash, for the ownership of title to these lands; and that, up to the present time, neither claimant has been able to show satisfactory evidence of title, no settlement has been arrived at.

"The Minister states that, recently, upon renewed application from the parties interested, a further submission of the case was made to the Minister of Justice, who advised, under date the 18th instant, that authority should be obtained for the payment to Mrs. Farlinger, or to such other person as may be found entitled thereto, for the parts of the lots 4 and 5 in the first range of Matilda, and for lots 1 and 2 in the sixth range of Mariatown; and that payment should be made to Mr. Nash, or to such other person as may be found entitled thereto, for the lots 3 and 4 in the sixth range of Mariatown."

Mr. BLAKE. I should think that this, if it be a debt, is due by the late Province of Canada, and ought to be charged to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

262. Culbute Canal—To complete ..... \$23,100.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this under contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. The delay was caused by the failure of the contractors to complete one of the dams in the time specified in the contract, which rendered necessary the maintenance of an engineering staff. A portion of this vote is to be applied to making good the materials carried away by the breaking of a crib.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this expected to cover the whole cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. This vote also embraces the damage done by the flooding of lands, which is estimated at \$8,000. The other items are engineering and other expenses, \$3,000, and the amount by special warrant required to complete the work, \$12,100, making \$23,100 in all.

Mr. BLAKE. What would be the total cost of the canal, including this vote? The hon. gentleman stated that \$12,100 was by special warrant. If the money has been paid, I do not think it should be included in this vote, because we understand that every shilling that is voted is yet in the public treasury.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total cost of the canal is \$312,577.

263. Cornwall Canal—Enlargement ..... \$15,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for the purpose of paying the percentage to the contractors on Section No. 1, also

for lock gates and other necessary outlays on the works now in progress.

264. Welland Canal—To compensate R. D. Dunn, Paymaster, for services in connection with the enlarged Canal..... \$1,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Dunn, who is paymaster on the Welland Canal, applied to have his salary increased on account of increased duties. The application was a reasonable one, but we thought it better, as these duties were temporary, to give him this compensation instead of an increase.

265. { Welland Canal—Compensation to Mr. John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, for special services as sole arbitrator upon several claims in dispute with contractors..... \$5,000.00  
To pay Mr. Page, for disbursements made by him in connection with the awards..... 105.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe it has been a great advantage to the country that Mr. Page's services has been utilized in this way. So long ago as January, 1872, he was called upon to act as arbitrator in the cases of R. McGreevy, contractor for the Parliamentary buildings, and Charles Garth, contractor for the heating and ventilation of the Parliamentary buildings. He stated very properly that this was no part of his duty as Chief Engineer, and did not wish to take the responsibility of performing these services. He was urged by Sir John Rose to perform them, and told that he would be well paid for these extra services. Since that time he has been charged with the same duty at a great saving to the Government, as, were the usual course of having three arbitrators appointed followed, a great expense would be caused. It has been estimated, the cost would have been something like \$20,000, and under these circumstances we ask the House to vote this sum to Mr. Page.

Mr. BLAKE. Last Session the hon. member for East York, referring to this matter, expressed great confidence in Mr. Page. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Page for many years, and have the highest possible opinion of his integrity. His professional capacity is better judged and is well spoken of by those who have a better right to speak of it than I. I shall not criticise this proposition of the hon. gentleman, except to say that I think it would have been more satisfactory if some understanding had been reached, by which, from time to time, as these transactions took place, the remuneration would be adjusted.

266. Welland Canal—To purchase a steam-pump.....\$5,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A good deal of difficulty has occurred in cases of wrecks in the Welland Canal, and the obstruction to navigation caused by sunken vessels. On the report of Mr. Page and the Superintendent we intend to buy this pump, so as not to be obliged to depend upon the use of steam pumps owned by private individuals.

267. Telegraph Lines—Manitoba and the North-West Territories—To pay balance due contractors, Oliver, Davidson & Co., for lines between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg.....\$16,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On the 5th February, 1875, a contract was entered into by the Department of Public Works, as then constituted, with Oliver, Davidson & Co. On the 5th April, 1882, an Order in Council was passed transferring this to the new Department of Public Works, then separated from the Department of Railways and telegraph lines in connection with railways. On the 28th August, P. J. Brown, the head of the firm which maintained the telegraph line from the date of its completion, presented a claim for instruments, materials, &c., amounting to \$27,949. They stated that as they were in want of money they would settle for \$22,000. This offer was accepted, and an Order in Council, passed on the 23rd September, 1882, authorizing the issue of special warrants by His Excellency for \$16,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Out of this \$30,000 transferred from the Department of Railways to the Department of Public Works, there was still \$6,000 in the hands of the Department, which, with the \$16,000, made the \$22,000 to pay this claim. The Government obtained, besides that, 65 miles of wire, 22 sets of instruments, batteries, repairing tools, &c., which together will make another sum of \$2,500.

321. To pay general charges in connection with railways.....\$5,500 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The first item is \$400, to be paid to Mrs. A. A. McInnis, *re* compensation for the death of her husband. Without prejudice to the defence of the case, I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), that he very much misunderstood what I stated to the House on a former occasion, when he charged me with want of sympathy for the victims of the terrible accident which occurred on the Prince Edward Island Railway. The question of whether the Government is liable as common carriers, is quite distinct from any question of sympathy and the deepest possible regret for the sufferers in that accident. I stated on that occasion that the judgment of the Chief Justice, supported by almost the unanimous Supreme Court, was, that the Government stands in an entirely different position from that of railway companies, who are common carriers. The distinction was drawn in that judgment in an emphatic manner by the Chief Justice, when he stated that the Government had constructed and operated the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway for the purpose of benefiting the public, as a matter of public convenience, and that the construction of the Imperial Act providing for the Union of the Provinces, and that by the Terms of the Union with Prince Edward Island, the Government were obliged to operate that railway. As the House knows, the Prince Edward Island Railway is still operated at a large excess over the receipts of the road. But assuming that the Government are common carriers, and that the law applies to us precisely as it does to any railway company, that would not necessarily involve us in the payment for compensation in case of death, or serious accident, to passengers carried by rail. The law, I believe, draws a clear distinction between accidents that are inevitable, and accidents that arise from negligence on the part of the employes, or any failure in the condition of the road. With reference to that point, the report of the officers of the road clearly established that the road was in good condition, so far as the Department could learn the fact. But the Judge who tried the case, subsequently arrived at a different opinion. Still, everything that the Government could do to ensure the proper condition of the road had been done. The gentleman who was acting as Superintendent and Chief Engineer of the Prince Edward Island Railway at the time of that unfortunate accident, had been employed by the late Government, and placed in charge of the Intercolonial Railway. His salary was advanced by the late Government in that position to \$4,000 a year, a much larger salary than that he was receiving at the time he occupied the same position and before the Intercolonial was finished. He was a gentleman, therefore, in whom I had every reason to place the most implicit confidence as to his ability to maintain in a thoroughly efficient manner the railway on Prince Edward Island. The evidence taken at the time of the accident seemed to be conclusive that the railway was in a thoroughly good condition. However, as I stated, the learned Judge who tried the case found differently. I think the observations of the hon. member for West Elgin were still more uncalled for, because the hon. gentleman knew, if he was in the House at the time, that when this subject was under discussion, I stated

that before the House rose I intended to submit the decision of the learned Chief Justice to the consideration of my colleagues, and to draw their attention to the fact that while he had found that the Government could not be held legally liable, yet it was a case that he commended to the Government as one worthy of their consideration, and upon which he seemed to think they would be warranted in invoking Parliament to make compensation. But when claims, which I had reason to believe from the evidence were extravagant and inordinate, were made against the Government, of course, they were resisted; we could do nothing else but resist them; the Railway Department have no power to pay a single dollar of public money in any case in which the law authorities of the Government declare there is no liability. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will agree with me that if any money is to be paid where the hon. Minister of Justice declares there is no liability, we must come to Parliament and ask for the money. That course was taken. The whole evidence in relation to these claims, was submitted to the Department of Justice, and that Department decided, in view of the evidence taken, that there was no legal liability, and we were not, therefore, to pay any public money. The case, as I have stated, was taken to court, and the Judge found certainly in the one case a very large amount as due; he not only found the Government were liable, but in estimating the damages he allowed the claim of \$23,000 made by the sufferer to be increased to \$35,000, and subsequently during the trial, to be raised to \$50,000 and awarded the amount of \$35,000 to Mr. McLeod, who was a very severe sufferer. There can be no doubt that this was a most distressing case, and the gentleman was subjected not only to great personal suffering, but for a considerable time his life was supposed to be in danger. There has never been a disposition to under-rate the character of the accident or the great sufferings experienced by Mr. McLeod. However, as I have stated, the Court having found that the claim was not one that could be established against the Government, it became necessary to consider what course should be taken. Mrs. McInnis is the widow of the captain of a vessel, who was on the train at the time this unfortunate accident occurred, and, although an invalid at the time, Dr. Hobkirk, his medical attendant, stated that he believed he would have recovered. Mrs. McInnis approached the Government in a letter which was in no manner complimentary to the Department, and she stated that her means were entirely exhausted, that she was unable to obtain bread and clothing for herself, and was, in fact, entirely destitute; and under these circumstances I recommended to Council that the Government should, without prejudice to the case, advance \$400, in order that Mrs. McInnis might be maintained until final action was reached. I have submitted this matter for the consideration of the Government, and I may take the opportunity of stating that it is not proposed to ask for any particular sum to be appropriated for the purpose of meeting these cases; but in a Bill which I now have on the Table of the House, and which I will take the earliest opportunity of pushing forward, accidents, whether to person or property, are included in the running expenses of railways, and we hold ourselves, therefore, in a position to treat every case on its merits, that wherever there is a case of injury to the person, whether the liability is strictly legal or not, the Government will be in a position, from the appropriation provided for the operation of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, to take such a sum as will, in the judgment of the Government, furnish proper compensation to those who are concerned. It will become my duty to take up the consideration of these very serious cases, and from the appropriation made for the operating expenses of these railways, to submit to the Government from time to time, what, in the judgment of the Department, is considered an appropriate amount to meet injuries or loss of life, in the

same manner as has been applied to the loss of property. I trust this explanation will be considered sufficient as showing a determination on the part of the Government to pay damages, irrespective of the opinion of the Judges, as expressed in this case, and to satisfy hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that there was no desire to avoid any fair and just conclusion in dealing with these unfortunate cases.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not quite understand the proposition which the hon. member intends to submit to Parliament in regard to these unfortunate cases. If I understood the hon. gentleman he proposes to authorize the head of the Department in some manner which he has not clearly defined, to ascertain, in each case, the amount of damages to be awarded. It is not intended to bring down in the Estimates any definite sum to be paid to those sufferers. That certainly will be very unsatisfactory in many ways, unless the hon. gentleman comes to the conclusion, as I hope he will, to accept the decision of the Supreme Court as to the reasonableness of the damages. I had hoped the hon. gentleman would, in the Supplementary Estimates, as he rather intimated he would do, take an amount for each case on the Island Railway. I must take exception to one or two statements made by the hon. Minister. He said that the road was in good condition, as reported to the Government. I am aware that it was in good condition, as reported to the Government, and that the action of the Government was justifiable on the report which the Chief Engineer presented to them; but I have no hesitation in saying that the evidence given in court, before the Judges, and the concurrence of judgment on the part of the six Judges of the Exchequer Court, went to show that the report made by the officer in charge was not based on truth. There was much excitement in the Island at the time. The gentleman in charge of the railway became in a very nervous condition; he held a court of enquiry with closed doors. He took down the statements of employes of the road, and forced from them statements at the point of the bayonet, or under peril of losing their situations; which statements they repudiated when on oath, and under cross-examination. Those facts were reported to the hon. Minister of Railways. Any person reading the statements of the Chief Engineer, as forwarded, would come to the conclusion to which the hon. Minister arrived, namely: that the Island Railway road-bed was in good condition. But it is not the fact. I remember about two weeks prior to this terrible accident, the cars ran off the track at the western end of the line. A number of passengers were slightly injured, nonseriously; but the road-bed for a distance of 200 yards was torn up, and the sleepers were found to be in a thoroughly rotten condition. There was a good deal of talk. Some gentlemen made enquiries into the facts and found, as I have stated, that the road-bed was in an unsafe and unfit condition, and one of the chief newspapers of the Island, having collected these facts, published them, and warned the gentleman in charge of the railway that unless he took immediate steps to remedy the state of the road-bed, a very serious accident must inevitably happen within a very few weeks. It was publicly stated, and reiterated in a daily newspaper there day after day, that the road-bed was in such a shockingly rotten condition that an accident must happen, causing loss of life; and the newspaper went further, and told this gentleman in charge that if such an accident did happen, now that the fact of the condition of the road-bed having been brought to his knowledge, he would be held liable criminally in case of loss of life. Yet he took no such steps, and the fact of the matter was simply this: he was an over-worked man. When appointed to the position he had to perform the duties of three men, and he broke down under it. He became nervous, and the result was that the country has had to superannuate him at an expense of \$1,700 for the rest of his life. He was over-worked and unfit for the position at the

time, and the consequence was, that when this unfortunate accident happened, he had taken no precautions, although warned that the road-bed was thoroughly rotten. The hon. gentleman went on to say—and I was sorry to hear him make the statement, if he read the evidence—it was proved conclusively that the road bed was in good condition at the time of the accident. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that out of thirty-seven or thirty-eight witnesses examined, some of them residents of the Island, and some passengers who happened to be on that train from the United States and from other parts of Canada, there were one universal consensus of opinion on this point as to the condition of the road-bed; that the condition of the sleepers was disgraceful, the sleepers were absolutely rotten, and the only wonder was, how trains were enabled to go over that part of the road in the morning of the day when the accident happened, and for the few days previously; and there were but three witnesses to controvert that statement. One, the section foreman, who was responsible for the condition of the road, and two of his understrappers. As was very well pointed out, when the Chief Justice heard the case up here on appeal, it was impossible for any impartial man to give credit to the testimony of two interested witnesses, and to throw over the testimony of thirty-six or thirty-seven disinterested witnesses. Many of these gentlemen had no earthly interest in the matter whatever, they were not even Canadians, but travelling as passengers. I myself may say—and have no hesitation in doing so—that personally I went there and examined the state of the road right after the accident; and I know from my own personal knowledge, that the statements of the thirty-seven gentlemen were true. I took myself with my own hand the ends of a dozen of these sleepers, just at the point of the accident, and without the slightest exertion broke them off at the rail. They were a mass of pulp, absolutely rotten. There is no escape from it. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman as to damages, it was found by the learned Judge who tried the case below, that the evidence of the thirty-seven witnesses was true, and the evidence of the foreman and the men under him was not true. When we came to the Court of Appeal, the whole of the Judges unanimously held that on that there could be no question. They held that the accident was caused by the culpable negligence—I use the word employed not once but several times by the Chief Justice in the course of conversation during the argument—of the Government employés. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he can point to any tribunal from which we could expect a fairer, a more impartial, and a more honest judgment, or a tribunal more capable of giving a fair, honest and impartial judgment than the Supreme Court of Canada? There we have on that material point the unanimous opinion of the Judges, without one dissenting voice; it was clear beyond all argument, so clear that they told the gentleman who appeared on behalf of the Crown, after reading the evidence there, that he would only take up time by argument, that this accident was caused by the culpable negligence of the Government employés. That being the case, we went on to discuss the question of damages; and on that point I would also call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the decision and declaration of the Judges. The amount of damages awarded to Mr. McLeod does seem at first sight to be a very large amount. I would undertake to say there is no man in Prince Edward Island—and I will hazard this assertion—who knows Mr. McLeod, and who saw him during the first six or twelve months after the accident, who will tell the Minister of Railways that those damages were excessive. Language fails me, at any rate, to describe that man's condition after the accident. Before that a young man in the prime of life, exceptionally well trained and holding the position of bank manager. He formerly re-

Mr. DAVIES.

ceived a very large salary in New York, and was then in receipt of a large salary in Prince Edward Island; and he had the promise of a large increase to his salary. He was also the agent of a large insurance company, from which he derived a very respectable income. He was an athletic man, accustomed to take a great deal of exercise. He was a very strong and powerful man, and in the prime of life; but after and since the accident he has been a wretched wreck. I myself was present when he was carried in from the train. I was there to see him day after day for six or eight weeks, while he lay without moving, being fed with a silver tube. His whole face was smashed, most of his teeth being carried away; and I suppose he suffered more during six or eight weeks than human imagination, or at all events than the language which I can command, can describe. He was for months and months unable to go near business at all, and was only retained in his position, not because he was capable of fulfilling his duties, but to a large extent from the kindness of the directors. He has been for many years the manager of the bank, and they were loath to discharge him. He went home to England, on the advice of his doctors, to take the advice of some of the most eminent surgeons, and they told him that by taking a fair amount of outdoor exercise, and by declining to or abstaining from continuing to give up his time to the duties of his profession, he might prolong his life some years. He was a man in a good position, with a good income before then; he had to give up \$1,000 which he received from the insurance company, and he remains in the bank more from the kindness of the directors than from anything else, discharging in a very perfunctory way the duties of cashier. I do not know any man in Prince Edward Island, at any rate, his equal, or anything like his equal, as a bank cashier. I know he has held very high offices abroad, and he had a right to look forward to a long life, and a very large salary for life, as bank cashier. We had evidence taken before a Commission there of gentlemen from abroad, who were acquainted with Mr. McLeod, as to his qualifications, and the prospects of obtaining a large salary. The facts are, that after all this evidence was heard, the Judges assessed the damages, and the hon. member complains that the Judge at the final, admitted the claim to be increased, and, I think, I ought to explain why that was. When the accident occurred, the chief injury suffered was a facial injury. After three or four months had gone by, he was able to communicate with his attorneys, and a claim was made on the Department. It was not known at that time that he received injuries beyond his facial injuries, because he had not attempted to walk about or take any physical exercise; but after the claim was forwarded to the Minister of Railways, it was found that he had received very serious injuries to his spine—injuries so serious that his medical attendants peremptorily insisted that he should take no physical exercise whatever, but merely walk down to his office and back. When the trial came on, the evidence of five or six of the leading doctors of Charlottetown went to show that the facial injuries were nothing in comparison with the effects to the spinal injuries he received. It was shown that these injuries were more or less paralyzing him, and that in all human probability his life would not be prolonged for more than three or four years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say the hon. gentleman is making the strongest possible case against his client.

Mr. DAVIES. Why?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was shown in the evidence given before the Judge that it was likely that this man's life would terminate in three or four years. Now he is



able to discharge his duties of cashier of a bank, and the evidence given by the medical men is shown to be entirely mistaken.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I hope the dogmatic statement he has made may be true.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is admitted to be true. The medical men themselves admit that they were mistaken, and I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not promoting the interests of his client.

Mr. DAVIES. Whether I am or not I am simply stating what the facts are, and I think the hon. gentleman should not have stated that the evidence of the medical men was not true.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has made the statement which I cannot allow to pass unchallenged. He says that the evidence given by the medical men was untrue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said nothing of the kind, and the hon. gentleman is stating what is untrue in saying that I did. I said that they were mistaken in their evidence.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not going to allow myself to be worked up into a state of excitement. The hon. gentleman made the statement that the doctors had now stated that they were mistaken in their statement that the man would not likely live more than three or four years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They admitted that.

Mr. DAVIES. I challenge the hon. gentleman to bring forward any evidence to show that they made that admission.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The facts show it. They cannot help but admit it.

Mr. DAVIES. The facts show nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is not one of them but will be compelled to admit it.

Mr. DAVIES. That is another thing. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say to the Committee, that these doctors now admitted that they were mistaken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So they did.

Mr. DAVIES. It would be improper on my part to make a statement which would prejudice my client, but, at the same time, I think it but right that I should place the House in possession of the facts. I say that the doctors swore that from their examination of Mr. McLeod, it was doubtful whether his life would be prolonged more than four or five years. He went home to consult some of the first doctors in England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. After the trial?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes. He went home by the advice of his medical men, and Dr. Ericsson, one of the most prominent authorities on spinal disease in the world, told him that as he had survived so long he might hope that his life might be spared. I know myself that Mr. McLeod dare not raise his arm to engage in any exercise whatever. I have known him as one of the best athletes in Charlottetown, a cricketer and one accustomed to horseback exercise. Now he goes around a weak, helpless man, shambling from his office to his house. Two years have elapsed since the accident occurred, and I trust that that may prove a sign that his life will be spared longer, but he can never be more than a sad miserable wreck. I had hoped that I would not get into a controversy with the hon. Minister of Railways, but I trust that he will not allow his mind to be carried away by the *ex parte* statements made by the man then in charge of the Prince Edward Island Railway. I frankly acknowledge that when I heard these statements first made by him, and supposing they were addressed to a jury, I thought the hon. Minister of Railways was not jus-

tified in saying that the case of Mr. McLeod should go to trial instead of arbitration. But when the trial came on, and I read these statements, I admit that I justified the decision of the hon. Minister of Railways, because it appeared to be a pure accident not resulting from negligence. But now it stands on a different footing. A Judge of the Exchequer Court has heard forty or fifty witnesses, and they thought that the *ex parte* report first made with regard to the case was untrue. But what occurs to me is the fact that when they came to argue it before the Court of Appeal, they unanimously determined that the verdict found by the Judge, that this accident was caused by the culpable negligence of the employés of the road, was true. Under these circumstances I think that the hon. gentleman should not hesitate a moment as to what he should bring down to the House. I am aware that those Judges have held that, technically, an action would not lie against the Queen in this case, and, of course, at present we are bound to bow to that decision. But when the hon. gentleman says that he will deem it to be his duty to propose some sum as compensation, I ask him what better basis could he take than the judgment rendered by a single Judge, and afterwards ratified by the unanimous judgment of the court above. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not allow the Session to go by without bringing down a vote to meet this claim. I hope that the hon. gentleman will see that the fairest and best mode of dealing with it, and of doing justice to the public and the parties, is to accept the damages as they have been assessed by the Judges of the land. Nobody can impute to them partiality. Even if the hon. gentleman was prepared to argue that one Judge had taken a wrong view of the evidence, it cannot be held that the whole Supreme Court of Canada took the wrong view. You cannot appoint any board of arbitration that possesses better qualifications than they possess. They are not a jury carried away by their passions; they read the evidence carefully together, and came to a unanimous conclusion; and I hope and trust that, upon all the facts of this case, the hon. Minister will see it to be his duty to bring down a vote covering the damages they assessed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to prolong this discussion further than to say that Mr. McLeod may very well say, "Save me from my friends." The hon. gentleman has put himself in the witness-box, and has undertaken to offer his testimony; and I have no hesitation in saying that that testimony will be regarded as worthless by any intelligent man who knows anything of railways. The hon. gentleman has given his evidence that the sleepers were perfectly rotten, in the condition of pulp, and yet he knows that around that sharp curve trains were running every day at a considerable rate of speed.

Mr. DAVIES. The accident did not occur at the sharp curve, but after the train went around the sharp curve, and it was beyond the curve where I said the sleepers were in a state of pulp.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Everybody knows that the accident occurred on account of the train going round the curve, and the hon. gentleman must not suppose that he can escape by a suggestion of that kind. The statement of the hon. gentleman can only result from his having been the paid advocate of the gentleman whose case is under examination; and this has blinded his judgment and destroyed his discretion, that he does not hesitate to commit himself to a statement so extravagant that no person could believe it if he desired, and as to render every statement he makes utterly valueless and worthless. When the hon. gentleman got up, he took the position that the amount assessed by the Judge would be the proper amount to pay; but he had not gone very far until he proved to the House that the Judge had been entirely misled by the medical testimony given on that occasion. He says that four or five skilful medical men

of Charlottetown went on the stand and swore that this man's life was gone; that his spine was injured; that he was an utter wreck; that he would be a helpless paralytic for a short time and would then die. Dr. Hobkirk, the surgeon who attended Mr. McLeod, took that view. These medical men were men of high character, and the Judge took their evidence, as he was bound to do, and on that evidence he assessed the damages. But the gentleman went to England, and I rejoice to know that he came back, having learned that the very serious view of his case taken by the doctors, was not the correct view, and with good hopes of attaining a good old age. And what is he doing to-day? Why, he is vigorously discharging the duties of cashier and manager of a bank, and showing that he is not only in the enjoyment of all his faculties, but physically so strong that he is able to maintain his position in a responsible and onerous office, and he is receiving as large a salary to-day as he ever received in his life. The hon. gentleman has done everything, in my judgment, to destroy the claim as it stood before he got up and informed the House of the true state of the case. I will not say more about that. I do not intend that the hon. gentleman shall prejudice the case of his client by the indiscreet and extravagant statements which he has made to-night; but I will not allow the hon. gentleman to reflect upon the Government or upon myself, as having been the cause of this accident. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. McNab was not equal to all the work put upon him, and that that is the reason the road was not in a better condition. I can produce Mr. McNab's letter written to me, stating that the engineer was entirely unnecessary, and that it was so easy for him to perform all the duties he had to perform, that he was astonished that the change was not made before. I put that against the statement of the hon. gentleman that Mr. McNab was overworked. My predecessor paid that man \$4,000 a year as Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, with the whole distance from Rivière du Loup to Halifax and Windsor and Pictou under his charge, and responsible for the condition of the road; and Mr. Brydges, a man as well qualified, I believe, to judge of the capacity of a man in that position as any man on this continent, declared that Mr. McNab was so able and efficient a man that he had asked Mr. Mackenzie to largely increase his salary. Now that gentleman has been charged with the maintenance of 200 miles of railway in Prince Edward Island. Mr. McNab, who had for years experience in a much more difficult position on the Intercolonial Railway, went upon the stand and swore that he had gone over the ground after the accident, and that the accident was not caused by any defect in the road. I put his sworn testimony against the statement made by the advocate of Mr. McLeod on that occasion. What more? Mr. Houle, who had been track master on that section of the road from the day it came into the hands of the Government, down to the time Mr. Mackenzie, then Minister of Public Works, left office, and who has continued in that position since—a man of undoubted skill and experience—a man best able to speak of the condition of the Prince Edward Island Railway, for his whole time was occupied in examining the road, swore the road was in first-class condition, and that the accident was not caused by any defective condition of the track. I put that sworn testimony against the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the sleepers were nothing but pulp. The hon. gentleman said a lot of people said that. So they did. They gave such testimony as the hon. gentleman gave, and which so excited the public—people who knew nothing about the maintenance and condition of the road—that one witness swore it was murder. No man was killed, no man had died; yet, just as the hon. gentleman stated to-night the sleepers were rotten as pulp, this man swore it was murder. How could he, when no man was killed or had died, swear it was murder without perjuring himself? Yet the hon. gentleman

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

got his witness to swear that. I give that testimony as an evidence of the excitement which was worked up in the country. The hon. gentleman got another witness to swear to the condition of the road—a railway man. What was his position? He had been driven out of employment, he had been dismissed by the Government, I think, for drunkenness and misconduct.

Mr. DAVIES. No—drunkenness?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For misconduct, at all events.

Mr. DAVIES. What kind?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not, at the moment, remember. I know he was dismissed by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. By whom?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By Mr. McNab, I presume; but, at all events, he was dismissed and he went to the United States, where he was starving because he could not get employment. They sent for this man, and put him on the stand, and he swore the road was in the condition stated by the hon. gentleman. When his own evidence was put before him and he was asked: "Did you not say the road was in first-rate condition when you had gone over it that day?" He said: "yes." "Did you lie when you made that statement?" He said: "yes; but I was then in the employment of the Government, and am not now." I did not intend to go into this question, but the hon. gentleman provoked it. So far as the hon. gentleman could damage the position of his client in the case, he has done so, and Mr. McLeod may well say: "Save me from my friends." But we will not allow the hon. gentleman's indiscreet and injudicious statements to prejudice Mr. McLeod's case. We will do what is right in the premises. With regard to the decision of the Judges in refusing to allow the testimony to be entered into, my theory is this, and I ask the hon. gentleman to contradict me if I am wrong. When the counsel for the Crown asked the Judges to allow them to place the character of the testimony before the court; when Mr. Hodgson, who was familiar with the whole case, and who placed in my hands abundant evidence to show the utterly fallacious character of the testimony, asked the court to hear him in reference to the question of damages, the court refused. Why? Because Mr. Lash, who was also a counsel for the Crown, had already exhausted the argument in relation to the legal liability. No doubt the Judges, having decided in their minds against the claimants on the ground that they had no legal claim against the Government, did not want to have their time taken up by going into the question of damages and assessment, or any other matters. That is the only ground on which we can understand their refusing to allow the counsel for the Crown to show the character of the testimony, and the discrepancies of the evidence on the other side.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not going to lose my temper as the hon. gentleman seems to have lost his. Whether my statement impaired or advanced the cause of Mr. McLeod, I know not, but I think this House will prefer I should make a plain statement of the facts, even if it injures Mr. McLeod, rather than that I should make a varnished statement of facts. I do not want to mislead the House, and should be sorry to make this a political question. It never was a political question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is making it one at this moment. The hon. gentleman made it so by his gross and unwarranted attack on the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. Argument, in the face of a statement like that, is useless. The hon. gentleman says I made a bitter attack on the Government. Why, if he desires to give a fair, impartial hearing to my statement of the case, the words I used must still be ringing in his ears when I

said: Having the *ex parte* statement in his hands rendered to him by Mr. McNab, I do not blame him for his action.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did you or did you not state that the cause of this accident was that Mr. McNab was so over-worked by the Government, he was not able to do his duty?

Mr. DAVIES. I did say so, and I call to bear testimony to that statement the hon. Minister himself, who, within a very few weeks after the accident occurred, acting upon a certificate produced by McNab's doctor that he was unfit to discharge his duties, recommended that he be superannuated at \$1,600 a year for the remainder of his life. I want to know if that is a political statement. Does the hon. gentleman remember that, when he was a Minister of the Government, he recommended Mr. McNab to be superannuated because he was physically unfit to discharge his duties? Does the hon. Minister mean to say that that physical unfitness was caused within two or three weeks after the accident, and that I was not justified in assuming that it was caused when the accident occurred? The hon. gentleman says that we ought not to make statements of facts here that are contradicted by two men. I tell the hon. gentleman, with all respect, that he has not latterly read Mr. McNab's statement, because Mr. McNab did not state the facts as he put them to the House to-night. Mr. McNab had not visited the scene of the accident before the accident occurred at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so. I said he went there immediately after the accident.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. McNab stated he did not arrive at the scene of the accident until after the sleepers had been taken up, and he was unable to say what state the sleepers were in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I will take occasion to submit the facts to the hon. Minister privately. I want to make no advantage out of this. I will submit Mr. McNab's evidence to him upon that point, but I have not got it before me now. The hon. gentleman says that Houle swore so and so. I can tell him that the fact that Houle swore so and so was submitted to the Judges of the Supreme Court by Mr. Hodgson, counsel for the Crown, and the Chief Justice did not decide that point, because they did not want their time taken up by having to decide a point of law. They stated expressly: "We have already carefully read the evidence, and we cannot believe that Mr. Houle, who was the man responsible for this accident, is telling the truth, when thirty-seven respectable witnesses swore to the contrary."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did they allow the counsel to state the whole case, or did they put him down and refuse to hear him?

Mr. DAVIES. They allowed him to speak partially, and they told him that if he was going to argue that they should accept the statement of Houle as against the sworn testimony of thirty-seven witnesses that they might save him the trouble of making the argument. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is customary in courts of law when a case is so clear that it does not admit of argument, for the Judges to interpose and say so. I would be prepared, if the hon. gentleman was not prejudiced, to argue it before himself, and to appeal to his sense of justice and to his common sense. The hon. gentleman has said that there was political feeling in this question. I can tell him there was no politics on one side or the other. He will find upon enquiry that there were more Conservatives who swore to the state of that road than Liberals. I tell him care was taken to exclude politics from that case entirely. The counsel on behalf of Mr. McLeod were not politicians outside of myself; some of them were the leading lawyers of Prince Edward Island who take no part in politics. I tell him frankly if

he chooses to ask the hon. gentleman who came from Prince Edward Island and supported the case of the Government, they will tell him that whatever political effect the newspapers may have sought to make, there was no politics in the testimony given by them. There is no man in Prince Edward Island outside the small clique of officials who will deny that it was the rotten state of that road which caused the accident. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a statement from any reliable man in Prince Edward Island outside the narrow clique of politicians connected with the railway, who attribute it to any other cause. Let him take the testimony of the gentleman he formerly sent to inspect that road, and ask him what was the cause of the accident and he will learn there was no politics in this matter whatever. The newspapers made political effect out of it afterwards in this way: They said that Mr. McNab had been solemnly warned from day to day that if he did not pay attention to this road-bed some serious accident would happen, and if death was the result he would be indicted for murder. That charge was made against Mr. McNab a fortnight previous to the accident, when they were calling his attention to another accident not far away where the cars went off and ground up the road bed to powder for nearly 100 yards. They pointed out that he was carrying people over that road when the sleepers were rotten, that they had called his attention to it time and again, and that if another accident happened he would be held criminally responsible. And if the hon. gentleman will go down to Prince Edward Island and enquire of the people there, irrespective of politics, he will find the facts just as I have stated them. I did not want to be entrapped into a warm discussion on this matter, but the hon. gentleman has challenged it, has provoked it, and I could not, with self-respect keep silent after the statements he has made. I am sorry to learn—I hope I have been mistaken—from the remarks that fell from him, that the statements I have made here to-night will prejudice the cause of the man in whose behalf I am speaking. I sincerely hope it is not so. I hope, not only for the cause of my client, but for the honor of the hon. Minister himself, that he will not allow a cause of this kind to be prejudiced by anything I may say. If the man is entitled to damages, let him have them; let justice be done him. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going, if I have transgressed in his opinion, to let my shortcomings or my failings prejudice the case in his own mind in connection with the claims of these unfortunate sufferers. Apart from Mr. McLeod, there are others—poor women—who have suffered. The very one for whom the hon. gentleman has proposed a vote to-night, probably lost her husband from this cause. There is no doubt that that accident contributed almost directly to his death from the shock it gave to his nervous system, and I hope that the case will be dealt with, and dealt with generously. The poor woman is left without a friend or protector in the world—I had not the honor to be her lawyer. Hon. gentlemen must not suppose that I was counsel for all the applicants; I was counsel for some, not for others. I hope, in dealing with the whole question, the hon. Minister will not allow himself to be governed entirely by the official statements, but that he will look at the sworn testimony, at the opinions of the Judges, and will consult men on his own side of politics who are not mixed up in the case, and he will find the statements I have given are correct statements, and are not exaggerated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has again discounted all he said by another indiscreet expression. The hon. gentleman, after making a violent statement of the case said, I hope you will not go to your lawyer for an opinion. What does he mean? That a retained advocate is an unsound authority to go to for an opinion. I am quite certain that those who have listened to the hon. gentleman will come to the conclusion that the last source to which to look for an unbiased and judicial opinion upon any

question is to a retained advocate in the case. I do not want to prolong the discussion further than to say that I am prepared to answer in the most explicit manner the only point which the hon. gentleman has named, and that is with regard to the superannuation of Mr. McNab. I have told the Committee the ground on which Mr. McNab was entrusted with the important duties which were placed in his charge; that having been entrusted for long years with vastly more important duties for the Government they were quite safe in placing the maintenance of the Prince Edward Island Railway under Mr. McNab's control. The facts were these: In order to reduce the expenditure we considered it unnecessary to have an engineer, a professional man on the 200 miles of the Island Railway. And what is the fact to-day? To-day the chief engineer of the Intercolonial in addition to his duties, makes a rapid trip over the Island Railway (Mr. McNab was engaged as a man of high standing knowledge and large experience), and yet hon. gentlemen opposite will not state that the Island Railway is not in a better condition to-day than at any time since its construction.

Mr. DAVIES. I said nothing about the bad condition of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And yet there is no engineer on the road, but it is only occasionally visited by Mr. Archibald of the Intercolonial. With respect to Mr. McNab's superannuation, the party press of which the hon. gentleman gave us an illustration, when he declared it was hounding Mr. McNab with the statement that he was to be arraigned for murder, made the management of the Island Railway the principal political topic of discussion in the Island.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. I tell the hon. gentleman that not only was that so, but when this accident occurred a brutal press—I do not hesitate to say so—taking advantage of this unfortunate and terrible accident, hounded Mr. McNab nearly out of his senses. I say that Mr. McNab, an able man, an engineer of high standing, an engineer to whom Mr. Brydges, after five years experience, gave a large salary on account of his worth and ability, was struck down by that press of Prince Edward Island which daily accused him of murder in the most foul manner, and aroused the population against him until Mr. McNab went to a doctor and said: Give me a certificate, I am unable to sleep.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen laugh; I say Mr. McNab, who had been an able man was stricken down and became a child. His doctor found him completely wrecked mentally on account of the violent assaults made upon him, and Mr. McNab brought that certificate to me and stated that it was absolutely necessary, if his health was not to break down utterly and become destroyed, that he should have one year's rest from duty. What could I do? Leave the Island Railway for one hour in the hands of a man who brought me a certificate from an able physician to say that he was utterly prostrated and incompetent, that his nervous system had collapsed and that it was utterly impossible for him to attend to business without danger to his life. What did I do? I said to Mr. McNab, I will relieve you to-morrow. Mr. McNab went back to the Island and in three weeks he implored me to put him back in his position, saying that he was as well as he ever was. I had all the evidence a man could desire of Mr. McNab's ability to hold the position; and he wrote a letter just before the accident stating, not that he was overworked, but that he was able to perform the duties with the most perfect ease, and was astonished to think that the chance of doing away with an engineer in addition to a superintendent had not occurred long ago. I desire further, merely to correct a statement of the hon. gentleman's that I had insinuated that the observations which had fallen from

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

him would prejudice the case; but we will not permit the hon. gentleman's indiscretion to have that effect in any way whatever.

Mr. BRECKEN. I think it is my duty to make a short statement in regard to the subject before the Committee. I am not acquainted with the details of the case as is my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) because he was counsel for some of the parties, and I have not been engaged professionally in any way in connection with it. I should be very sorry to allow any remark made by me to in any way prejudice the claim, if it is a claim, which Mr. McLeod and others may have on the clemency and grace of the Crown. But I must say this, that Mr. McLeod may say: "Save me from my friends." I do not hesitate to say that this very unfortunate accident was made a political hue-and-cry. I recollect when this accident took place, that two gentlemen, both in their graves now, one of whom was my political opponent in 1878, and for whom I had personally the greatest respect, and the other was a violent politician, went out to survey the debris of the accident. I agree with the language used by the hon. Minister of Railways, that the attacks made on Mr. McNab were atrocious, and I was intimate with that gentleman, and those attacks had a great deal to do with upsetting his nervous system and placing him in the state of nervous depression in which he was when he came to Ottawa. He was an exceedingly sensible man, an honorable man, a kind-hearted man—not one of that class of men who, if he escaped from an accident, would laugh at it. That man felt it as keenly as these men, who made their attacks upon him. He was an able man and very conscientious, and he believed he was doing his duty faithfully. He believed that this railway was in a good state. I am not prepared to say, because I was not out there, whether it was or not; but I saw two or three rotten sleepers exhibited by ardent politicians on the opposite side, and looked upon with as much curiosity as portions of the willow tree that drooped over the grave of Napoleon, on the Island of St. Helena. They were exhibited as one would take a specimen brick to show what a building was like. Little bits of crumbling railway sleepers were exhibited to prove the incapacity and worthlessness of the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald's Administration over the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES. Where did the hon. gentleman see those exhibits?

Mr. BRECKEN. Well, I can hardly tell you, but I saw them where they had a right to be. I am stating what is the case. Two violent politicians, who were just as well qualified to judge of the efficiency of this road as any two of the first men you might meet out of the Parliament buildings, went out there and filled the papers with atrocious attacks on this man. I know where I saw some of the specimens, however. It was where they had a perfect right to be—in a court of justice.

Mr. DAVIES. Did the hon. gentleman ever see them, except in a court of justice, in the hands of a sworn witness?

Mr. BRECKEN. Those you had I saw, but I do not know what pieces you had in court.

Mr. DAVIES. Did you ever see any other? I know you did not.

Mr. BRECKEN. Yes; I know what I am speaking of, and how dare the hon. gentleman say I did not see them. This little game of bluff of which the hon. gentleman has been accused time and again, is now practiced in this House. I do not want to bring in names; but they were brought in by hon. members now dead in their graves. The hon. gentleman knows, that two of our most violent opponents—if they were not heaven-born engineers, what took them there—went out and made a great ado about this matter. Another thing reached my ears. A man who was

fortunate enough to escape, lying at the Nun's Hospital ill, told me, that when it was thought he was going to die, the man who filled the office of coroner said: "I will be the man who will hold that inquest;" before he was acquainted with the evidence, in his political zeal to help his party, and to help his opponents, he was prepared to hold an inquest upon that man, and whether the hon. Minister of Railways, or Mr. McNab was to be indicted for murder, I suppose, was a matter of perfect indifference to him if he could thus help his political cause; that is the fact.

Mr. DAVIES. Who was that?

Mr. BRECKEN. I will mention no names. The hon. gentleman can very soon find out. I do not know what the hon. gentleman said of Mr. McNab, but I admired his colleague during the campaign last June.

Mr. DAVIES. I said nothing against Mr. McNab.

Mr. BRECKEN. I went from hustings to hustings, and I observed that at every one of the meetings the hon. gentleman never opened his lips against Mr. McNab, but his colleague (Mr. Laird), did. I know when the political machines went down to Prince Edward Island, I was ill at the time, and had not the privilege of hearing their speeches. The leader of the Opposition, Mr. Huntington, and Mr. Anglin, those gentlemen who were so secure in their own seats, certainly possessing the confidence of the people, that they need not look after their own constituents, became a commission to look after other people's constituencies, and the burden of the song of Mr. Anglin was the superannuation of Mr. McNab. I state that as a fact. I am not going to say what the cause of the accident was. I do not know. I saw specimens of sleepers, which were certainly very much decayed. I recollect this much about it: There was a car laden with coal, and some material was taken up to a factory. This was laid across two cars and lashed to them. And I know where the accident took place—at the foot of a grade at the commencement of a curve—after that trains—and I may be told, and that very properly, that this was on account of negligence—passed over this track the day before, and the day before that, and daily for years. And therefore, not professing to be a heaven-born engineer, I take that as sufficient proof, at any rate, that there was no *malice prepense* with which Mr. McNab was charged; and that the road was not in a deplorably rotten state, though, it is true, it is the last straw which breaks the camel's back. It was in evidence that new sleepers were put in there. It might have been, and probably was. The sleepers were left there in a state of decay; and if that was so, it was a very great misfortune and ought not to have been. But is that little circumstance to be made so much of? Why, if Mr. McNab had secretly instructed one of his employes to put a sleeper there and throw the train off the track, he could not have been attacked more vehemently than he was, as is well known. I cannot speak about Mr. McNab's superannuation, I know nothing at all about it, I had no right to know, my late colleague, Mr. Pope, was then in the Government, and I supposed, that this superannuation was based upon certain calculations; and I venture to say, that there is no Government official in Prince Edward Island, who found it necessary to be superannuated, that would not have made as big a claim as he possibly could. I do not know Mr. McNab's political claims, but I lived in Charlottetown while he was a resident there, and my hon. friend will agree with me, that he was a most estimable and honorable gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not said anything against him.

Mr. BRECKEN. I do not know that the hon. gentleman could. No man grieved more sincerely than that poor man owing to the terrible accident that occurred; and I think, to say the least of it, that my hon. friend's closing remarks

might have been just as well reserved. I believe that the press particularly should watch public works of this kind, where the lives and the limbs of the travelling public are every day at risk, and I am sure that the Minister of Railways, a humane man, I am confident, is as anxious as any hon. member on the other side of the House to have this work efficiently carried out. I will go further: Although I heard every particle of the evidence, perhaps the statement I am about to make will cause me to be told that I ought not to make it, because I do not give names, but I pledge my veracity for it, and hope that since I have been in the House, no hon. member has found me deviate from it; but I may say that not a fortnight ago, I was in conversation with a gentleman in Charlottetown, as intelligent as my hon. friend, and as well acquainted with the facts and circumstances of this case as almost any man not professionally engaged in it, and he said to me: "Brecken, that evidence was fearfully exaggerated." He gave me an instance of it; but it is a piece of information that I cannot, as an honorable man, in justice disclose, and he said he had the evidence of himself, having heard two statements from the same man, when he came into court. He stated that this evidence was frightfully exaggerated and was not up to the evidence which, he had stated, a few days before, he was prepared to give. Mr. McLeod is a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect; he sustained fearful injuries, and I hope that the Government will see their way to make some compensation to him, as well as to several others. I believe that Mr. McLeod conducted this matter upon business principles, and that he had too much discretion to be inclined to join in a political howl. But I do say, Sir, and I know it, and I do not know where my hon. friend's ears could have been when he did not know it, that it was treated as a political question and almost wholly as a political question in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. I never heard it.

Mr. BRECKEN. I have heard it a hundred times. The Minister of Railways sent out a professional engineer, a gentleman who once had charge of works on the Intercolonial railway, to take charge of a small road 200 miles long on Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman will not deny that a more conscientious man does not live in the Dominion of Canada. But supposing one of these men were negligent, does it follow that the Minister of Railways is responsible for the conduct of the thousands of men he has employed in the Dominion of Canada whom he has never seen and never will see? Supposing a track-master improperly lays the track and passes by three or four sleepers which are rotten, is that to be charged against the head of the department? If the hon. gentleman will look at the charges which have been made in the newspapers against the Minister of Railways, he will see that these charges could have had just as much foundation if they had been made against me; and I do not wonder that the Minister of Railways, looking at the animus found in these attacks, should not have come to the conclusion to which he came. I say this, that the indiscreet conduct of my hon. friend will not be allowed to prejudice the case. I know that that man suffered fearful injuries, and I for one would be sorry to take his injuries for damages the judges awarded. I hope the Government will see their way to make some compensation, because his injuries, as well as those of Mr. Stewart, were very severe, indeed. I say this, however, that the attacks which emanated from the Opposition were not prompted entirely by their feelings of humanity, or a desire to see this man compensated, but like everything else they have tried to turn the matter to political account. These attacks were tintured and permeated by that bitterness and acrimony which has always distinguished the political conduct of these gentlemen in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has endeavored, so far as in him lay, to destroy any possible claim that McLeod or Stewart might have on the Government, for if his statements are true I cannot see how the Government can possibly give it any consideration. The hon. gentleman says that he has private information to show that the evidence given was frightfully exaggerated, but I think he might at least have had the generosity, and the fairness to have given the name of his secret informer in order that we might ascertain whether his statements were true or false—whether he was credible or not. I think that he might have been generous enough to have taken this course instead of giving it to the House haphazard, without knowing whether the evidence was exaggerated or not. The hon. gentleman says that this question was made a political hue-and-cry in the Island, but he knows himself that I never opened my lips during the whole campaign about this question. He knows that in a thousand and one discussions which took place there, I might have made political capital of this matter, but as it was *sub judice* I never mentioned it.

Mr. BRECKEN. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had done so. I never uttered any such statement, because I do not know.

Mr. DAVIES. You were there every time I spoke.

Mr. BRECKEN. When the hon. gentleman speaks of my want of generosity he says nothing which surprises me, because I am so accustomed to hearing him speak in the same way. I have just as generous and disinterested feeling towards McLeod as he has, although he is politically opposed to me. But I repeat that political prejudice and political bias permeated the case, as it was managed by the Opposition outside the courts of justice, from beginning to end. With regard to the statement which I made before, I can only say as an honorable man and a gentleman, that if he doubts my word, let him come to me to-morrow and I will convince him of the truth of what I said, by a man who heard the statement from the lips of the man who gave the evidence, and I know the man's name. I said to my informant that that man was a Conservative. He said, you are wrong, Brecken, he is a renegade Conservative; he is no judge of railways. But I heard that man give a statement of the matter, and I heard his statement in court.

Mr. CASEY. I would just say that my knowledge of this case has been acquired chiefly, but I cannot help discussing a few of the points that have been raised. The hon. Minister of Railways has made a strong point of the agitation which existed in the Island on account of the state of the Railway. He said it went so far that, what he calls a brutal press, threatened to arraign Mr. McNab for murder if an accident occurred, and the hon. Minister of Railways asks us to believe that this tremendous agitation was got up about nothing. Why, Sir, he was too clever, when he made that statement; he proved a little too much when he talked about the agitation that existed in regard to the state of that road; he proved that there must have been cause for the excitement. If he expects us to believe that the press of Prince Edward Island were excited without cause, he wishes us to believe a statement that is "too thin," even from the Minister of Railways. Now, Sir, in opposition to the unsupported assertion of the Minister of Railways, that that road was in good order, we have the decision of a Court that the road was in bad order; and we are naturally inclined to believe the decision of these Judges, who heard the evidence, and who are better qualified to decide whether that evidence was perjured than the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who is an interested party. He says we should not believe the statements of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), because he was a hired advocate in the case; but if we are not to believe the statements of a hired advocate, what are we to think of the state-

ments of a principal? If the weight to be attached to his statements depended upon the loudness, the temper, the anger, the vehemence with which they were uttered, they would certainly bear great weight. We are asked to put out of sight the decision of a judicial tribunal and accept the frothy, vehement statements of one of the principals, who was interested in securing a verdict against the plaintiff, just as much as the plaintiff was interested in securing a verdict against the Government. Suppose we do accept the unsupported statements of the defendants in this case, and admit that Mr. McNab was as efficient a man as could be found; we have the fact that, with an efficient manager, an accident occurred on the road. Now, an accident does not occur without some reason; it does not occur if everything is in good order. The inference is perfectly clear that the road must have been out of order; and whose fault was it, if not the fault of the manager? It was the fault of the hon. Minister of Railways himself. He has described in touching terms, the state of mind of this poor Mr. McNab, when he thought that life was lost as the result of mismanagement. I can appreciate his feelings when he thought that the responsibility of this accident rested upon his shoulders, when the real responsibility rested on the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Railways, who, by his mean policy, was starving out the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, in order to produce a false appearance of economy. The hon. gentleman said that a political agitation arose out of this matter. I should not consider it unlikely that there would be a political feeling against the Government, which held the lives of the people so cheap, as to leave that road in the condition they did. That was bad enough; but when the Government descending to the meanness of refusing to acknowledge their responsibility for the accidents that occurred, there will be a political agitation, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Railways, that it will not be confined to Prince Edward Island, but will ring through the whole Dominion. He will find it even cheaper to have acquiesced in the judgment of the court and paid the damages than to bring such a hornet's nest about his ears as he will by the course he is now following. Since he has appealed to a technicality, and that appeal has been successful, there is no judge of what should be paid in cases of this kind except the hon. Minister himself. The hon. Minister of Railways is the judge of what is right; and what a judge! Have we not heard his judicial remarks here to-night? Have we not heard with what impartiality and fairness he has declared that witnesses had been got to perjure themselves in order that the case might go against the Government? He said that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had got a man to perjure himself. We can understand with what confidence the friends of those whose lives are lost or those whose limbs are broken on the Government railways will feel in a man, who speaking in his judicial capacity, can use language such as the hon. Minister of Railways has used to-night. Sir, if anything were needed to convince the House and the country that it was absolutely necessary to remove such obstacles as appear to exist to making the Government liable, as it is in justice and decency in matters of this kind, it would be the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, for they were remarks which no man, who wishes to act honestly and decently in matters of this kind, would have ventured to address to the House. I cannot conceive of any reason for those remarks except the reason he has imputed to his opponent. I cannot conceive that he has any spite against the poor people who have been injured on Government roads, but I imagine that he has some spite against those who have pleaded the cases of these people, and he has allowed political animosity to influence him in a matter of compensation for a hopeless case of disablement, caused by the carelessness and inefficiency of his own officers.

Mr. BRECKEN.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item of \$5,000 for the Windsor Branch and \$500 for the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The \$5,000 is required for the maintenance of the Windsor Branch. By the arrangement with the company the Government receives one-third of the gross receipts of the road. This expenditure will be covered to a large extent by the amount received from the third of the receipts. The item of \$500 is to pay some accounts incurred while the line was operated by the Government.

322. Canals..... \$34,745.14

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are \$20,930 required for maintenance of the Welland Canal, over and above what is required for the year to the 1st July, and the amount taken by the vote for that service. There are other amounts required similarly on the other canals to make up the balance. I have all the particulars of this proposed expenditure, and they are simply those incidental to the maintenance of canals.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:20 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 14th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

The following Report was laid on the Table:

General Report of the Minister of Public Works, from the 30th June, 1867, to the 1st of July, 1882, accompanied by balances of Appendices to said Report, from 1867 to 1882. —(Sir Hector Langevin).

THE CASE OF MR. HÉBERT.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to know whether the Government has had a report from the hon. Minister of Justice, in the case of Hébert. Since that time, the Government will have learned that Mr. Hébert has been found guilty and condemned to \$200 damages and costs; and, therefore, as he is in the service of the Government, on the Intercolonial Railway, I hope the Government will take notice of the fact, and give Mr. Hébert the same treatment that he has received from the court of justice. I do not think he ought to be retained in that position any longer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see the hon. Minister of Justice, and give the hon. gentleman an answer tomorrow.

ORANGE DEMONSTRATION AT OTTAWA.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter which is considered especially important to those members who do not belong to the same religion as the hon. member from Hastings (Mr. White). Friday or Saturday last a large meeting was held in the city of Ottawa, and at this meeting the following address was presented:

“ ADDRESS:

“ John White, Esq., M.P.,

“ DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—Your friends in the Ottawa district, comprising the counties of Russell, Ottawa, Carleton and city of Ottawa,

cannot allow you to leave them without expressing to you their heartfelt admiration of the noble stand made by you in your place in Parliament in defence of their rights while the Orange Incorporation Bill was under discussion. We would have felt deeply mortified had the Bill been withdrawn (as was the desire of some of those to whose charge the Grand Lodge had entrusted the matter), and we owe it to your steadfast adherence to the will of the Grand Lodge, as expressed by resolution, that such a mortification was spared us. It will be always a source of the greatest satisfaction to us that the said Bill was brought to a vote, and that thereby we were enabled to ascertain who our friends are, and to prove the want of sincerity of the professions of toleration of those of the Roman Catholic faith, and who have always been treated with so much moderation by members of the Order. It will ever be a proud remembrance for you to look back to the exciting occasion and to feel that by your forbearance and moderation, in the face of the ravings of bigotry, intolerance and ignorance, that you spoke no word that could be tortured to appear as injurious to the cause of which you were the honored champion; that while you undauntedly upheld our rights, you were careful not to attack the principles of any others. We know that though for the moment we have been denied the commonest rights by an intolerant and ungrateful combination, that the great principles of which the Orange Order is the exponent are eternal and must prevail.

“ The glorious principles of the Revolution of 1698 are too thoroughly imbed in the hearts of Orangemen for them ever to sanction the attempt to deprive any body of men of their rights; but while we are careful not to encroach upon the rights of others, we will not suffer any tampering with our own, and we will teach our intolerant maligners that our sainted ancestors did not shed their hearts' blood in vain at the battle of the Boyne. To us the memory of the heroes who defended the walls of Derry, and who smote the minions of Rome at Aughrim, shall be as an example, and we will emulate their deeds, not in shedding blood, but by the arts of peace, in demanding our rights and taking such a stand on political questions as will enable us to obtain these rights respective of party. While our sympathies have hitherto been largely with one political party, we shall hereafter be more independent towards both of the great political parties, and give our support only in favor of those who are willing to emancipate us from the thralldom of Rome. We shall ever remember that we are Protestants first, and that no party can secure our support that will deny us our rights.

“ It being the duty of every true Orangeman to aid and defend the loyal subjects, of every religious persuasion, in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights, we have been ever ready to grant to the Roman Catholics such measures as they deemed necessary for the freedom of the exercise of their religion and the education of their children. We have, in many instances, exhibited our moderation in electing them in purely Protestant constituencies, and in all ways have sought to live together in amity and peace. And how have we been met? By a display of bigotry and intolerance that is a disgrace to this enlightened age. From the proceedings in Parliament on the Orange Incorporation Bill we have learned a bitter, but salutary lesson, and one that will bear fruit in due season. While we disclaim an intolerant spirit, we declare that henceforth the Roman Catholics must be prepared to reap as they have sown, and that if we are such disturbers of the peace as they declare us to be, we will for the future abstain from voting for them, and so deprive them of the power to mortify us by refusing to grant to us the same rights that we have always cheerfully accorded to them. Trusting that you may long be spared to take a foremost part in the council of our beloved Order, and that it may always receive the benefit of your sound and mature advice, we subscribe ourselves on behalf of the brethren.

“ Yours in the bonds of faith, hope and charity.”

Among the signatures he who has displayed the most charity is one named Edward C. Barber, who, I am informed, is an employé of the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Read all the names.

Mr. LANDRY. I do not know them all. I know one of them, and, if I am well informed, he is an employé of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reading of extracts from newspapers is not in order, unless the hon. member is to follow it up by some motion, and then the practice is to have these papers read at the Table by the Clerk. The mere reading of newspapers by hon. members is not a practice that ought to be encouraged.

Mr. LANDRY. I will make a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion must be pertinent to the matter read from the newspaper submitted to the House.

Mr. LANDRY. The motion will be pertinent.

“After the cessation of the most vociferous cheering, Mr. White replied as follows:—

“ WORTHY SIR AND BROTHERS,—It is with much pleasure, upon all occasions that I meet with my Orange brethren in this or any part of Canada; but I can assure you that I am unworthy of this grand reception. This is not the first time that I have been so kindly received by the Orangemen of this section of the country. But a few years ago I met with you, when I was presented with a most handsome

Orange collar and address. To-night I meet you again, but under different circumstances, and I am glad to meet you. In speaking of the Incorporation Bill and the influences that were brought to bear with the view of withdrawing it, he said no, he could not disgrace the Bill and the Orangemen by such a proceeding. He came from the wrong part of Ireland to be so easily led away from so important a duty. He was born in Donegal, and had sprung from a family that had stood the siege of Derry, and had proved their determination by enduring the hardships of one of the most terrible battles ever recorded, by living on horse flesh, rats, &c., sooner than surrendering. They had to blame themselves for not having the Act of Incorporation. It was the duty of all to stand true to their church and families. There is no use finding fault with members of the House of Commons. He asked them 'Had they been true to themselves?' As far as the Bill was concerned, he refused to take hold of it at first, because he was not a speaker, and thought it should have been given to others better qualified; on that account he refused, but was subsequently encouraged to take hold of it as the committee felt it would fall through if he did not. He then made reference to the postponements of the measure while before the House; he said he was not to blame for it. The Most Worshipful Grand Master, Mr. Merrick, M.P.P., had, after its first reading, asked him to withdraw it, but he (White) would not. He asked the members to not censure the Grand Master yet, till he had an opportunity of giving his reasons for so doing, which opportunity would be afforded at St. Catharines this summer at the Grand Lodge meeting. He (White) had been offered in the House of Commons another Bill, but he was determined at the outset to accept no compromise. The Orange Bill had been put into his hands, and he would have that second reading, so as to know who were his friends and who were his enemies. He asked where was the Bill—the compromise—which was promised them, in the Commons to-day? He alluded to Sir Alexander Campbell's Bill introduced in the Senate to relieve the disabilities of Odd-fellows, the Orange Society, &c., in the Province of Quebec. A Committee of seven Roman Catholics and five Protestants had been put on that Bill, and he asked, why did it fall through? Also that other Bill of Mr. McCaul's had been laid on the shelf. Had he (the speaker) given way to the intrigues of those persons, where would they be to-day? Their enemies would have laughed at them and sneered at them, and said John White had taken the dirty shilling. He said they had got along well without incorporation, and he for one would never surrender the word 'Orange' from the Bill if they were never to get incorporation. (Loud cheers.) Speaking of societies and their secrecy, he said no church or society under the sun was so secret as the Roman Catholic Church. One of its members could take a life, rob, destroy or commit any crime, and then go to his priest and confess without fear of the law being informed. It was a disgrace to Quebec Province to claim that a loyal and religious society like this was illegal. He drew their attention to the fact that they (the Orangemen) had received no support from a Roman Catholic excepting friend Hawkins, who is now slurred at in consequence. Every Orangemen and Protestant should respect Mr. Hawkins. He spoke of the dissatisfaction prevailing in Toronto and the rumored formation of a third party. He said there could be but two parties in this country, and for Orangemen to stand true to those men who stand true to them, and never mind his party. Speaking of the proposed abolition of the French tongue from the House of Commons, he said Orangemen always adhered to the laws of the country. That right has been acceded to them by the Treaty of Paris, and was therefore law. The French-Canadians love the French language as taught them by their mothers, and let them have it. Again their Orange brethren in Toronto proposed a new party to do away with the Separate Schools. Separation from the Public Schools have done the Protestants good, therefore he would let them stay as they were, and would assist them to get educated in that manner, sooner than have none at all, which would be the case had they not separation and were compelled to contribute to the Public Schools. Going back to the Bill he defended some of those M.P.'s who abstained from taking part in the debate because they were not speakers, but did all they could with their influence and their votes. He here narrated a little anecdote of an old lady in the South during the war, who came out with a broom stick on her shoulders, and upon the officer informing that he could cut her in pieces for so doing, said: 'Yes, but I want to show which side I am on.' It was the same with some of their friends in the Commons. He spoke of Mr. Langevin, and said he favored the church of Rome more than the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada. He appealed to the young men present to be loyal to the flag of Britain. Referring to friend Curran, of Montreal, he said it was all that he could do to keep himself on the floor of the Commons from using harsh language in reply to the unbecoming, ungenerous, unmanly utterances of Curran. He said that if the Battle of the Boyne is to be fought over again in Montreal, he believed it would be, as lately expressed by the Rev. Dr. Wilde, in Toronto, with the same results—right against wrong. He said he and other Orangemen had made mistakes in the late and former elections, and cited one mistake as being that of opposing Mr. Bethune when running against Dr. Bergin. He believed that had Mr. Bethune, although a Reformer, been in the House during this Session, the Bill would have been carried to-day. He said Mr. Bethune was one of the truest friends they had in this country, and they well knew him to be one of the most able and eloquent. Many Conservative members had asked and begged of him not to ruin them, but he told them he would stand by the Order first. Another mistake was that of assisting to elect a Frenchman in Russell and an Irish Roman Catholic (Mr. Baskerville) in Ottawa city, and said he was now ashamed of his actions; he hoped the Orangemen would forgive him for asking them to vote for Baskerville. There are very few Hawkines. One Roman Catholic member of the House whose name he did not wish to

Mr. LANDRY,

mention, said to him privately: 'How can we vote for this Bill when the priest says he has power from the Pope to damn those of his constituencies who dare vote for a candidate for parliamentary honors who would support such a measure.' If the Conservatives would not stand true to us, then let us be Reformers. He likened them, at the present day, as being between the devil and the deep sea—the Roman Catholics and the Reformers. He kindly praised the Reformers who supported the Bill. He believed Mr. Blake had made a mistake in voting against the second reading. It was, at that time, within his grasp to have the united Orange vote of Ontario. Speaking of Orange loyalty, he defied the world to say that they were disloyal in any country in which they lived. He thanked God they could not say they (the Orangemen) were disloyal in any country, and asked: were they Orangemen who were creating disturbance in France, Italy, Spain, the United States, or in any other country? No. He exhorted them to band together more closely. In his first election he received two Roman Catholic votes, next seven, and at last it stretched up to thirty-five. All liberal-minded Protestants were satisfied they should have this Bill. He would always be true to the Orange society, and related some touching little incidents in his young days by way of advice from his mother. He was under a deep sense of obligation to the Ottawa brethren, and hoped at some time to meet in that Grand Lodge above which the Rev. Bro. George preaches about.

"BAND—'PROTESTANT BOYS.'

"The chair hoped the brethren would remember the remarks of Bro. White, and at future elections vote for the man. Roman Catholics hated Protestants, but he thought they hated the Orange a little more.

"Mr. Scott, M.P., then addressed the brethren, and made mention of the formation of the first Orange lodge in Manitoba, it being organized in an old schooner by the officers and men of the 1st Ontario Rifles. He believed that within the space of ten years, through the progress of the Anglo-Saxon race, that the French language would become extinct in Manitoba. He was glad to hear the brethren had won the case at the Court of Appeal.

"Several other brethren addressed the meeting in response to the toasts made, among them being Messrs. F. Clemow, W. Porter, Dawson, Jas. Clarke, E. C. Barber, &c.

"The meeting came to a close about 1:30 a.m., with cheers for Bro. John White and the Queen, and all joining in singing the National Anthem."

I want to call the attention of the Government to these facts. I know the Government is not at all—

Mr. MITCHELL. Partisan.

Mr. LANDRY. Not at all responsible for the utterances of the hon. member for Hastings, nor for those of the hon. member for Winnipeg; but one thing strikes me, that which was delivered by one of the employés of the Government, and really we want to know what are the views of the Government on the question. I remember in a similar case, when Mr. Huntington made a speech in Argenteuil, the matter was brought before the House, and different members gave their views on the subject with great satisfaction to all parties. I suppose in this case a similar thing will be done. We want to know whether the sentiments proffered by the hon. member for Hastings are those which should find place in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman proceeded to read the extracts after I called his attention to the fact that the reading should be followed by a motion founded on the matter he brought forward. These papers, if they should be read at all, should have been read by the Clerk at the Table. It is an inconvenient practice that extracts and papers should be read by members. When there are any extracts to read containing any observations or reflections on any members of this House with regard to their action, they should be read by the Clerk at the Table, and then followed by a motion. As there is no motion in this case, I must call the Orders of the Day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the dignity of the House has been infringed on. The hon. member had declared his intention to propose a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question before the House.

SUPPLY—ROYAL ACADEMY OF ARTS.

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



Mr. JAURIER. I beg to call the attention of the House to the following memorial, presented to the Government by the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

"The memorial of the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts respectfully sheweth:

"That the meeting of the Conference at which the foundation was laid of the Confederation of the Provinces constituting the Dominion of Canada, is an event of such importance in the annals of the country as to make it desirable that it should be commemorated in a painting which would present not only the assemblage, but authentic portraits of the distinguished statesmen who took part in the deliberations.

"That such a painting would not only be a work of present interest to the people of Canada, but that the interest will be an ever increasing one, as the fabric of Confederation, the very foundation of which the picture will commemorate, continues to assume still larger and grander proportions, in the extension and consolidation of British North American nationality.

"That every year which is allowed to elapse adds to the difficulty of executing such a work. Already, in the sixteen years since Confederation, several of the actors have passed from the scene.

"That an opportunity now offers for the execution of this work in the presence here of Mr. Harris, a Canadian artist of ability, who has returned from prosecuting his studies and practising his art in Europe, and who is fully competent to paint such a picture.

"The entrusting of such a commission to a Canadian would be an encouragement to the whole profession of Art in Canada. Such encouragement is needed; for the want of it our country has repeatedly been denuded of its most promising artists, who have been drawn away by the recognition of their merits abroad, and other countries are now enriched by the product of their labor.

"Wherefore, we humbly pray that a commission may be entrusted to the artist named for the immediate prosecution of this very desirable work.

"Signed on behalf of the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.

"L. R. O'BRIEN,  
"President.

"OTTAWA, April 28th, 1883."

This memorial, as I am informed, has been in the hands of the Government for some time past; but the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts have not so far received any answer from the Government. We can all well understand that, perhaps, His Excellency would feel some delicacy in supporting the request for financial aid to a project in which he has himself taken so prominent a part. But believing, as I do, that the idea expressed in this memorial is a good one, I will now beg to bring the matter before the House, with the hope that the prayer set forth in the memorial will receive the unanimous approbation of the House of all shades of opinion. Last year we commenced in this city what we were pleased to call the Canadian Art Gallery, and which we intend shall become in time our National Picture Gallery. Everyone of us will agree that on the walls of that gallery it is very desirable to have pictures illustrating Canadian history—the whole Canadian history—from Jacques Cartier's time to the epoch of Confederation, at all events. Confederation is the last of our great historical events, and a great event it certainly was, for this country. In fact, it is no extravagance to say it was a revolution, a peaceful revolution, but no less effective for all that. Now, it is well known that that measure, as well as two or three other changes of a similar nature, did not at the outset receive the unanimous support of all the people of this country. It was attacked and resisted in many quarters; and I am free to say that in the Province from whence I came, the men with whom I have been associated were at first hostile to Confederation—not hostile to the principles of Confederation—but to the scheme as it was then proposed; but hon. gentlemen in this House know that those men after that scheme had become law, submitted with good grace to what had taken place, and loyally contributed to make it a success. I am sure that many hon. members of this House will remember, and fondly remember, that one of the men who most heartily and cheerfully accepted the new order of things,

though he had been just as sincerely opposed to Confederation while the question was a debatable one, was our late lamented friend the hon. Mr. Holton. Now, in the same spirit, not only to be faithful to the principle of Confederation, but to give it all the illustration in our power, it seems to me that the painting of that historic scene at which the basis of Confederation was laid, would be a highly desirable and very popular work, and it is for that reason that I bring this question before the House. It is not simply because I approve of this project, and think that the event which gave birth to Confederation should be commemorated, but because I think it should be commemorated by a Canadian artist, that I take great pleasure in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and Government. I am anxious to give to our Canadian artists all the encouragement we can give them as individuals and as a Parliament. We are not deficient in artistic talent, I believe; on the contrary, that this country is extremely prolific of artistic talent. Unfortunately, too few of those talents bloom into full development, because of the obstacles which they encounter, and the little encouragement they receive in this country. But, notwithstanding all the obstacles which beset them, we are proud to remember that in almost every branch of art we have distinguished artists whose talents have been consecrated to the best uses. I understand Mr. Harris, who is named in this petition, is one of them. Mr. Harris has prosecuted his studies for some time in Paris, where, I believe, he stands very high in his profession. We have seen some of his pictures exhibited in the Library, and although I am not myself a competent critic of paintings, they have been pronounced of great excellence by men who are capable of judging. We have also all been glad to hear that four Canadian artists have had their works admitted at the Paris Salon, and of those four one is a young lady who bears a name already illustrious in this country; two others are also young ladies, daughters of a gentleman who was formerly a popular and respected member of this House. In another branch of art, that of sculpture, all those who have seen the model for the statue of Sir George E. Cartier, have been glad to know that it was the work of a Canadian artist, who carried off the palm of success against competition all over the world; and everyone of us must come to the conclusion that the achievement of Mr. Hébert is certainly one of which all Canadians may feel proud. In another branch of art, in music, it is a source of pride to us to remember that one of the three great singers of the age is a Canadian lady. Now, these are not the only artistic talents we have amongst us; I am sure we have many others who would make their mark if they had the same opportunity. We all know, doubtless, of some young gentleman endowed with artistic talents, but who, for the want of encouragement, has been obliged to devote himself to some other employment in order to earn his living. Now, I, for one, am desirous to give all possible encouragement to young artists, and for this reason I have a peculiar pleasure in bringing this petition before the House. There is one paragraph which seems to me to be sadly true; it is this:

"Such encouragement is needed; for the want of it, our country has repeatedly been denuded of its most promising artists, who have been drawn away by the recognition of their merits abroad, and other countries are now enriched by the product of their labor."

Mr. Harris has finished his studies abroad, and has come back to our shores, and I, for one, am anxious to give him such encouragement as we can. If the Government, under these circumstances, think it desirable to bring in a small appropriation of \$3,000 or \$4,000 for carrying out the idea here expressed, I have reason to believe that it will meet with the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker: It is with much pleasure that I second the proposition of the hon. member for Quebec East. That hon. gentleman has placed his case before the House in such a graceful and appropriate manner that little remains to be said concerning it. But I have been requested by a number of gentlemen, both inside and outside this House, to say a few words on this matter, which they conceive to be of importance to the inhabitants of this Dominion. It has been suggested that in the youth of this country, under the very spring-time of the life of the Canadian people, some attempt should be made to perpetuate the memory of an event which may be called the birthday of the Dominion. It has been suggested that a Canadian artist should be selected to preserve and embalm, in an historical picture, the very form and appearance of the men who, animated by a lofty patriotism and a far-seeing statesmanship, conceived and carried into execution the idea of building up, on the northern part of this continent, a great British power, which, while cherishing Canadian sentiment and aspirations, would preserve the laws, traditions, and institutions of the Empire, and be animated by an undying love for the old lands beyond the sea. The event which it is proposed to perpetuate is the meeting of that Quebec Conference, which was held on the 10th of October, 1864. On that occasion the foundation of the Dominion were broadly and deeply laid and cemented with the love, loyalty and affection of a gallant and generous people. We have the actors and the theatre on which was performed this great historical drama. We want to delineate and preserve them, so that they may be held in everlasting remembrance. Perhaps I may be permitted to give a brief historical *resumé* of the events which preceded this meeting. I entered political life in 1863, and I well remember the fierce political conflicts which were of almost daily occurrence. There were giants in those days, and the picked men of the Canadian people were selected to lead the assault and maintain the defence. Nearly every week witnessed a vote of want of confidence. So evenly were the great parties balanced, so skilled were the leaders in parliamentary tactics, that constitutional Government seemed almost impossible. You can imagine how gallant was the attack and how desperate the defence, when George Brown, Sandfield Macdonald, A. A. Dorion and Wm. McDougall, and many other gallant gentlemen and able statesmen, held the fort; while John A. Macdonald, G. E. Cartier, A. T. Galt and D'Arcy McGee led the stormers. In the main, the warfare was conducted on generous and chivalrous principles. It was at times like the contest between the French and English Guards at Fontenoy: "Messieurs of the French Guards will please fire first!" At other times, I am free to confess, a more irregular and guerilla system of warfare prevailed. But when the battle was over our bugles sang truce, and we smoked the pipe of peace and passed about the wine cups, as did the French and English soldiers at the battle of Busaco. This state of things could not last, and it became absolutely necessary that a change should take place. It was under these circumstances that the great coalition between the Liberal and Conservative parties took place. At this time the idea of a great Confederation of the Provinces of British North America loomed up as a possible solution of a very difficult problem. This idea originated with the statesmen of the Maritime Provinces, who held a meeting at Charlottetown for the purpose of forming a federation of the Provinces on the sea-board. The leading Liberal and Conservative Canadian statesmen attended this convention, and the result was the great meeting of Provincial delegates at Quebec, on the 10th

Mr. LAURIER.

of October, 1864. A writer of this period tells us that the place of meeting was one of historic interest—the time, the men, and the circumstances were peculiar. Beneath the shadow of Cape Diamond, on the ruins of the old Castle of St. Louis, with the broad St. Lawrence stretching away in front, the Plains of Abraham in sight, and the St. Charles winding its silvery way through, seems replete with the memory of Old France. It was at this grand old fortress that the toilers of the sea and the toilers of the land made their solemn compact—a compact which bound them to stand shoulder to shoulder, and hold this lone outpost of the Empire against all odds. It was on the ruins of the old Chateau of St. Louis that the Englishmen and Frenchmen struck their hands together, not in deadly, but in friendly rivalry, to decide the destinies and mould the future of the northern part of this continent. Ninety years before, when the first Congress of the thirteen States met at Philadelphia, it was in defiance of the authority and of the country from which their people sprung. Now, the delegates from the British North American Provinces met with the full sanction of their Sovereign and the Imperial Parliament. In their deliberations, and the forming of their Constitution, they would have the benefit of the experience of the working of that Constitution, which, under conditions somewhat similar to their own as to country, institutions and people, had carried the United States through half a century of triumphant progress. It would be for them to avoid those causes of dissension which had created the then existing troubles of the United States. This great scheme was at last fully realized; Nova Scotia and New Brunswick joined the Union, the Great Lone Land and British Columbia became parts of the Confederation, Prince Edward Island threw in her fortunes with the Dominion, and at last Newfoundland was the only colony without the pale. Lord Monck opened the first Dominion Parliament at Ottawa, November 8th, 1867. In his speech on the occasion His Lordship gave utterance to the following remarkable words: "I congratulate you on the legislative sanction which has been given by the Imperial Parliament to the Act of Union, under the provisions of which we are now assembled, and which has laid the foundation of a new nationality that, I trust and believe, will ere long extend its bounds from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean." Well, the prophecy of His Excellency has been realized; the Dominion of Canada extends from ocean to ocean. The Minister of Railways, in his speech the other night, assured us that at no distant day the railway system would unite with an iron band the Atlantic and the Pacific. Well, the New Jerusalem, the North-West, dawns upon our vision. If one side of the statements concerning that El-Dorado of the North-West be correct, we have in that country what Dr. Johnson said of Threal's Brewery: "The potentiality of wealth before the dreams of avarice." But we have also in the older Provinces, notably in the county which I have the honor to represent, agricultural, mineral, lumbering and other resources, which will compare favorably with those of any part of the Dominion. And I trust that while we will do all in our power to advance the interests of the younger members of our political family, we will not forget the older Provinces. Who can forget that first meeting of the Dominion Parliament? It was composed of the foremost men, the very flower of the Dominion. In the front rank, literally the head and front of the offending, stood the right hon. the leader of the Government, who then, as now, stood first in the Councils of his Sovereign, and foremost in the hearts of his countrymen. I am certain that we are all pleased to see that, after an arduous Session, he still maintains that singular

R

statecraft and political prescience which characterized him in the days of yore. Next to him stood his colleague and brother-in-arms, the gallant Sir George E. Cartier, who represented so well the gallant and chivalrous race to which he belonged, and whose memory will always be cherished by a large majority of the Canadian people. There stood, also, the hon. Minister of Public Works, who was then, as now, the indefatigable worker, the kindly and genial gentleman, and the able statesman. Nova Scotia sent us a magnificent contingent. First was the hon. Minister of Railways, who came to us with no supporters from his native Province; he was backed up only by his own matchless eloquence and dauntless courage. We all remember how he was ringed round by his abler countrymen, and how sternly he fought the fight and kept his faith in the cause of Union and progress, until Union perched upon his banners. There was also that grand old statesman, Joseph Howe, of whom Canada and Nova Scotia may well feel proud. He came to us in the evening of his days, somewhat broken by his long services in the cause of constitutional Government. New Brunswick sent us men of great ability, among them the hon. Minister of Finance, who by his practical ability and profound knowledge of economical questions has done so much towards developing the resources of the Dominion. There also came the hon. member from Northumberland, Peter Mitchell, the leader of a great party, destined, perhaps, at no distant period, to exercise a vast influence, but which at present is more distinguished for intelligence and genius than its numbers. That hon. gentleman, as we are all aware, built up a magnificent department, which has been of incalculable benefit to the country. It is to be regretted that, while always foremost in the fray and fight, he was always late at the division of the spoil. Then, we recollect the gallant Irishman, the brilliant orator, the true poet, and great statesman, the late lamented D'Arcy McGee, who went out from the light of this room one night, after delivering a speech replete with patriotic sentiments, into the darkness to his doom. We had also many other able men, some of whom I see before me, but many of whom sleep that sleep that knows no waking; and I think it would be well that the appearances of those men should be perpetuated by a Canadian artist. Therefore it is that I have most earnestly supported the proposition of the hon. member from Quebec East. We have been told that there are certain ideas which preside over the human intelligence. These are the ideas of industry, justice, religion, the beautiful and the true. In a young land like ours, where nearly every man is engaged in the fierce race for wealth, or the active struggle for existence, we have little time to study the beautiful. Lord Roseberry said the other day that this was the age of the bees, and not of the wasps. The whole land is teeming with life, energy and activity. The hot lava of youth courses through the veins of industrial and social bodies. Under those circumstances, it is very pleasing to find some men who step aside out of the dust and turmoil of political and commercial warfare, and devote themselves to the study of the good, the true and the beautiful. I believe that our Canadian artists are worthy of all honor and respect. I am satisfied that there are among them men of genius, whose works will reflect credit on their native land. I think that those men deserve every encouragement which the Government and general public can afford. Even if they were not men of marked ability, as a Canadian I would be disposed to stand by and encourage them, saying, as Touchstone did of Audrey: "They are all our own." I have much pleasure in seconding the proposition of the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, as I asked the hon. member for Quebec East, to speak little louder. I myself, in common with most of the hon. gentlemen around me, failed to be able to understand what motion he was making. May I ask now what motion is before the Chair? And I take this opportunity of saying, I do think that when I ask any person addressing the Chair on an important motion before the House to speak a little louder he should do so, in order that we might know and intelligently consider any proposition made to the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion now before the House is that I do now leave the Chair, and that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MITCHELL. A very proper motion. I second it.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry that I could not be heard by the hon. gentleman. I regret that I cannot speak any louder, as I am suffering just now from an affection of the throat, which prevents me speaking louder.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant). I want to say one word. I suppose that my hon. friend from Ottawa county in enumerating the principal characters which took part in this great scheme has omitted to mention the name of one of these gentlemen, which I at any rate hold in very high regard—one who sleeps the sleep that the hon. gentleman spoke so nicely about with reference to another gentleman. I am sure that it was simply an oversight on his part, as he was one of the most prominent actors in that matter—I refer to the hon. George Brown, of course.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is really one of those occasions in which the asperities of politics are forgotten, and the amenities of social and political life are remembered. I think that the House must have listened with great pleasure and satisfaction to the remarks which were made by the hon. gentleman who sits opposite to me, and by my hon. friend from Ottawa county, who so gracefully seconded his proposition. It is true that this subject was laid before the Government a little while ago, and that no answer has been given to it; but I take it, from the remarks made by those hon. gentlemen and from the general consent which their suggestions have received from the House, that we may conclude that it is the desire of the House that this commemorative painting should be prepared by a Canadian artist, and should adorn, or, at all events, be present in the halls of the country. My hon. friend from Quebec East has truly said, that Confederation was, in fact, a revolution—peaceful it is true, but still a revolution, and it is one of the gratifications which Canadians in the future will have, when they read the history of their country, to know that so great a revolution, altering the Constitution, and changing the position of four scattered and separate Provinces into a position of a proud and strong Dominion, was carried without a blow being struck, without a drop of blood being shed, and without life being endangered. It was my pleasure to call attention in the first Confederation meeting at Quebec, to the marked difference between this revolution in Canada and the one which took place in the thirteen colonies. In 1864, we had nearly the same population as the thirteen colonies, had when they severed themselves by force from the Mother Country; and it was a remarkable thing that, approaching to 4,000,000 inhabitants living under the same Government, under the descendant of the same Sovereign—the first resolution which was adopted at Quebec was this: That the four Provinces should be one united country under the perpetual Sovereignty of Her

Majesty and her descendants. Of course, as in every other great change, we were not unanimous in arriving at the present Constitution in all its details. Of course, it would be impossible to suppose in a free-thought country like this, that we should have been unanimous—unanimity would have been a proof of want of freedom. I cordially appreciate the remarks of my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier) when he says that those who opposed Confederation had cordially and loyally accepted the decision of the majority of the people of Canada, or the Parliament of Canada, and of the Parliament of England. As he truly said, one of the leaders of the opposition to the new Constitution in its details, and in some of its principles, was a distinguished statesman from the Province of Quebec, my great friend, though always my political opponent, Sir Aimé Dorion, the distinguished Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec. No man acted more loyally under the new Constitution which was adopted than he did, as was shown on his entering into the Government and assuming the responsibilities of Government under the new Constitution, and, whether on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, doing his very best, exercising his great abilities to carry out loyally and faithfully in practice, the principles of the Constitution which was laid down in the British North America Act of 1867. I am sure it was a mere accidental omission on the part of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) that he did not allude to the merging of all political parties, of all political dissent, of all political asperities for the good of the country in 1864. No man entered into the scheme more strongly, more zealously, and more earnestly, than the hon. George Brown; and everybody that remembers that hon. gentleman, must remember that whatever he did, he did with all his might. He entered into this scheme with all his great energy—then at its height—with all his physical strength, and all his mental and intellectual power; he entered into the work manfully, and he associated with him two other gentlemen of the Liberal Party, the present Premier of Ontario, and the hon. William Macdougall; and I must say that I never had three colleagues belonging to my own party, of the same political proclivities as myself, who worked more honestly or manfully carrying out at Quebec those resolutions which formed the basis and foundation of the Confederation under which we now live. Sir, it was a great event, for good or for evil. Here were four Provinces to be formed into one, in the first place, and, with statesmanlike provision, the conference entered into the work, not for the purpose of only uniting those four Provinces, not for the simple purpose of curing the anarchy—the almost perilous, hazardous anarchy which existed in the Old Province of Canada—but they entered into it with the far-seeing design of raising on this continent an auxiliary England, similar to all its principles, and in most of its practices, to the Mother Country; to unite the whole British race, and those whom circumstances had made British subjects—and who were among the most valuable of the British subjects on this continent—to unite them altogether, and form under one constitutional monarchy, the whole of the British possessions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have been successful so far in bringing together, I may say, that portion of the continent, for Prince Albert Island is so close that it may be considered a part of the continent. We are all united into one Dominion, in an auxiliary England; and if the same moderation, the same desire to perpetuate the present Constitution continues, I am sure that our best hopes will not be disappointed, and that years and years hereafter, though

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

every man who now hears me shall have disappeared from the stage of action, this painting when it hangs on the wall will be looked upon by our children's children with the same admiration as being the portraits of those who were instrumental in laying the basis of a great country—an allied country to the grand old nation to which, as the hon. member for Ottawa said, we happily now belong. So far as this painting itself is concerned, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is fortunate for us that in Mr. Harris, the gentleman named, we will have a Canadian artist who has already attained celebrity in Europe, and who, if he is spared, will do honor to Canada. We cannot expect, Mr. Speaker, to keep all those Canadians who will distinguish themselves in art and science; we cannot expect them to remain in Canada. The great centres of arts and science and civilization, like London and Paris, will, to a certainty, attract a great portion of these men; but whether in Canada, England, or France, still they will do honor to Canada and illustrate Canadian genius and Canadian ability; and wherever they make their habitation, they will be known as Canadian artists, and we will be proud of them, just as the people of the United States are proud of their Story and their Hosmer, though from their artistic tastes they may reside altogether in Italy. So with others, like Thomas Walden at Rome; they may be taken away in order to pursue their art, in order to be on the great fields of science and art; they may leave their country, but if they are Canadians they will be Canadians still, and we will be proud of them. As regards this particular painting I can have no personal objection to have another artist try his hand upon myself. There is another Canadian artist who draws me with power and graphic skill; and I think under the principle of wholesome competition, I may hope that Mr. Harris, whose paintings I have not seen, may, by slow degrees, rise to the artistic skill and perfect accuracy in portraying my countenance that my friend Ben-gough possesses. I take it from the kindly manner in which the proposition made by the two hon. gentlemen has been received, that it accords with the general sense of the House, and the Government will take care that a sum shall be placed in the Estimates for the purpose of carrying it out.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have to thank the hon. member from South Brant, for calling my attention to an omission in my remarks which certainly was accidental. I did not intend at all to eliminate the fact that prominent Liberal gentlemen took a most active part in the proceedings relating to Confederation. My relations with those gentlemen have always been of the most agreeable character. I well remember the singular energy with which the late lamented Mr. Brown, and also the present leader of the Provincial Government of Ontario, entered into those proceedings. I remember also the prominent part taken by the late hon. leader of the Liberal party, the hon. Alexander Mackenzie; and for that gentleman, and all the gentlemen concerned in that great scheme of Confederation, belonging to the Liberal party, I have the most extreme and profound respect.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

223. Civil Government—Department of the Interior. \$10,713.54

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain these items?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I have had occasion to mention already during this Session, the Government in order to make the land granting Department as efficient as possible, have ventured to come to Parliament and ask for

a considerable addition to their staff. They believe the House will quite appreciate the importance of a prompt and efficient administration of matters connected with the settlement of the North-West. We not only desire to increase the staff numerically, but to secure as much practical ability as can be obtained; we find it especially necessary that we should retain in the land granting Department all those men who, by their previous conduct, have shown themselves valuable officers. The Department has already suffered very considerably from the loss of some of our most valuable officers, who were offered higher inducements elsewhere than we were able to offer; and we find it necessary to endeavor to stop this depletion. We have also found it necessary to take from the other Department some men most fit to carry out the policy of the Government in actual practice. Therefore, we have not hesitated to come down and ask the House for this vote. The first item of \$200 is to provide for the increase in the salary of Mr. A. M. Burgess from \$1,800 to \$2,200 per annum; and I need scarcely say to those who know Mr. Burgess that that is no higher salary than that a man of his proved ability, earnestness, and wonderful industry deserves. He is in effect, carrying on in the office what the deputy-head, Mr. Russell, is carrying out over the whole Department, interior and exterior. The increase of salary to Mr. Hall to \$1,800 was caused in this way. Mr. Hall was an officer in the Department of Justice, and a very valuable officer, and the hon. Minister of Justice was very unwilling to lose him; but Mr. Hall had arrived at the head of his class, and not being a lawyer, had no further hopes of promotion. As Mr. Burgess, who formerly acted as secretary to the whole Department, was performing the duties of deputy-head, a competent officer to take his place and assist him, was absolutely necessary. After very careful enquiry, we found that Mr. Hall possessed all the qualifications, and we stole him away from the Department of Justice for the purpose of placing him in the position he now holds. Then we wanted to get a first rate officer, a short-hand writer, and especially acquainted with correspondence; and we procured the services of Mr. Pereira, who for many years was connected with the press of Canada, and who is now acting as secretary to the hon. Mr. Macpherson, who is assisting me in the work of the Department, and, as I have already had occasion to say, without whose assistance I do not think that particular branch of the service could be so well attended to as it is at present. Mr. Chisholm was an officer highly prized in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We induced the hon. Minister of Marine, also with great unwillingness, to allow his transfer from that Department to the Department of the Interior, and he was especially selected by the deputy-head of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Grignard is a draughtsman and lithographer. He invented a process for producing plans of townships directly under the supervision of the Surveyor-General, which reduces the expense of the work to one-half, and enabled the Department to throw open a township for entry within a few weeks of the receipt of the surveyor's return. Mr. Grignard was formerly employed on the Geological survey. Mr. Wallis was transferred from the Post Office Department. Mr. Brough was brought from the Inland Revenue and was selected for the Department of the Interior on account of his qualifications as a precise writer. Mr. Bonfellow is an excellent draughtsman. He was a member of a leading firm of surveyors in Toronto, and was brought into the Department to take charge of Colonization grants. Mr. Brooke, unfortunately, cannot benefit by this vote to the full extent, because he died a few weeks since. Mr. Billings has been for ten years in the Government service and seven years in the Department of the Interior, and was placed on the permanent list in 1882. His duty is to examine the surveyors' returns and prepare the plans for the lithographs. His work is delicate, requiring great integrity and ability. Mr.

Sherwood has been in the service four years as extra clerk. He was made permanent last June. Previously he had received a thorough business training at one of our banking institutions. Mr. Rauscher is a Dominion Land Surveyor and Civil Engineer, and was in the employ of the Government on the Canadian Pacific Railway until incapacitated from outdoor employment by rheumatism, contracted in the service. He is specially valuable in the draughting room. Mr. Ardouin is a young man who was examined at the first examination under the Civil Service Act. He passed with the highest honors in the ordinary examination, and in his optionals he carried everything before him. His was by far the best examination of all the candidates who presented themselves before the Civil Service Commission. On account of the really distinguished qualifications proved before the Commissioners, he was appointed at once at a salary of \$750, with the avowed object of showing all candidates for the Civil Service what they might expect if really they passed an extraordinary examination, as this young gentleman did. Mr. Pope, who was transferred from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, is now my private secretary, and a very good officer he is. I could not desire a better. Mr. Voyer is clerk in the timber and mining branch.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we cannot estimate the cost of the business of a Department of this description or the real demands made upon it. The increases and proposals to appoint clerks at salaries which are higher and grow more rapidly than the Act provides, are entirely subversive of the principle of the Act. The hon. gentleman says that it is necessary in some cases to advance salaries more rapidly to secure continuance in office of the clerks and prevent their depletion. But the hon. gentlemen seems to be setting a bad example himself, and while he steals clerks from other Departments he blames the public for stealing clerks from him. There are men freshly put on in the third class grade whose salaries are increased at once. For example, I find Mr. Brough is brought in on first of June, 1882, and it is proposed to increase his salary by \$300 from the 1st of January, 1883, after he has been only six months in the service. The same observation applies to Mr. Bonfellow. He is brought in on the 1st of June, 1882, and after he has been six months in the service there is a proposal to increase his salary from \$700 to \$950. If the rates at which they were first engaged were proper rates, how is it that after six months time it should be proposed to add 50 per cent to their salaries? Then in the case of Billings, a third class clerk, there is an increase from \$700 to \$900 from 1st January. Then, another, there is an increase from \$700 to \$800 for one Sherwood; and an increase from \$700 to \$850 for Rauscher, another third class clerk. On the next page I find four new creations proposed by the hon. gentleman from 1st March to 30th June, to commence at \$750. Now, this would appear to indicate either that the scale of salaries proposed by the Civil Service Act for third class clerks is wrong and ought not to exist, or that the salaries are too high. It appears to indicate a general proposition to raise the salaries of third class clerks beyond the sums which the Act prescribes, and beyond that which third class clerks have obtained in the other Departments. Either there is some specialty in this Department which ought to be explained, or the salaries are too low generally in the other branches of the service. Of course, in the other branches of the service, application for similar increases must follow from such a serious violation of what I understand to be the practical provision of the Act. We passed the Act only last Session, and already we are beginning to violate its limitations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think this is a violation of the law of last Session; on the contrary, it proves that we are respecting the law. The Government

thought these men were entitled to a higher salary, but they could not give it to them without a vote of Parliament, as we could not do so under the law. The law allowed us to give these officers only the minimum salary of \$700, and as we desired to give them more, we have come to Parliament for a special vote. The Government have found that these officers, from their qualifications and the work they were doing, deserve a higher salary than we could give them under the provisions of the Act, and Parliament, being above the Act, is the only authority that can give them this increase; therefore, we are not at all violating the law. If we gave them the minimum salary of another class, we would have to give them a much higher salary than we propose to give them here, and more than they are entitled to. When we found that the Auditor-General would not allow these increases to be paid because it was against the Statute, we came to Parliament for a special vote.

**M. BLAKE.** Of course, the hon. gentleman did not violate the law, because the Auditor-General stood in the way of its violation.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. We wished to give these men the same salary as the officers of the same class and qualifications had. The Auditor-General said: "We cannot do that because it is against the Statute;" and the Auditor-General is here exactly for that purpose, to see that there is no addition to any salary which is not authorized by Statute. Therefore we come to Parliament and ask for the desired increase.

**Mr. BLAKE.** What I complain of is that you establish one Session a standard of salaries, a system for the whole service, and propose the following Session to alter that plan, both with reference to the number of offices that you have appointed and with reference to the salaries provided for under the Civil Service Act for persons of that rank. Thus you are practically altering and modifying the law in a manner which renders its provisions nugatory. I see two or three of these clerks were appointed on 30th June last, at \$700; that was the salary which was thought fit to appoint them at. Now, I see that from January last up to the next June, it is proposed to take a vote for \$300 more for the man who was appointed at \$700 and served six months at \$700. Now, I say here is a proposal advancing far beyond the provisions of the Civil Service Act which prescribed the first appointment at \$700 and a gradual increase.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** With respect to the four third class clerks from 1st March to 30th June, at \$750 per annum, the hon. gentleman would remember that, under the Civil Service Act as it stands now, the minimum salary for that class is \$450, but the law says that the salaries may go up to \$1,000. If we require a third class clerk with special qualifications, who is not a mere copyist, who has qualifications that would fit him in a higher class, he deserves more salary than you can give him in that class, but you come to Parliament to get authority to pay him a higher salary than the Act allows in that class.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I understand that perfectly, but I say that the general scale provided by the Act is being departed from entirely in these proposals. It is not among the high class clerks, who have become valuable, but it is in the lowest class, and almost immediately after their introduction to the service, that it is proposed to depart from the Statute.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** The rule is well observed in the Departments. The hon. gentleman will recollect that we had two classes, a junior second class and a senior second class, instead of which we have now a third class, which may go up to \$1,000, while the minimum is \$400. Such clerks will not come into the service at \$400, and must be paid a higher salary. Instead of placing them in the

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.**

second class and giving them \$1,100, we ask that they shall be placed between \$400 and \$1,000, the maximum of the third class.

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).** I observe by the statement of the hon. First Minister that some officers have been promoted from other branches of the service to that of the Department of the Interior. The Civil Service Act provides that in the event of promotions being so made they should take place only after examination. By this system of transfer an officer may be able to obtain a larger advance than he would have done if he remained in the Department in which he was employed; but I do not know that this has taken place in these cases. I am exceedingly anxious that we should observe very strictly the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It is of the first importance that this should be done, otherwise we will demoralize the service and do what the Minister of Public Works mentioned the other day—place Ministers at the mercy of officers in the Departments and their friends, to be importuned for increases whether the officers are meritorious or not. The Minister of Public Works mentioned that, although the Department could not make such increases, Parliament may do so. The Government have no right to come to Parliament and ask it to violate the Civil Service Act, and to ask it to do what they are not willing to do themselves. I am not objecting to these proposed advances, for some of the officers, speaking from what I know of some of them, are deserving of the increase; but it is given in violation of the law, and will form a precedent which will give Ministers themselves much trouble.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** What is proposed is according to law and not a violation of it, because the law says that no higher salary than the amount specified shall be given to the officer unless voted by Parliament. In this case a number of officers were taken from other Departments where they had shown ability and capacity, and transferred to the Department of the Interior.

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).** At higher salaries.

**Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.** No; we could not give them without Parliament voting them. We now come to Parliament and say that these officers are required, and that the work requires men possessing more ability than that of mere clerks, and we therefore ask the House to vote the necessary money.

**Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).** How many are new appointments?

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Mr. Burgess was in the Department, and an increase is proposed. Mr. Hall was in the Department of Justice; Mr. Pope, in the Marine and Fisheries Department; Mr. Wallis, in the Post Office Department; Mr. Pereira is a new appointment; Mr. Chisholm was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries; Mr. Brough was in the Inland Revenue Department, receiving \$850 a year. He was transferred and only paid \$700, and this is an increase to his salary. Mr. Bonfellow, draughtsman, and clerk, and Dominion Land Surveyor, was specially appointed to look after the business of Colonization Lands. He was not in the Department before. Mr. Billings, Mr. Brooke and Mr. Sherwood were in the Department. Mr. Ardouin is a new appointment. Two third class clerks at \$400, and three third class clerks at \$600, and four third class clerks at \$750 are all required in the Department. This is a thorough reorganization of the Department for the purpose of making it efficient. It is of the highest importance that at this time the work should be thoroughly and speedily done with as few errors as possible, and it would be false economy to secure inferior men with a view to saving a few dollars. We do not want untried men, but men who understand their business, and who can at once enter on their work the moment they put their foot in the Departments, and per-

form it with some intelligence and with as much experience as possible.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I quite agree with the hon. Minister, it is quite possible that there has been a large increase in the work; I have not the slightest doubt in regard to that; but as to this item of an increase of eighteen additional clerks, that is a very large increase to be made in one year. The increase has been constant. I know that when Mr. Mills left the Department there were only thirty-six clerks in the whole Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was not anything like the work then to be done.

Mr. ROSS. I know that the work was not then to be compared with what it is now; but that was the number, and they did considerable work in the Department. Lands in the North-West were being opened up then, though not much progress was made; but I merely call attention to the danger of the hon. gentleman overloading the Department with clerks, and the public service with the expenses of maintaining their salaries. The hon. gentleman has not said anything about the necessity for the increase, except the mere general statement, that an increase was desired; and I suppose that this is all the explanation which he can give. With regard to third class clerks who are about to be admitted, they are certainly of the class which has passed the Civil Service examinations, no doubt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

225. Civil Government.—Department of Indians Affairs:  
To provide for the salary of a Surveyor, from  
1st February to 30th June, 1883, at 1,600 per annum ..... \$666.65

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I explained this before. It stands thus: Originally the Indian Department had a surveyor who prepared the plans and looked after the surveys of Indian reserves and Indian properties, and their sub-division when they were going to be sold.

Mr. ROSS. He was paid out of the Indian Fund?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes. This surveyor it was thought proper, for some cause or other, perhaps to get rid of him, though, I do not know what for, to do away with, and the late Surveyor-General's Branch did the surveying business for the Indian Department; this has gone on for a while, but it has been found not to answer, and on the authority of both the permanent heads of the Interior and Indian Departments, it is stated that this caused great delay. The draughtsmen of the Interior Department are continually employed, and we have to have a number of supernumerary men doing work there just now. The Indian surveys are delayed, and so it is necessary to return to the old system.

Mr. ROSS. Is it intended to use the surveyor to survey the Indian reserves, when they are laid out?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is to be generally useful, to supervise the whole business and to attend to Indian surveys, where he can be employed. He is also to examine the returns of the surveyors employed elsewhere.

Mr. ROSS. I observe that some districts of Indian lands are parcelled out in small lots for convenience of management and disposition, in which local surveyors have been employed; am I now to understand, that this Departmental surveyor will do the work previously done by local or resident surveyors whose politics were right?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, this surveyor will be so employed so far as one man can do it; but if a surveyor whose politics are right is employed, that is of course, I think, in his favor, as the hon. gentleman will admit, for I am quite sure he would never appoint a man whose politics were wrong.

Mr. ROSS. I may also call attention to the fact that the officials of the Indian Department, are rapidly increasing in numbers. We cannot certainly blame the hon. gentleman for economy in managing his Department, for besides the Indian Surveyor, he has appointed an Indian Agencies Inspector to travel throughout the Dominion, Matitoba excepted, of course. This item is not in this vote but it is germane to the question. The hon. gentleman might, perhaps, explain the necessity for the employment of this inspector, Mr. Dingman?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Dingman is selected for his qualifications.

Mr. ROSS. And his politics.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope that his politics are right; at all events, he is a good officer, and the hon. gentleman will quite understand that the number of agencies requires an inspector. In Western Ontario, we had Mr. Plummer, until the Toronto office was moved here; and so Mr. Dingman has been appointed not only to inspect the agencies in Ontario, but also those in the other older Provinces.

230. Civil Government.—To provide for contingent  
expenditure of the High Commissioner of  
Canada in England ..... \$2,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The memorandum placed in my hands is as follows:—Cost of Sir A. T. Galt for removal and expenses of his family to England, \$950.00; and it is expected that it will cost the same for the return of his family and himself. The income tax is £50 sterling, and Sir Alexander made petty payments for £48 sterling; and to complete the year including telegrams, it is not safe to ask for less than £100 sterling more, the whole making under \$2,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Were not his removal expenses to be taken out of an old vote?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, no. A separate vote was taken for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. They are not included in this vote?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. BLAKE. This is to pay his way back again?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And telegrams?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. And telegrams, and the income tax, as well as the expenses to which he has been at in Paris recently. There will be expenses connected with that trip.

Mr. BLAKE. These items are not the items which heretofore have been included in the annual \$4,000?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. BLAKE. They are extra?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Last year we paid much more than \$4,000 connected with the High Commissioner's office; I think nearly \$6,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We had his travelling expenses to Madrid.

Mr. ROSS. And \$2,000 more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The \$4,000 covers all expenses at London, house rent, &c.; but when he goes to Paris or Madrid, that is extra.

Mr. ROSS. This balance is voted to bring the Commissioner home?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; he leaves England on the 24th of this month.

Mr. ROSS. And the next vote will be to send him somewhere else?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not in the Estimates yet.

Mr. ROSS. He is a very expensive officer. He has cost \$18,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, not \$18,000.

Mr. ROSS. Well, it was nearly \$18,000 last year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was \$14,000.

Mr. ROSS. We paid \$10,000 for his salary; \$4,000 for house rent, &c.; nearly \$2,000 for travelling expenses, not including \$1,500, which, I think, was charged to Capital Account on Dominion Surveys; and now \$2,000 more to get this expensive officer back again. I hope that the hon. gentleman will keep him still when he gets back, and not send him to Manitoba on another tour, the expenses to be charged to Capital Account. The hon. gentleman should really give him a rest, and us a little rest too; but then I suppose, we have to pay somebody else in his place, to get him there and to bring him back again. I think that the next time we get a High Commissioner we will have to get the hon. gentleman to make arrangements for him to stay there.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will have to make arrangements with the hon. gentleman when he goes there.

Mr. ROSS. I am not open to a communication of that kind—under this Government, at any rate. The next High Commissioner we send to England, I think we should send him there forthwith, and it is to be hoped that he will stay there for a long time for the cost of peddling these men backward and forward to England is a source of considerable expense.

233. Administration of Justice—To pay S. Richards for holding certain assizes in Ontario..... \$461.50

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Richards held these assizes in Hamilton in 1872. Part of the time he held them for the Judges' convenience, but for another portion of the time it was not, as for fourteen days of the time no Judge was available, and for twenty-nine days he was paid nothing. He also held the Guelph fall assizes in November, 1875, sixteen days, no Judge being available for the work. It was held that though it was proper, as a general rule, that barristers should not be paid for performing these judicial services, yet as no Judge was available, Mr. Richards, should be paid this amount.

Mr. BLAKE. As I stated the other day, when the question of another Judge was being discussed, the rule was not to pay for the holding of assizes for the performance of judicial work by other persons in lieu of the Judges. This work is never done by barristers, except only when no Judge is available, in which case a Queen's Counsel is asked to do the work, and does it. I suppose several Queen's Counsel have, at different times, done that work to oblige a Judge. I know I was asked once myself to do it, and I did it, but I never thought of either taking the circuit allowance or making any claim upon the Government for it. If you once begin the plan of paying barristers for doing work which would ordinarily be done by arrangement with the other Judges there will be no end to accounts like the present. It is a wholesome arrangement which we have now, namely, when a Judge demands a leave of absence the Judge or Chief Justice has to see that efficient arrangements are made for the administration of justice in his absence. These things are managed by mutual arrangement, the Judges undertaking the work as far as possible or a Queen's Counsel is engaged, and always I believe gratuitously, or, as it would appear from this case, on his obtaining certain allowances. Now for the first time since Confederation it is proposed that we should pass a vote paying a Queen's Counsel for doing the work of a Judge upon circuit. As

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

some of the circuits are long and some are short, a stated sum of \$100 is allowed for each. It is given on the supposition that there will be an average compensation all around; but if the suggestion is made that the barrister, when the Judge is away, shall do the heavy work while the other Judges shall receive the light circuits, and the allowances it will follow, of course, that we will have a vote of this kind on every occasion when a Judge leaves in future. If you allow the principle that if the Judge is not available, and that the expense of the barrister who acts on the Bench is to be paid, not by the Judge who gets the leave of absence, but by the country, you will find that Judges will not be available and we will have these votes frequently brought before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe, as a general rule that these amounts will not be claimed; but in this case the application was made, and I did not see how we could well refuse to pay it. I think, however, that the Department should let the Judges know that unless when special permission is given, or a special request made by the Minister of Justice, counsel who perform the duty of a Judge must look to the Judge for his share of allowance.

Mr. BLAKE. This gentleman did not perform the work at the request of the Department, and we have no contract with him whatever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is true.

235. Penitentiaries—Prince Edward Island..... \$4,075.20

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a claim made by the Province of Prince Edward Island for the accommodation of penitentiary convicts. There is no penitentiary on the Island, and long-sentenced prisoners were confined *ex necessitate* in the county gaol at the expense of the Province. The Province made a demand of some \$12,000, but on the report of the Inspector, only this sum was allowed. Perhaps I may as well read the report.

The undersigned has the honor to report that on the 15th instant he instructed the Inspector of Penitentiaries to proceed from Halifax to Prince Edward Island to examine the claim of the Prince Edward Island Government against the Government of the Dominion for expenditure in respect of gaol extension, and expenditure for the accommodation of Penitentiary convicts, from the 1st July, 1873, to the 31st December, 1879.

That the Inspector has made the examination, and reports as follows:—

"I have the honor to report that I had interviews with the Clerk of the Executive Council of Prince Edward Island, the Prothonotary and the Gaoler of Queen's and Prince Counties, and that these officials, although instructed by the Attorney General to give me all the information they possessed, were unable to throw any further light upon the matter than appears in the papers which formed the basis of my report of 10th March, 1880. With reference to the extra cost (\$20,108.60) in connection with the Prince County Gaol at Summerside, no new fact or circumstance has come to my knowledge that could lead me to deviate from my former recommendation that this portion of the claim be disallowed.

"It is quite true that a new gaol was positively needed to properly accommodate the debtors and short-term prisoners of Prince County, many years before the one was provided for the construction of which the Government of Prince Edward Island now asks the Dominion Government to pay a proportionate share of the cost. It is also true that a new gaol has been built, but there is nothing to show that the average of one convict from the 1st July, 1873, to the 31st December, 1879, rendered it more necessary to build a new gaol between 1873 and 1879, than it had been between 1870 and 1873, when there was the same average of one. So far as I have been able to learn, a new gaol for the safe-keeping and accommodation of debtors, short-term prisoners and convicts of Prince County, was as much required in 1870 as when the building was actually erected.

"I consider, therefore, that the allowance made for the average of one convict imprisoned in Prince County gaol, from the 1st July, 1873, until the 31st December, 1879, and included in the sum of \$16,589.25, the amount recommended by me in settlement of the whole claim of the Prince Edward Island Government, is an adequate indemnity for the gaol accommodation supplied to the convicts of Prince Edward County.

"Respecting the claim of \$12,539.10 for providing gaol accommodation from 1876 till the 1st December, 1879, for criminals sentenced for two years and upward to Queen's County Gaol, at Charlottetown, I find that, whereas there was only one convict in that gaol on the 1st July,



1875, the number increased to eight by the 31st March, 1876. On the same dates respectively, the total number of all classes of prisoners in confinement was sixteen and sixty-six. Before the enlargement of this gaol only thirty-two prisoners could be suitably lodged in the eight rooms it contained. Between the 1st July, 1873, and the 31st March, 1876, when, as I have already stated, sixty-six were confined—the largest number of prisoners on the return is shown on the following dates—thirty-eight on the 1st January, 1874; thirty-one on the 1st July, 1874; and thirty-seven on the 1st January, 1876.

"Thus it will be seen that the increase both in the number of convicts and other prisoners from the 1st July, 1875, to the 31st March, 1876, was so great as to compel the Government to make the enlargement which like the new gaol at Summerside had been very much wanted, even before the 1st July, 1873.

"The enlargement added forty more cells to the gaol, thereby giving accommodation to a total of 72 prisoners.

"There were nine convicts transferred from Charlottetown Gaol to Kingston Penitentiary on the 15th December, 1879.

"Had the Queen's County gaol afforded sufficient accommodation for the convicts confined there, without any expense for enlargement being incurred, I contend that the amount (\$16,589.25) already paid by the Dominion Government, beyond year or nay, amply compensates the Government of Prince Edward Island for every expense connected with the maintenance of all the convicts, including prison lodging, from the 1st of July, 1873, to the 31st December, 1879. But as the convicts were left in the hands of the Provincial Government to take care of and provide for, as the gaol appears to have met the requirements of the Local Government until 1876, as the number of convicts and other prisoners suddenly and largely increased, and as the enlargement of Queen's County Gaol has been on the part of the Prince Edward Island Government, avowedly made to meet the demand for increased accommodation for convicts whose maintenance and safe-keeping are the concern of the Dominion Government, I am of opinion that this particular part of the claim is entitled to favorable consideration.

"I deem it proper to add that I have failed to learn whether the Prince Edward Island Government notified the Dominion Government of their intention to claim compensation for the enlargement of Queen's County Gaol before the work was commenced."

In regard to the proportion of the expenditure incurred in the extension of Queen's County Gaol, which the Dominion should bear, the Inspector reports as follows:—

"I beg leave to report that in view of the fact, as stated in my report, that between the 1st July, 1875, and 31st March, 1876, the number of convicts increased from one to eight, and of the other prisoners from fifteen to fifty-eight, and that the total new accommodation provided by the extension was forty cells, and that the gaol as extended is the property of the Government of Prince Edward Island, I am of opinion that if the Government of the Dominion should pay to the Government of Prince Edward Island one-fourth of the total expenditure incurred for extension, with interest at five per cent., they will be assuming their fair share and proportion of the expenditure."

The undersigned, therefore, recommends that nothing be paid on account of the Prince County Gaol at Summerside, but that upon the Prince Edward Island Government giving a full discharge of all claims in connection with gaol extension as aforesaid, there be paid to them the sum of four thousand and seventy-five dollars and twenty cents, being one fourth of the sum of \$12,539.10 certified as the cost of the extension of Queen's County Gaol, and interest thereon for six years at five per cent.

That is the report of the Minister of Justice. This sum closes the whole account.

Mr. BLAKE. Do the Island Government accept this settlement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

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

### After Recess.

263. Public Buildings—Ottawa..... \$84,000.00

Mr. FAIRBANK. I have waited in the hope that some member of the Government, or some older member of the House, would call attention to what I believe is almost a universal feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of hon. members with the condition of this Chamber, in some respects, and I believe it is a subject proper to introduce in connection with this item. It is the general feeling that the room is not suitable in its present condition in many respects for the purposes for which it is used. It is forced by the rooms surrounding it away from the outer walls, and windows are rendered impossible except at an elevation some 30 feet over our heads, and particular pains seems to have been taken to prevent the coming in of the slightest ray of pure sunlight by stained glass. Not a solitary ray

of the light of heaven is admitted here until it is so changed as to become unrecognizable, in flagrant violation of that very ancient command: "Let there be light." It is certainly not carrying out that command to light gas, as we have to do here for three or four hours before sundown. The necessity of sunlight to successful vegetable life, or vigorous animal life, is admitted on all sides. A short time ago we heard in one of our Committees the statement that the fruits of the North-West were unusually sweet owing to the unusual amount of sunlight there, and perhaps the occasional undue acidity of our debates may be attributable, to some extent, to the want of sunlight. A Bill for the admission of sunlight, duty free, would, I believe, be passed without amendment. Air, no doubt, we have in abundance, but the manner in which it is distributed is very unequal, and, at times, too vigorous at the back benches. Those upon the front benches have, perhaps, not experienced the disadvantages of this to anything like the extent they would if they occupied the rear benches. Indeed it is questionable whether the proper outfit for members on the rear benches would not be an over-coat, a night-cap and an ear-trumpet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. And a blanket.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I believe it is not putting it too strongly to say that one-half the hon. members do not know one-half of what is going on at the time it transpires. Now if the object is that the hon. members should take a practical part in legislation, it is almost entirely defeated by the miserable acoustic properties of this Chamber. If the object be to have the rank and file know but little and do but little, except answer the division bell, then this Chamber might be considered nearly a perfect success. It is no uncommon thing to see the hon. gentlemen occupying the front seats use their hands as ear-trumpets on asking for a question or an answer to be repeated. If this is the case on the front benches, in what blissful ignorance must hon. members on the rear seats remain as to what is transpiring. The practical result is that hon. members coming here anxious to learn and to serve, for a time, exert themselves to know what is going on. After a time they find this is impossible and they surrender at discretion, and consequently we see that nearly every day a great many of seats are vacant. Now, I believe it is a matter of no small consequence that the 200 men who assemble here should know more of what is going on, that they should be more educated in the system of Government. If we were to introduce military tactics here, I believe this evil would soon disappear. Suppose we placed the skirmishing line in front, and the occupants of the front benches, the heavy artillery, the great guns, in rear, obliging them to fire over the heads of the light infantry in front, I think that very soon there would be a change in the battle field in this respect. Nothing but guns of the greatest calibre could stand the strain for any length of time. Ten years ago a Committee was appointed to consider the difficulties which then existed to a greater extent than now. They called to their assistance four experts, of whose assistance the Committee expressed their high appreciation. But their appreciation was not so obvious in practice, as very few of their suggestions were adopted. In relation to air they said:

"It is allowed to fail to the exhaust flues, along the windows and sides of the walls, producing a dangerous cold current upon the heads of those in proximity thereto."

This evil still continues to an extent that has rendered quite a number of members unfit for duty a considerable portion of this Session. The report also suggested that "to get pure air it should be taken from above the surface of the ground by letting down galvanized iron tubes into the present hot air vaults;" and "to take the air for the fan from the sky-light above instead of from the puddle below." The air is

still brought from one of the most shaded localities surrounding the grounds. It was suggested that the "glass in the casing of the ceilings be brought down to the under level of the casings," as traced in the plan. These suggestions have not been carried out. The report goes on to say:

"The Committee having called our attention to the want of light in the House, we beg to say that the only change to admit more sunlight without altering the building, would simply be to substitute plain for the stained glass in the windows above."

On the subject of acoustics: "They could be very much improved with comparatively small expense." But it is not my province to point out the remedy; I wish to call attention to the defect. Certainly the matter referred to by the Committee in relation to sunlight could be very easily remedied. The general site of the building perhaps is surpassed by that of no capitol in the world. This location is one that commands the admiration of all visitors. Standing as it does upon a cliff some 200 feet above the river, its location is particularly well adapted to obtaining any amount of pure air and all the sunlight that we can desire. It cannot be claimed that the science of acoustics is lost when we know that rooms are being constructed in which from ten to fifteen thousand people can hear an ordinary voice. It is not beyond the science of the day to provide a room in which some two or three hundred persons can hear comparatively well. I think it is the duty of the Government to place this Chamber in a condition in which it would be possible for members to perform their duties. I may be met with the answer that it would be attended with cost; but we have few things without cost. There are two kinds of expenditure—those which are finished when they are made, and those which only begin when they are made. An expenditure in this direction will be made once for all. If it is considered impossible to place this Chamber in a suitable condition for the purpose for which it is designed, then, I believe, the question is of sufficient importance to warrant us in considering whether we should not use this Chamber for Departmental purposes, and build another suitable for our use.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Every year we have had complaints about this Chamber. Of course, we cannot make it perfect, but, I think, it has been much improved. As to the stained glass, that was put there before my time; but I am sure that if it were replaced by plain glass, we would very soon have complaints from hon. members that they were troubled by the sun upon their heads, and they would be asking to have the curtains drawn. The hon. gentleman complains that we have not fresh air, that it is too warm. We must have fresh air from some quarter, but it must be remembered that we cannot have fresh air in this room without producing more or less draught; I think, however, that these draughts are much less this year than previously. But we shall always have more or less draughts, as long as we have doors that are being constantly opened and shut. The hon. gentleman has said that we, on the front benches have not felt much the draughts that have been felt by occupants of the back benches. We must have draughts in the middle of the Chamber, due to the passage of fresh air through ducts and so forth. I lately saw an account of an experiment made elsewhere by which the foul air of the room was carried off and fresh air brought in by means of a sort of jet placed in the corners of the room. That might be used perhaps in the upper portion of this building; but, at all events, that cannot be done this year. The hon. gentleman has also stated that a great many of the members cannot hear what is going on and the remarks of the members. I must say, without any reflection on any hon. members, that this is greatly their own fault. I am perfectly well heard and I do not force my voice; but I am in the habit of speaking to the last row on the other side. But if hon. gentlemen will speak to the

Mr. FAIRBANK.

Table they cannot, of course, be heard throughout the Chamber. The hon. gentleman has mentioned that in warfare skirmishers go in front and the big guns follow behind. In this Chamber, however, the big guns are in front and the others behind. If, however, the hon member had been in the House for some years he would have recognized the fact that a great improvement has taken place during the last few years. We have tried to make hon. gentlemen as comfortable as we can, and if there is anything we can do to improve the Chamber as regards its acoustic properties, or in other respects, we will be most happy to do so. If hon. members have any suggestions to make I shall be glad to receive them and submit them to the Chief Architect.

Mr. BLAKE. The points referred to by the hon. gentleman are of great consequence. The hon. Minister, I think, has undervalued the importance of sunlight. I have always admired the stained glass windows, but I have always wished that plain glass should be substituted. I agree that provision would have to be made for curtains or blinds, because during a portion of the day the direct rays of the sun would fall, for a short time, however, on members. That is no reason, however, why we should not have the light, for the greater part of the day, when the sunlight would not be direct. Another reason why there should be plain glass substituted is, that means would be afforded for rapidly ventilating the chamber by means of the windows as well as by the other methods that at present exist. I admit that the arrangement for the door behind the Speaker's chair has proved more satisfactory than I expected. Members of the back benches complain that they are subjected to a direct draught. I do not know whether it is impossible, instead of having broad gratings to have narrow openings; at all events, if the present arrangement is to continue I think there should be occasionally change of position between the occupants of the front and back benches. With respect to the acoustic properties of the Chamber, while there is much force in the observation of the hon. Minister, much difficulty is due to the fact that the speaker addressing the House is not the only speaker, for there is sometimes fifty or a hundred also engaged in conversation. There is no doubt, however, that the Chamber is a dead failure as regards its acoustic properties. We have adopted, and I do not say we should depart from it, the English system, instead of the system which prevails in many assemblages, of having a tribune. In conducting business in Committee, no doubt the system of speaking from your place is a most convenient one; but there is no doubt that it involves all sorts of difficulties as to hearing. Although the hon. Minister of Public Works is determined to be heard, I am afraid a good many hon. members behind him fail to hear him. These difficulties will always exist more or less in any Chamber where a large portion of the audience is behind the speaker; and whether, in making improvements, some plan should be adopted whereby in set debates the speaker could address the House from such a place as a tribune, if such a place here could be found, and could thereby contribute to the ease and comfort of his audience, which tends very largely to the ease and comfort of the speaker, I do not know. But in carrying on our business as we do, it is of the utmost consequence that the Chamber should be constructed, as far as possible, with respect to obtaining reasonably good acoustic results, and I believe the corners and recesses have a great deal to do with it. I do not mean to say that the hon. Minister can effect any important change in this Chamber; on the contrary, my impression is that we will never be able to conduct our business here in such a way that three-fourths of the members present will be able to hear more than half of what takes place. It is very well, when one is making a speech to raise one's voice, and the very context bridges over the difficulties of missing occasionally a word, &c., but a great deal of busi-

ness is conducted conversationally. My hon. friend from Northumberland, who does not happen to be here now, and who is very constantly saying that he does not hear, is only telling what is going on all the time. It is not because my hon. friend from Northumberland does not hear as well as anybody, but he has chosen to make audible and vocal, a complaint concerning which other hon. members are silent. Discussions and answers to questions, returns and the arrangement of business which naturally cannot be carried on in a high tone of voice—it is impossible they can be, for a man cannot raise his voice to its highest pitch, when he has only five words to say—cannot be heard by hon. members generally; therefore it is really a serious question, whether for all time to come, the business of the House of Commons of Canada shall be discharged in a chamber so constructed and arranged, that, as I have said, half of the members cannot hear half of the business that is going on. For my own part, I think it is really a serious question, whether we ought to attempt to construct a Chamber, not extremely expensive, for it need not be very expensive, and this apartment could be used for other purposes no doubt—designed to discharge these duties, and to give us fresh air, sunlight during the day while sunlight can be admitted to the Chamber, and the power above all and beyond all things, of being able to hear what is going on in the Chamber—for I believe that the difficulty of hearing conduces very largely to the circumstances, occasionally—of course I make no personal reflection, as the House is full—to the House being rather empty.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that there is a great deal in what the hon. gentlemen has just said. This is a matter, of course, in which both sides are interested, and we have all the same object in view, which is that hon. gentlemen should be able to hear, and that we should have as much comfort as can be obtained in a House of this kind. I must say to the hon. gentleman that these recesses, that, as he says, these galleries and this ceiling, must prevent necessarily the room being what it should be; there is no doubt about that. The room, as the hon. gentleman must remember, as to the disposition of the seats of hon. members, was changed some fifteen or eighteen years ago. Then the Speaker's chair was at that end, and hon. members' seats were just in a different direction from what they now are. Then about one-half of the House could hear, and those in the lower portion of the House could hear nothing at all; the change to the present condition of affairs was an improvement, but as the hon. gentleman says, a number of hon. members cannot hear, as a rule; I suppose three-quarters of the hon. members cannot hear as they should. It would be very difficult to change this room so as to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen; but I think that in view of the remarks made from both sides of the House, that this is a matter which should be studied by the Department of Public Works, during Recess, which I will have done, and next Session we will be able to say whether a new Chamber should be built outside, and have an estimate of the cost, and then we may be able to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen. I know that some have spoken of changing this room into the library, and of using the library to meet it; this might be done, but of course, it will have to be studied during Recess. This room might advantageously be used for a library; but could the library be used for our purposes? I have grave doubts about it. We would require galleries for the public, fresh air and ventilation. I only call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the position of the library; they must see this and what changes would be required. That might be the best and most feasible thing; but, at all events, it will be my duty during Recess to have the matter placed in the hands of the Chief Architect of the Department, and

have it studied, not only by him, but also by some other skilled architect, in order to see whether we could not either use the library or have to build an outside chamber to meet our requirements. Hon. gentlemen may say I would favor the latter, because I am Minister of Public Works, but I think that if we make a change which would cost a large sum comparatively, we should, at all events, get the value of our money; therefore, I say to hon. gentlemen that I will have the matter studied during recess.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I do not wish it understood that I seriously proposed that the Ministers should go to the back seats, but merely that if they did they would find what the difficulty was and take steps to remedy this great evil, which cannot be over-estimated. If this can only be accomplished by building a new Chamber, I believe that the hon. gentleman who does it, will confer upon Canada a blessing which neither he nor his posterity will ever be ashamed of. Of course, I must admit, that very many hon. gentlemen have acquired parliamentary distinction in this Chamber, but in doing so, they are under obligations to their physical endurance, as well as to their mental ability; and while many have succeeded, I believe that many also have perished in the attempt from this cause. I am very glad indeed to hear the Minister say that the matter shall receive his serious consideration. Of course, it is not for an unprofessional man to point out how this should be done. I have no doubt that to some extent it can be remedied, but to the full extent desired I do not believe it possible. I believe the remedy is to appropriate this room for some other purpose and to construct a proper Chamber upon well-known acoustic principles.

269. Additional compensation to Mr. Calvert Vaux, for the plans submitted by him for the embellishment and arrangement of the Parliament grounds, Ottawa ..... \$500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This relates to the time when plans and schemes were proposed for the embellishment of these parliamentary grounds. On the 6th June, 1873, the Chief Architect was instructed to proceed to New York and to consult with Mr. Vaux as to plans for the laying out and embellishments of the grounds. Mr. Vaux was an architect who had a great reputation there, and I think he had contributed largely to the embellishment of the parks, &c., of New York. The arrangement was, that Mr. Vaux should receive \$500 as a preliminary fee, and one per cent. on the outlay in carrying out his designs if they were adopted. On the 9th of May, 1874, Mr. Vaux received \$500 on the supposition that his designs would not be carried out, he stating that if the Government should finally adopt his plans, he would expect the one per cent. on the amount. In September, 1876, Mr. Vaux wrote, stating that he had been informed that the suggestions in his plan had practically been adopted. The Chief Architect, to whom the matter was referred, considered that Mr. Vaux's plan had practically been adopted, and that he was entitled to an additional recompense. Under those circumstances, it was arranged that he should accept \$500 in full of all claims, instead of one per cent. on the outlay.

290. Public Buildings—Nova Scotia: Pictou Marine Hospital..... \$6,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A certain amount of the appropriation in this case was allowed to lapse, and we had to get the Governor's warrant to cover that amount, \$3,000. The balance is required for contract work, Clerk of Works' salary, &c. The total amount to be provided for in Supplementary Estimates is \$5,130. The total balance required will be \$2,000 to complete. The total cost will be about \$11,000.

Mr. DAVIES. I have been unable to find an amount in the Estimates for Charlottetown Marine Hospital. Char-

lottetown is a large marine port, many sailors coming there from ships trading in all parts of the world.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The annual expenses of that hospital do not come within my Department, but I will take a note of what the hon. gentleman says, and my colleague will give him an answer to-morrow or next day.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to mention that there was a good deal of conversation in Charlottetown about this matter, and I understood from the public press that the Medical Superintendent had resigned, or had been notified that his services were not required. I do not know whether a successor has been appointed, but it was rumored that the patients had been put under the treatment of the general hospital, which is managed by Sisters of Charity. This is an admirable institution, doing good work; but it is questionable whether the class of patients requiring to be treated in a marine hospital, and the diseases from which they generally suffer, could be properly treated in a hospital managed by Sisters of Charity.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I only know that the Sisters of Charity have been entrusted with the care of the patients at the rate of, I think, \$5 per week.

271. Public Buildings—New Brunswick: Sussex Post Office, Custom House, &c..... \$4,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The whole estimate is \$13,945, and an additional amount of work to be provided for, \$4,000; estimates for 1883-84, \$3,826, or say \$9,000. This \$4,000 for the current year, with what is in the Supplementary Estimates for next year, will cover the whole amount. The cost will be, I think, \$13,000, which includes land, I believe.

272. Public Buildings—Quebec.....\$67,095.35

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are four items under this head, the first being Montreal Dominion Building. On the Montreal Custom House, by an inadvertence \$6,029 provided for in the Estimates of 1881-82 were not carried forward. Therefore, we have to provide for it by a warrant. The remainder of the vote is for the construction of two additional hoists in the Montreal Examining Warehouse, costing \$1,600. We also ask \$57,000 for a wharf, a site for an immigrant building at Lévis. In the large fire which took place there, our emigration buildings were destroyed. These were on Grand Trunk property, and we have thought it better that the Government buildings should be on its own site, and consequently more isolated and less exposed to fire than it was formerly. The building will be about midway between the ferry and the Grand Trunk property.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this estimate include the cost of the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, both the site and the building. The building will cost about \$15,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman going to build a wharf or buy a wharf?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are to buy a beach and build the wharf.

Mr. TROW. Is there any necessity for such a large expenditure there? Emigrants, as a rule, leave there immediately on landing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is an absolute necessity.

273. Public Buildings—Ontario.....\$9,750.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$4,000 for the erection of immigration buildings at Hamilton, is required to cover a special warrant for the sum expended, by the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who reported that the necessity for proceeding with the work was urgent. The next item is \$2,500 for an immigrant building at

Mr. DAVIES.

Sarnia, also on the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that it was required.

Mr. ROSS. I think the Government should see that these immigrant buildings are, in all cases, built near the main railway station. I notice that there is an immigrant building in Ottawa, not hard to find, but very far from the station. In Toronto the immigration office is a very poor affair.

284. Public Buildings—Manitoba..... \$14,650.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is for an immigration building at Brandon, \$9,150. That is to pay the contractors for additional work performed by them in accordance with their contract. The total amount expended will have been \$17,350. The next vote is \$5,500 for additions, alterations and fittings in the Winnipeg Post Office. These were required to provide accommodation for the public, as many complaints were made that the postoffice was too small, and that many people had to remain for hours before they could get their letters. A building will be erected temporarily, so that the public may be attended to and the service properly performed. This, with the city boxes, will, no doubt, be sufficient until the new postoffice is built on the site of the present one. The temporary building will be put up in sections, so that it may be taken to pieces again and shipped wherever required.

276. Public Buildings—Immigrant Buildings at Prince Arthur's Landing.....\$6,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We expect a large immigration out there, and will have to provide a shed for their accommodation. \$6,000, under the circumstances, is very moderate. We have not yet selected the site.

277. Public Buildings—Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.....\$39,610.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is an addition to the amount voted last year. Among other items are the salaries of engineers and firemen for 1882-83, which were unprovided for. The second item is the heating of the Public Buildings, Ottawa. Fuel was dearer this year, and having new buildings a greater quantity was required. The same thing may be said of the gas, \$750. With respect to the next item, the custom that has been followed for years has been to have the water rates for the last quarter to be paid the following year; and we thought it better this year to pay the last quarter, when due, so as to begin the new year clear. I have been informed, by the Chief Architect, that new hose was required. In the Department of Indian Affairs on Wellington street, Ottawa, we had to provide for improvements and for rent, plumbing, gas fitting, electric bells, &c., \$2,000. In the Department of Interior, Dominion Lands Branch, we had to provide for the construction of a gallery and a supply of cupboards and doors, \$1,080. In the Assistant Receiver-General's Office I ascertained that the vault doors were not burglar-proof and had to be replaced by others. This amount was authorized to be expended, and we now ask authority from Parliament for the expenditure, which was urgent. Heating the Dominion Buildings: this amount was not included in the appropriations of the different Departments. The fact is, there is a misunderstanding about it. It was thought that my Department would provide for this service last year, but the Council thought it was too late at the time to do it and the matter dropped. But for the following year it has been determined that this service for the large Departments shall be provided through my Department. Then, finishing rooms in attic, furniture and so forth, Winnipeg Land Office, \$2,300. It has been found that this building is too small for the service, and this amount is asked for in accordance with the requisition of the hon. Minister of Interior.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to the extraordinary amount we pay annually for furniture, repairs, &c. We voted, last year, \$165,000; now the House is asked to vote \$10,000, or \$175,000, for furniture, repairs, &c., for Public Buildings at Ottawa. I fail to see where this annual expenditure goes. The offices seem to me, when I visit them, to be very comfortably furnished, and they have been so for years, yet every year we are asked to vote an increased sum for still further repairs. Then we have an extraordinary bill for heating; \$40,000 has already been voted, and now \$6,000 more are required. Then \$11,000, in another place, which no doubt occurred in last year's estimates in another form, making, in all, \$57,000 for heating these buildings. I think if the hon. gentleman would revise the system of heating, it is quite possible the expenditure might be reduced. Why have we increased expenditure now? Where is the increased necessity? Is there an increase in the price of fuel? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how the fuel is supplied. The gas bill is very large, \$20,000. I am quite satisfied the offices in the Departments do not use much, as they are not seldom opened after sundown. And these figures do not include fuel and light for Rideau Hall, amounting to \$8,000 more. I think we ought to get some details of this expenditure. Where are these buildings required? What is the report of the Architect thereupon? Then we have the Department of Indian Affairs, Wellington street, \$2,000. How is that going to be spent? It does not contain more than seven or eight rooms, and there is considerable furniture there at the present moment. We are coming near now to an expenditure of \$16,000 more on public buildings. If we are going to add, year after year, to expenditure for fuel, light, repairs, &c., it will cost us, in a short time, \$200,000, or \$250,000, to keep our public buildings in repair. I think the Minister ought carefully to scrutinize the expenditure on these points before he asks us to vote this large sum of money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As to the heating surely the hon. gentleman does not think for a moment that I would leave him in the cold. The heating is done by contract. We call for tenders for wood and for coal and we accept the lowest. As for the feeding of the furnaces, that is left entirely to the firemen. I can assure the hon. gentleman that item is as low as we can make it. Now, about the rents, repairs, furniture, &c.; the hon. gentleman must not think that this amount is for these buildings only—it is for all our public buildings from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island. We have new buildings every year that we have to heat, furnish and repair. I may say to the hon. gentleman that our expenditure for this item is not nearly as large as it has been. In 1877, it was \$182,000; in 1878, \$202,000; in 1879, \$226,000; in 1880, \$220,000; in 1881, \$149,000; in 1882, \$173,000; in 1883, we have expended \$165,000 up to the 1st of May, the balance for the remaining two months being for standing account, &c. This is for all our public buildings throughout the Dominion. The abolition of the workshops here reduced this expenditure, otherwise instead of \$175,000 we would be asking for \$250,000. As for the gas, the hon. gentleman knows there is a contract with the Gas Company, and the whole amount is in accordance with the contract, which I consider a very moderate one for all the public buildings in Ottawa. The water is provided by the city, and is of a very much better quality than that we formerly used. On Concurrency, if the hon. gentleman desires, I will bring down a statement of the contract rates paid for cordwood and coal.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe the hon. gentleman has taken into his own Department the supplying of fuel and the payment of furnacemen and others required in the public buildings throughout the Dominion. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain why the change is made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason of the change is that formerly each Department had to pay its share of the cost, and difficulties arose with regard to amounts, and so forth. The whole of this grant has, therefore, been placed under the Public Works Department. I think economy will be secured in regard to fuel, as contracts may be let for large quantities.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What is the mode of purchasing furniture and articles of that character?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When only small quantities are required, the sub-head of the Department has an estimate made by the proper officer and sends a circular to ten, twelve, or fifteen firms in this city, calling on them to send in tenders, and the lowest is accepted. When we furnish a new building at Hamilton or elsewhere we call for tenders.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I understand that the practice of sending out circulars is to send them only to those men whose politics are right, while those generally engaged in the trade know nothing about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that was done five years ago.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Then the worst features of government five years ago are continued.

279. Harbors and Rivers—Quebec ..... \$13,200.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to meet payments due on timber contracted for continuing the works at Etang du Nord on the opening of navigation. The timber was contracted for during the winter, when it is better and cheaper. The \$4,000 for New Carlisle are to continue the pier contracted for there some two years ago. At Lake Megantic, the pier is to be completed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Was the timber at New Carlisle furnished by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

280. Harbors and Rivers—Ontario ..... \$3,781.79

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$784 for Cobourg are to make payments for materials used in the construction of works there. At Owen Sound \$1,776 are to pay the award of the Dominion Arbitrators, on a claim of \$2,967 preferred by Mr. Larkin, contractor for improvements there; and also to defray legal expenses connected with the arbitration. These works were contracted for on the 15th of June, 1881.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain the understanding between the Government and the Corporation of Owen Sound with reference to the Owen Sound works, and as to the condition of the enterprise generally, and what is to be done upon it. There has been some misapprehension I am afraid, or misunderstanding, or at any rate, I know from some correspondence I have seen, that there is a feeling up there in this relation; and it is said an arrangement or understanding has been arrived at on which certain specified payments the Department has agreed to produce certain results in the harbor—I forget how much water; the result has not been produced as yet, and steps require to be taken, but we are really in suspense as to what the nature of the arrangement is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think an answer will be given to-morrow, while we are on the Supplementary Estimates.

281. Harbors and Rivers—British Columbia..... \$2,804.40

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$300 are to remove snags from Fraser River; the balance is as represented.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to know whether \$2,504.40 are the balance of the original contract, after deducting the amount expended in completing the

work by day's labor under the Public Works Department, irrespective of any claims made for excess of rock removed over and above the amount included in the contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the total was \$9,445.60; \$6,941 have been paid; and the balance due the said representatives is \$2,504.

282. Miscellaneous—To pay a gratuity of \$250 to each of the widows of the late James Meharg and Patrick Cooney, who met with death accidentally, 19th February, 1882, while discharging their respective duties of engineer and fireman of the Montreal Examining Warehouse.....\$500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This accident occurred last year. One of the deceased was the engineer in charge of the heating apparatus or engine, and the other was his assistant. When the accident took place, one seeing his companion injured and in great danger, went to his aid and met with such injuries that led also to his death. Under these circumstances we thought it proper to give this small sum, \$250, to each of the widows.

283. Miscellaneous—To pay O. Dionne, for detailed statement showing expenditure incurred for construction, maintenance, repairs, &c., in connection with the Public Works of Canada, by the Departments of Public Works and Railways and Canals, 1st July, 1867, to 30th June, 1882.....\$1,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For some two or three years the Public Accounts Committee has been asking for a statement showing the expenditure incurred in the maintenance of repairs, &c., connected with our Public Works, for each year, and also during a number of years; it has also requested the amount expended in each previous year. Well, it was impossible for us to have that work done in the time. It would have required two or three years of work, but I found that there was an officer in my Department, Mr. Dionne, who for years back had devoted his nights to this work for himself. I asked him to hand it to me, in order that I might show it to the proper officers as well as to Council. After ascertaining that the work was accurate, and exactly the work required for Parliament, I asked him to give us the work, and, I think, under these circumstances, it is only proper that he should be remunerated.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I remember when this schedule was asked for by a Sub-Committee of Public Accounts, and I see that it covers about seven pages of the Public Accounts. But I cannot understand the fact that if any little extra work is required in the Departments, some clerk has to be employed and paid extra for his services. I think this mode of expending money should cease, for I cannot conceive that the staff of the Department is so worked night and day, that every little extra return of this sort must be specially paid for.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman would be right in this case, but for the fact that this work could not have been done in ordinary hours, and that it engaged this officer during his after hours for several years. I think that if an officer, instead of wasting his time by loafing about, or perhaps doing worse, chooses to spend his evenings in performing a useful work like this, it would be a poor encouragement to him for the Government to oblige him to hand it over without remuneration.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I cannot see how an officer could be engaged for several years on a work which we only asked for last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He had been engaged on this work for himself for years before.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman's clerks must be very acute if they can anticipate work which shall be required by the House in this way. What I object to with

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.)

regard to this extra work, is, that though ostensibly it is done outside office hours, my experience has been that in nine cases out of ten, the clerk manages to do a considerable portion of it at least during his office hours. Let a man be paid a full value of a working day for the services of a working day, but let him understand that this is all that he is going to be paid for that particular work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says, that so and so happens in nine cases out of ten, but I beg to inform him that this is the tenth case.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). And the others belong to the nine.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sure that if the hon. member for West Middlesex had had the experience of some hon. members on both sides he would not have made the remark he has made with regard to the Civil Service. I can say from experience that there is a vast amount of work done by the clerks in the Departments after hours. I have been told, on information which I have received, and which I have reason to believe, that in some of the Departments a great deal of work has been done this Session after hours in the way of preparing papers which have been asked for by the House. I know that this has been particularly the case in one of the Departments to which my attention has been called by parties connected with it, and that not by one clerk, but by a dozen clerks. When you have statistical work to be done, or work involving the compilation and the copying of figures, no stranger can do that work so well as the persons in the Department who are accustomed to do it, and I can see no reason why discretion should not be given to the Chief of a Department to employ these men after hours instead of engaging outside men, especially as many of these officers have great difficulty in keeping up their increasing families on their salaries. If help is to be employed, the Minister should be allowed to employ the public servants to perform that work; and I am sure they do not get too well paid for anything they do. I know my hon. friend would not willingly do any injustice to any of the public servants, or to any of the Ministers, in the inferences that may be drawn from his remarks, and I am sure if he were informed on this point, he would know that better service can be performed by those gentlemen than by any outside persons.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think the Government employés are overworked—beginning at ten o'clock in the morning and working till about a quarter to four, with an hour for lunch. Moreover, I think the time of the Government employés should be devoted exclusively to their Government duties; and if they have any time to spare, I do not think it should be employed in any other work. In the present instance, I have my doubts as to the value of the work for which the Government pays so bountifully. I can say that the time of Mr. Dionne has not been entirely occupied in his office, or compiling that work, for I recollect very well that, during election times, I had the pleasure of meeting that gentleman in my county. He had plenty of time to spare for electioneering. I remember that that gentleman turned me out of my room one evening. He took my bed one evening.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not take your seat.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps he would have filled it more satisfactorily for the hon. gentleman than I do. He went from my county to other counties; and he had time to go on an election tour, not only himself, but his brother also. If that gentleman found so much time to devote to the interest of the Government, I am not at all surprised that at this late hour he should receive a little salary for the work he did.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in the view he takes, and

I am glad to be supported in my opinion by no less an authority than the hon. member for Northumberland as a Minister, for the law passed while he was in the Administration contained the wise provision that no clerk should receive extra remuneration for work performed in his own Department. It was felt that such a practice would be open to abuse—that the clerks might be continually asking for extra work, and that, perhaps, the work of the day would include the extra work that would be paid for extra, and therefore the law prohibits it. The hon. gentleman speaks of over-hours. As I understand, during the Session of Parliament, the ordinary rules as to the evening hours are suspended, and it is well understood, that at that period, when returns and information are required by members, it is part of the duties of the clerks to put in over-time to perform those duties. They are not over-hours, but are part of their contract. The discretion possessed by the deputy heads under the present law, is, I think, a very wise provision, and the repeal of it would lead to great abuses.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was aware that the practice of requiring the clerks to put in extra time without remuneration prevailed, but I hardly remembered that such a law existed. But, whether the law exists or not, it does not alter the force or effect of any argument I advance. I know nothing about this particular case; I was speaking generally in reply to the hon. member for Middlesex. I know, for a matter of fact, that there is one Department of this Government, in which the clerks have been employed for upwards of a month up to ten or eleven o'clock at night. If the law is as the hon. gentleman states, the sooner the law is altered, in my opinion, the better. We ought not to exact from these gentlemen any such extraordinary hours of work as some of them have to put in; and while I am free to admit, that the heads of Departments might be open to great importunities, I trust that they have firmness and determination to resist these importunities, and to decide when extra services should be performed. I take issue with my hon. friend as to the contract that exists between the civil servants and the Government. They are obliged to work from ten to four, and when required to perform extra services, they are bound to do that; but while they are bound to do so, they are not bound to do it without extra remuneration. That is the position I take, and if the law is different from that, it ought to be amended.

Mr. ROSS. I hope I am not to be understood as casting any reflection on the service, as the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland might lead one to infer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not mean them to bear that inference.

Mr. ROSS. I know many of them too well as able, courteous gentleman, to accuse them to be guilty of offence in the respect alluded to. I do not mean that all the members of the Civil Service are equally able and valuable. I am speaking my mind freely and frankly on this subject. The hon. member is allowing here not only a violation of the law, but is establishing a very bad precedent, the natural effect of which is to lead the civil servants to neglect their duties in the day in order that extra work might accumulate which they might do in the evening and get extra pay for it. Human nature in the Civil Service is the same as anywhere else. If three or four of them put their heads together and agree to loiter away their time during the day in order that work might accumulate, and when there is a plethora apply for the extra pay for the extra work accumulated, their conspiracy—I call it a conspiracy—under this system would succeed. As to the hours of the service, the clerks are not taxed more or as much as the members of any other profession. My hon. friend from Northumberland puts in a greater number of hours, taking

the year round, than any member of the Civil Service; and take any professional man, a bank clerk or dry goods clerk, the same thing will be found, while their average salary is not so large. I have made an estimate of the average salary of the service from the deputy head down, including third class clerks and messengers, but excluding packers, and I find it to be \$1,120 a year. That is a salary that would gladden the hearts of members of some of the learned professions and of many other individuals in this country which is so prosperous. If we ask civil servants to put in a little extra work, occasionally, we do not ask too much. True, some of our officers are paid very small allowances. The messengers that wait in our lobbies are paid very small allowances. They are the worst paid class in our service. The hours of our Civil Service clerks are from ten to four, and they have two or three weeks' holidays in each year, so that they are not so badly paid for the work they do; and I am not to blame if I insist, not only that the law should be observed, but that we should not be asked to vote this money again and again. I know of four officers of the House, besides Mr. Dionne, who have been away at the elections. I could name other officials who were similarly engaged. If these men are so severely taxed to perform the work assigned them, how is it they can leave their business and go electioneering to the various counties where they can bring political influence to bear? Take the case of Mr. Dionne; not only did he oppose the hon. member for L'Islet, but he was one of the most active canvassers in Ottawa during the last campaign, and was noted for his exertions in seeing that his own political friends, and nobody else, got a hearing. Was he working extra hours during that time and is this his extra pay?

Mr. BLAKE. These are a part of Public Works.

Mr. ROSS. No doubt these are the public works that Mr. Dionne did, that he was employed upon. They were the public occasions upon which he was employed, and this \$1,500 is no doubt to compensate him for the noise he made at various public meetings, and the assistance he gave to candidates of the Government. Do these little duties turn up in the Estimates occasionally? I hope not. I am not satisfied, taking this matter on its merits, that the seven pages I notice in the Public Accounts are rendered value for the \$1,500. The principle is wrong from top to bottom. This man should not be so employed or any other man, contrary to law, contrary to the duty of the Administration, and detrimental to the morale of the service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are departing from the practice of Parliament in discussing in Committee of Supply "all round my hat," going over the whole subject of the public administration of affairs. My hon. friend wants to know if Mr. Dionne is to be paid for howling at different elections. If the hon. gentleman will look at the paper, he will see that it contains a detailed statement of the work Mr. Dionne is to be paid for. The information is thorough, and therefore he cannot for a moment suppose the payment is in any way connected with crying out at elections. There is nothing contrary to law in this. The Minister of the Department in which Mr. Dionne has been engaged asks Parliament to vote the money. The law says, the employé of a Department should not be paid for extra work. My hon. friend did not pay him, but he asks Parliament in its omnipotence to do so. Now, what is the work? As a clerk in the Department Mr. Dionne was not obliged to prepare this elaborate compilation.

Mr. ROSS. Only seven pages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a valuable work containing a detailed statement of all the expenditure on every public work from 1867. We are in the habit, and have been properly in the habit, of voting remuneration to a clerk when he applies himself to some useful work outside his

office hours. If the Clerk of the House of Commons prepares a work on constitutional practice, we pay him. If our Librarian writes a good book on constitutional history, we do not say to him: You ought not to have done it and you will get nothing, for you must have stolen your time to write. If the late Fennings Taylor wrote a book on constitutional law, whether we were a Parliament or a Legislature, he should not have got any consideration. Sir Erskine May, Clerk of the House of Commons, was stealing his time when he wrote his valuable books. Mr. Alfred Todd, who is now no more, the brother of our Librarian and the Clerk of Private Bills, compiled two magnificent indexes of all the Journals of the old Province of Upper Canada and the Provinces of United Canada, a very valuable volume without which you cannot thread the maze of the Journals of the Province, should not have been paid for his work. Mr. Hartney, in the same way, a very valuable officer, lost his time when he prepared his work on Private Bills. The hon. gentleman's theory is absurd on the face of it. Mr. Dionne did the work without being asked to do it, and without being under any obligation to do it. Being fond of statistics it was a labor of love for him, and for years he kept his record from day to day and from year to year. We have no right to steal his brains or his work, and I have no doubt he performed his work faithfully, thoroughly and honestly, during his office hours. But this book is his own and not ours, and if we want it we must pay him for it. But if we do want to get this valuable book concerning all the public expenditure on all the public works in united Canada since Confederation, how are we to get it? We cannot steal it; we cannot force him to give it to us. We cannot threaten to stop his salary, but we must pay him for it. There cannot be a more valuable book prepared than a classified analysis of all expenditure on all public works of Canada since 1867.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The book has only seven pages.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has no idea of the amount of labor required to produce this result. It is very easy to write down four or five figures in a line, but sometimes it requires an enormous amount of labor to ascertain what figures to write down. This gentleman worked hard and well, and performed his work with great accuracy. The hon. gentleman knows that during the last two years we wanted this book for the Public Accounts, and could not get it.

Mr. ROSS. I hope the hon. gentleman will not leave the House under the impression that seven pages from the Public Accounts constitute a book. I would like to say in reply to the hon. First Minister, since he has mentioned the names of some of the officers, are we to understand that they are not to be paid for the services they render? Take one clerk for instance. I believe, there was a vote of \$1,500 for purchasing a very valuable work which he has prepared. I do not know that that gentleman has been paid \$1,500; I think that money has been expended to supply hon. members of this House with that valuable work. The same with Mr. Todd the Librarian. I remember seeing the sum in the Estimates for a certain number of copies of his work, but I have no recollection that he received any of the money personally.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What about Mr. Bowles?

Mr. ROSS. That is another case. Mr. Bowles profited by that. That matter was discussed in the Printing Committee, I think, and I agreed with that vote myself, because I could not see any other way of getting that service rendered. Mr. Bowles had charge of the Index of the Sessional Papers, and of the Votes and Proceedings, from day to day, and he had peculiar facilities for the discharge of that duty. There was no other man, in the House or out of it, that was as competent as Mr. Bowles to do that work.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

Mr. BOWELL. The Librarian had formerly been paid for the same work, but when Mr. Bowles presented his book to the Printing Committee, though it was much smaller, the hon. gentleman thought that he was entitled to the amount.

Mr. ROSS. I believe Mr. Bowles prepared the book at the suggestion of the Committee, and I was one of the Committee who made the suggestion. But, after all, the officers named by the hon. Minister of the Interior are not officers whose time is engrossed the whole year in the performance of their official duties, but only during the sitting of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are much mistaken. Ask the Clerk, and see what he will say.

Mr. ROSS. I know what his main duties are during the Session; the balance of the year his duties are comparatively light. I am sure, as a member of this House, I am delighted to know we have an officer who is capable of preparing a book that commands the commendation of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Chairman: I have only a few words to add in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for L'Islet. I must, first of all, express my surprise that the work which has been prepared by one of our fellow subjects should receive any opposition in this House, and that this opposition should come from the hon. member from L'Islet. It is true that the hon. member, at this moment, sees all kinds of phantoms. Not long since he raised his voice relative to another gentleman, who, if I may use a popular expression, gave him something to attend to in his own county. To day he desires to attack Mr. Dionne. Mr. Dionne had some leisure, and I do not think he could have employed it better than in opposing the hon. member from L'Islet. There is no reason why the hon. member should seize this occasion to declare war without reason against one who produced so praiseworthy a work as the one in question. When one wants to be considered the first in Israel, I think he should display much broader views, and not walk in the mist of personalities.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). I am not aware whether my hon. friend refers to a certain gentleman named Hébert; if he speaks of him I am in a position to inform him that I have just received a telegraphic despatch informing me that this Mr. Hébert has been fined \$200 for the little affair in which he took so much interest a short time ago.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). For the information of the hon. member from L'Islet, I may inform him that I received a despatch saying the decision has been appealed from.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). It cannot be appealed.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). The hon. member ought to know that the same Judge recently ordered a Mr. McKenzie, of Bellechasse, to pay a fine of \$200; and that the case having been appealed the judgment was reversed. If the hon. member says the case cannot be appealed not only he is not a good member but he is not even a good lawyer.

284. Miscellaneous—Surveys and inspections..... \$5,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is because the vote last Session was not large enough. I might have said that this vote was for new works, or for unforeseen works; but that is not the case.

287. Fish ries—To provide for payments for extra services to officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and for printing and other expenses in procuring information and making payments in connection with the Act granting bounties to fishermen..... \$3,000.00

Mr. McISAAC. Perhaps the hon. acting Minister will explain this vote.



Mr. BOWELL. It is to provide for the payment of clerks, principally clerks in the Department, who were employed after hours in preparing the statements on which the fishery bounties were made, they were paid at the rate of \$2 for each five hours' work performed under the superintendence of an officer of the Department. The vote is also to cover printing and other outlays consequent upon making these payments. I might mention that no less than 13,000 claims have already been received and disposed of. The reason why clerks in the Department were employed, was, that if clerks from outside had been engaged, a couple of men would have been required to teach them what to do.

Mr. McISAAC. I should like to know from the acting Minister why lobster and salmon fishermen are excluded from participating in the bounty?

Mr. BOWELL. Because they were not affected by the Washington Treaty. This payment was given to fishermen who, it was presumed, had suffered by the Treaty of Washington, and it was to compensate for loss. As I understand it, the lobster fisheries were never affected by that Treaty.

Mr. McISAAC. I would admit the truth of a portion of the hon. gentleman's argument, if the Act authorizing the appropriation had been passed in 1880, instead of the resolutions introduced by the hon. First Minister and supported by a large number of hon. members. The argument would then have had some force. The resolution to which I refer, ends with these words:

"The portion of the Fishery Award paid over to Canada, constitutionally and of right belongs to the Dominion of Canada."

Speaking to this resolution the hon. First Minister said:

"The coasts of the Maritime Provinces of Canada belong to every British subject; and a man living in the centre or any other part of Ontario or the Dominion, if he chooses to go, has the same right to fish within these three miles of coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island as the people of those several Provinces have; he has precisely the same right; it is no exclusive right."

Further on he said:

"So, when Confederation was consummated, when the several Provinces consented to surrender their entities, and to be merged in the Dominion, the coasts of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, and of Prince Edward Island ceased forever, for they became the coasts of the Dominion of Canada; their waters became the waters of the Dominion of Canada, and their fisheries became the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada."

According to the doctrine laid down by the hon. First Minister, and supported by a majority of the House, the sea coast and fisheries are the domain of the people of Canada generally. The fisheries belong to no particular province or class of the population, and therefore, we cannot say they belong to any particular class of the fishermen. If this doctrine was sound in 1880, I cannot see why it is not sound now. It being sound then, there is no reason why any particular class of the fishermen should be excluded. It is true that our lobster and salmon fisheries are not affected by the Washington Treaty, but the Act authorizing this appropriation makes no exception. The Act says, and it is not in conflict with the doctrine enunciated by the hon. First Minister in 1880:

"The object of the appropriation is the development of the sea fisheries and improvement of the condition of the fishermen."

And then it says:

"Such grant to be appropriated for said purposes under orders to be made from time to time by the Governor in Council."

The money is for the improvement of the condition of fishermen and the development of the sea fisheries. No distinction is made between classes of fishermen. Neither is any distinction made in the resolution, nor in the speech of the First Minister, in 1880. I, therefore, contend, that the order for the distribution of the money for the coming

year, should be made so as to include lobster fishermen and salmon fishermen; that is to say, salmon fishermen who fish along the coast of the Atlantic, and those who fish in the Straits of Northumberland and in the St. Lawrence. These are very important fisheries. The lobster fisheries of the Maritime Provinces in 1881 amounted to about \$3,000,000. The reason given by the acting Minister for excluding these classes is no reason at all, because they are entitled to the bounty, independent of the Treaty of Washington and the Halifax Award, after the resolution passed by this House in 1880, just as much as iron manufacturers are to the bounty they are to receive. I must also complain that the Order laid on the Table the other night was not what I expected it to be. There is only one amendment, and that I admit is an important one. It doubles the money allowed to fishermen in boats, but it makes no change as regards fishermen in vessels. But the other objectionable features in the last year's Order still exist. These features are the smallness of the sum allowed and the conditions to be fulfilled in order to entitle a fisherman to participation—I mean the condition of three months' actual fishing, and the condition of 2,500 lbs. catch imposed on fishermen in boats. These conditions, I venture to say, exclude one-half of the boat fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. In 1881—I have not the returns of 1882 before me, as they are not yet published—there were 7,254 vessel fishermen, and 32,644 boat fishermen in these Provinces. It appears from the memorandum submitted the other evening that the number of boat fishermen who succeeded in getting the bounty last year is 19,392, and this number includes the successful applicants in the Province of Quebec as well as those in the Maritime Provinces. I can safely assert that now we have some 40,000 boat fishermen in the Lower Provinces alone. That number added to the same class in the Province of Quebec, it becomes evident that more than one-half are entirely shut out by one or the other of these conditions. It is absurd to argue that a fisherman is not entitled to a share because he does not catch 2,500 lbs., and does not take three months catching the quantity especially as the money is voted to improve his condition. The man who meets the worst luck needs the aid more than the man who is more fortunate in his catch. I may be told that the money is not in the nature of aid or relief—that it is a bounty. It is not a bounty in the sense that a bounty means a premium given according to the quantity of fish caught. This also is evident from the fact that a fisherman who may catch even tons, unless he spends three months catching the quantity, is entirely excluded. I hope when the Order in Council is laid on the Table for the assent of Parliament, it will be so changed as to admit a larger number of fishermen into sharing in the bounty. Let the condition of the quantity caught be removed in case of boat fishermen, as it is not applied to vessel fishermen, let the condition of time be also modified by shortening the period. The exclusion involves a greater loss now as the amount awarded to each is increased.

Mr. BURNS. I may be permitted to make some observations in reply to the hon. gentleman. Under the Treaty of Washington, I do not think it was contemplated that the shore fishermen should get any share of the award. As everyone knows the difficulties that prevailed for a number of years between the Canadian and American Governments, with regard to the rights of American fishermen to the share in the fisheries within a certain distance from the shore, led to the appointment of a Commission. This Commission led to the admission of our fish duty free into the American market. I may remark here, I do not think the United States treated us very well in evading, to some extent, this provision, by imposing a duty of 1½ cts. on the tins in which the lobsters are packed. The award of \$4,500,000 was paid for the right of the Americans to share in our deep sea fisheries, within a certain dis-

tance from the shore, and on account of this concession, it was deemed proper to give some compensation for a recognition of the competition to which our fishermen were subjected from the Americans; but no such argument would apply to the shore fishermen. I do not think the hon. gentleman will dispute the fact, that the salmon and lobster are shore fisheries; and as the Americans are not allowed to share in these fisheries, unless they reside or do business in this country, no particular injustice is done to this class. This, to my mind, is one reason why the bounty granted is only distributed to deep sea fishermen. The hon. gentleman argues, that according to the reading of the resolution, this money is only paid to develop the fisheries; but I ask the hon. gentleman and the House, would it be likely, if it were not for these \$4,500,000, that we would give this recognition to the fishermen in the shape of a bounty of \$150,000 a year? I think not, and, therefore, maintain that it is to the deep sea fishermen that it is really due. I took occasion some time ago to refer to the grievances under which I thought the salmon fishermen are laboring, and I asked the Department to give their attention to the tax which is now imposed on their nets, with a view to having it reduced. That tax is imposed largely for the purpose of registration, and I think it might be reduced one-half, if not entirely abolished, and thus confer a benefit on these fishermen. A word or two with regard to the distribution of the bounty. It is distributed in this way: A certain amount, equal to \$2.50 is given to each fisherman in a boat, and as a boat's crew consists of four, the amount given to each boat would be \$10. But if my recollection of the regulations is correct, it does not follow that if each man of the crew did not catch the quantity prescribed by the regulations he would not get his proportionate share. The hon. gentleman endeavors to make a point by saying that in proportion to the total number now engaged in the fisheries, the boatmen do not get a sufficient share of the bounty. He argues that the regulations are oppressive, inasmuch as one of the conditions imposed on the fishermen is the necessity of fishing at least three months in the year. Any person who does not fish for three months in the year cannot fairly be called a fisherman, and I do not think it would be desirable to encourage, by giving a bounty, the farmers of the county living along the sea shore, to devote part of their time to fishing. This bounty is exclusively for the benefit of the fishermen, and I do not think the amount which should be paid to the fishermen, should be lessened by giving it to the persons who go from the shore and catch a few quintals during the time which they can spare from their farm operations.

Mr. McISAAC. Increase the subsidy.

Mr. BURNS. Though the subsidy is a very respectable one, no one would rejoice more than I would to see it increased. I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister to one fact in relation to the boat fishermen. Under the present system, as operated in my own county, at all events, the fishermen do not get what I think that they should get, namely, the whole of that bounty. I think it is unfair to give to the owner of the boat any portion of what is earned by the fishermen. Under the operation of the present regulations, one-fifth of the amount goes to the boat owners, and I will tell you how that operates in the county of Gloucester, which is a large fishing county. A great number of the boats are owned by the supplier—the merchant or the man who advances the supplies, and buys the fish. The fisherman pays to that owner a certain sum, \$25 or \$30 as the case may be, for the fishing season which is supposed to close on the 25th of August. It is unfair to the fishermen that, in addition to paying the owner of the boat a rent for it, they should also pay a share of their earnings. It would

Mr. BURNS.

be all very well if it reduced the amount which the owner of the boat charges to the fishermen; but the practical working of the regulations is not in that direction, as the money which was intended to go to these toilers of the sea practically goes to increase the rent which they pay to the owners of the boats. It is argued that in some cases that one of the men in the boat is the owner. If such is the case the other three pay him a proportionate amount of what would be a rent for it, and he should not be placed on a better footing than themselves or the supplier or the merchant who supplies the boat.

Mr. BRECKEN. Last year the forms which are necessary to be signed, did not reach Prince Edward Island until the crews had dispersed, some of them leaving the Island, and others living at a considerable distance from the officer who has these matters in charge. If possible, these papers should be sent before the season is over, so that they could be signed before the fishermen go home, for if a fisherman who is entitled to receive \$5, has to spend considerable time or money in travelling, it amounts to a tax upon his bounty, especially in the case of those who have to leave the Island.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if some of the bounties are still to be paid?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a large amount to be paid yet, as is shown by the fact of the Order in Council having been changed, doubling the amount to the fishermen.

Mr. VAIL. I may say that I agree with the opinion expressed by some hon. gentlemen that this money in a strictly legal sense belongs properly to the Dominion. But then we must consider what the money was received for. It was received from the United States Government for the privilege of allowing American fishermen to come on our coasts and catch fish, which, of course, means participating in the same advantages which our fishermen have with regard to the three-mile limit; consequently, every fisherman coming on our coast to catch fish interferes with the rights and privileges of our fishermen, not only by catching fish, but in many instances they have injured the fishing grounds by throwing their gurry overboard, and as we had no control over them, and no supervision of the fisheries, of course there was nobody to prevent it. Now, while I quite agree with the view that the money paid in that way belongs to the Dominion of Canada, at the same time if this grant of \$150,000 was made to the fishermen as a bounty, it was made for the reason that a certain amount of money was collected from the United States Government in return for the use of our fisheries, and that, therefore, a portion of it—I contend the whole—belongs to the fishermen; and I consider that the Government have granted only a portion of what was due to the fishermen. The Government of Canada received that money in October, 1878; and having used it for the four years up to October last, the accumulation of interest would add nearly \$1,000,000 to the principal. The amount received from the United States Government after paying Newfoundland was something like \$4,498,802, which was reduced by the deduction of expenses incurred to \$4,350,531. The accumulation of interest for the four years would make the fund at the credit of the fishermen \$5,400,000. I agree with the hon. member for Antigonish when he says, that the fisherman is as much entitled to a bounty on the fish he catches as the manufacturer of iron is on the iron he manufactures; but as this bounty was given for another reason, I contend that the fishermen should have the benefit of the whole amount, and that the Government, instead of paying them \$150,000 annually, should pay them about \$240,000 annually. I hope the Government will see their way clear to pay over the difference between \$150,000 and \$240,000. If the

money belonged to the fishermen at all, the principal belonged to them; but if the Government keep the principal, they should pay over the full amount of the annual interest.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask, what proportion of this money is for extra service, who are the officers paid, and how much is paid to each?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information at present, but I will obtain it on Concurrence. I have but few words to say in reply to the hon. member for Antigonish, with reference to the distribution of this fund. He sets out with the declaration that the money belongs to the whole Dominion, and that that was the argument used by the hon. Premier, when the question was first brought before the House in 1880. At that time it was not decided that any portion of this money should be given to the fishermen, or distributed in any other way than forming part of the general revenue of the Dominion; but after due consideration, and after having adopted the policy of assisting all branches of industry in the country, it was deemed advisable—as it was alleged that the fishermen had lost a certain portion of their trade—that an amount equal to about 4 per cent. of the award should be divided among the fishermen. It is quite true that they have not been granted the full amount; but the hon. gentleman must remember that a large amount of expenditure is incurred every year in the protection of these fisheries in different ways, and by that means it is completely absorbed. If the theory laid down by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) be correct, that because an award was obtained, under the Washington Treaty, in connection with our fisheries, it belongs exclusively to one branch of industry in the country, that, I fancy, might apply to a great many other industries which we are encouraging. The hon. gentleman objects to the principle upon which the bounty has been paid, and he objects to it on the ground that the Premier, in 1880, in discussing this question, stated that the fund belonged to the whole Dominion, and not to any one class of fishermen. That is quite true; but, in 1882, when it was decided that \$150,000, a sum nearly equal to the interest upon the amount of the award, should be distributed among the fishermen, the manner in which, so far as possible, the money was to be distributed was distinctly stated. I will read a short extract from the speech made by the hon. Minister of Finance at that time, which is the best answer I can give to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The hon. Minister of Finance said:

"The proposition is to reimburse the fishermen of that portion of the Dominion who have had taken from them, by the Treaty, exclusive privileges which they formerly enjoyed. It is to compensate them for the competition which they are now meeting with from American fishermen. A number of communications have been received, through members of the House representing fishing districts. There have been propositions to pay on the fish exports. It was felt that the amount would not reach the parties engaged in the business. Another proposition offered was that every man engaged in the fishing business should receive a certain sum per head. That, however, would be a difficult undertaking, although from a political point of view, it would be advantageous. But there are two objects in view in the proposition submitted: first, to encourage the construction of a class of vessels that is much needed; second, to compensate the fishermen. It is the intention of the Government to use the fishery officers for the purpose of granting licenses and looking after the matter, but it would be a difficult matter to distribute the amount according to the number of men in a boat. The point with respect to which there is at present some difficulty is as to the size of the boat, but we may arrive at that by the length of the keel and the dimensions of the boat."

I find also on this subject, in answer to a question by the then hon. member for Gloucester, that the hon. Finance Minister said:

"The law, I think, speaks of registered vessels of ten tons. Any smaller vessels are not registered, and there is where one of the difficulties lies in reaching a decision."

I read these extracts to show that the intention of the Government at the time was to confine the distribution to the fishermen who were deprived of certain privileges, and the

reason for paying a certain proportion of the bounty to the vessels was a desire on the part of the Government to encourage, as much as possible, the building of that class of boats. It will readily be understood that if it were open to all classes of fishermen, as pointed out by the then hon. member for Gloucester, any farmer taking his row-boat and spending a few days or weeks fishing would be able to claim a certain portion of the bounty. That was not the intention either of the law or the Government. The intention was to reward those who had lost certain privileges and to encourage as much as possible the construction of vessels in our own country for fishing purposes. I assure hon. gentlemen it has been with no little difficulty that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has arrived at the decision at which he did arrive in laying down some practical basis on which to act. He has carried out almost to the letter the declaration made by the hon. Finance Minister at the time, and the only object the Government can have in view is to carry out the law and give the bounty to those who are engaged in the deep sea fisheries and who are deprived of those privileges to which the hon. Finance Minister alluded, and to encourage in our own country the building of vessels to be used in fishing operations in the Gulf and the deep sea.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). From the Order in Council which I find was passed on the 7th November—of course, it was simply impossible for the Government to collect any information and pay the bounty before the close of that year—I think if the hon. Minister had undertaken to obtain the information earlier, the Government might have been in a position to pay the bounty before this time. Fishing voyages are always settled for on or about the first of the year. On the 4th or 5th of January, fishermen are always settled with and paid off; and I trust the hon. Minister will see that the returns are collected before the end of the year, and the claims paid as soon as submitted to the Department. The hon. Minister says this money was given in lieu of the privileges of which our fishermen were deprived by the Washington Treaty, and in the next breath he says it was given as a sort of protection to the fishing industry.

Mr. BOWELL. A bounty.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a part of the so-called National Policy. It was but right the Government should extend a fostering influence to this industry, for the simple reason that, by the high tariff on all the articles used by the fishermen, the cost of carrying on that industry was largely increased; and it would be but right and fair that bounties should be paid to lobster and salmon fishermen as well. Will the hon. gentleman give me some information as to the position occupied by Mr. Ogden, of Nova Scotia, in connection with this service—what his duties are and how he is paid?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to give the particulars now, but will ascertain them and lay them before the House.

Mr. WELDON. In regard to the principle laid down by the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is altogether different to that adopted in regard to the drawback given to ships. The latter is for the purpose of returning to ship-owners in that shape the duties they have paid. In this case the fishermen are still to pay the duties, but this amount is given as a compensation for certain privileges taken from them by the Washington Treaty. If that be the principle, it is ignoring the principle laid down in the resolution of the First Minister in 1880 in regard to the right of the Dominion to the Fishery Award. What was contended then by the Maritime Provinces was, that the fisheries were their property, held in trust for them by the Dominion, and the fact that Newfoundland received her share of the award was

proof positive of that contention. If the principle is to protect the fishermen against foreign competition, the lobster and salmon fisheries have the same claim, more particularly when the hon. Minister of Finance placed an increased duty on cordage and nets.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) As this debate seems to have taken a wide range, perhaps I might be permitted to ask whether, in view of the fact that the Province of British Columbia is also a Maritime Province, any provision is to be made for her fishermen. We have there no lobster fisheries, but we have there salmon fisheries and crabs. I know we have been in some way overlooked in the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, as regards the free entry of fish and fish oil; but in this matter of the fishery bounty, I think it is pertinent for me to ask why British Columbia should not be included in the disposition of that \$150,000?

Mr. BOWELL. I think I cannot do better than read a short extract from the speech of the hon. Finance Minister when the same question was put by the late member for Victoria, Mr. DeCosmos: "British Columbia does not come within the terms of the Treaty, and American fishermen are not competing with them." As the object of this appropriation was to pay those who were affected by that Treaty, British Columbia not being affected by it, it was not considered correct to pay them the bounty in the same manner as it was paid to the others.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying we are not affected. For the past six or seven years large American schooners have come up to our coast and taken part in our deep sea fisheries, and we have no safeguards against that.

Mr. BOWELL. I am aware of that fact, because during the short time I have been acting for my hon. colleague that question has been brought under my notice. American fishermen, I am informed, come into our waters almost unimpeded, but they are acting in direct contravention of the law, and I instructed the officer to warn them off, and if they do not obey that warning some other steps will have to be taken in order to prevent them poaching upon the fisheries of British Columbia, where they have no rights.

Mr. KIRK. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at this late hour of the night in discussing the points which have been so ably discussed by my hon. friend from Antigonish and others on this side of the House, further than to say that I entirely agree with them that lobster and salmon fishermen are as justly entitled to share in the bounty as other fishermen, and that the bounty, instead of being only the interest on \$3,000,000, it should be the interest on \$4,500,000 annually. There is another question which I wish to bring to the notice of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with this matter, and that is in connection with the close season for lobster fishing. I would like to enquire whether it is the intention of the Government this year to allow lobster fishing in the fall of the year. As it is now the fishermen are only allowed to fish for lobsters practically for three months in the year, because they cannot fish during the month of April, and it is the first of May before they are able to fish for lobsters; consequently, the above season confines them practically to three months in the year. This appears to me too short a time to allow fishermen to engage in lobster fishing. It is impossible for them, unless the business is more than usually profitable, to earn enough during those three months to support their families during the remainder of the year. You are expecting a little too much from their business. Therefore, I am of opinion that this close season is an imposition on the lobster fishermen of the Dominion. The lobster fishing industry is a very large one and employs a great many men. I think in the county I have the honor to represent, there are eleven or twelve lobster canning establish-

Mr. WELDON:

ments that employ a great many men, and I would like to see the Government allow them to fish in the fall of the year, and I can see no good reason why they should not. I can see a reason why there should be a close season for lobster fishing, because there is a certain season of the year in which that fish is not in fit condition for human food, and during that season they should not be allowed to be taken. But from information I have received from those engaged in the business that season extends for only about four or five, or at most six weeks, and that is the only time during which the season should be closed—that is, at least, the opinion of the fishermen themselves. Some two months ago I obtained an Order of this House for petitions and correspondence on the subject, which, I am informed, are in the hands of the Department, but which have not yet been brought down. I, therefore, take this opportunity of urging the Government to bring down that information and to take this matter into their early consideration, and, if possible, permit fall fishing for lobsters.

288. Scientific Institutions..... \$1,750.00

Mr. BOWELL. This sum is to cover the deficiency in the sum voted last year on account of extension of the service. Full details of the expenditure will be found on page 162 of the report. I think the increase may be considered a permanent one.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the condition of the Toronto Observatory?

Mr. BOWELL. The cottage formerly occupied by the observers having been claimed by the University as their property, it was ceded to them, and it was necessary to provide another residence. The item of \$250 is to pay rent.

289. Steamboat Inspection..... \$2,000.00.

Mr. BAKER. I desire to impress on the acting Minister the necessity of appointing a steamboat inspector in British Columbia, with as little delay as possible. It is utterly impossible to expect to obtain a man capable, scientifically and practically, to perform the duties incident to that position unless he is paid a respectable sum. For \$750 a year, the Government will never be able to secure a man who can satisfactorily perform the duties expected from such an officer, and the Government have been without an officer for one year now.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I desire to draw the attention of the Department to a matter of considerable importance. We have, of course, a Steamboat Inspector for Canadian vessels plying between the Dominion and the United States. I do not know whether the acting Minister is aware of the fact, that the United States Government have passed a most stringent measure, providing for the inspection of foreign steamboats. Steamboats owned here, and plying between Canadian and American ports, no matter if they have been inspected by our inspectors, are compelled to undergo a rigid inspection in the United States. I trust the Dominion Government will look into the matter, and pass a law the same as that of the United States. There are steamers plying between the United States and Canadian ports, and I am informed, by men familiar with steamboats, that those boats, in some cases, and at certain seasons, are unsafe, but they are passed by the American Steamboat Inspectors. The subject is one to which the Government should give their immediate attention.

Mr. BOWELL. The vote was taken for the purpose of providing for additional expenses connected with the Inspection Act. Three inspectors were appointed, one for Quebec, one for the Maritime Provinces, and one for Ontario, and the expenses attending their work have been greater than are anticipated. We have also found it necessary, particularly at the present season, to give assistance to the Inspectors, the additional officers being selected from among

those who had passed the necessary examination. For about a month or six weeks, the Inspectors have a great deal more to do than they can possibly accomplish, and all the shipping is practically stopped, owing to the fact that these officers cannot possibly overtake the work they have to perform at the opening of navigation. Only two days ago we appointed two additional inspectors to assist the regular staff. I have no note of an inspector having been appointed for British Columbia; but inspectors in Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, receive \$1,000 a year and travelling expenses. I will make enquiries and ascertain what appointment has been made in British Columbia, and whether it was under the Steamboat Inspection Act, or the Act relating to the inspection of hulls.

Mr. BAKER. The members for British Columbia have already urged on the Minister of Marine the appointment of an inspector of hulls in addition to, or in connection with, the inspection of steam-engines and boilers. We had a disaster the other day, by which seventy or eighty lives were lost. It is no use locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen; and so we want to take time by the forelock and have the appointment made without delay.

Mr. DAWSON. This year many vessels have been sent up to the lakes which are very old, and are used at points where new lines have been established. It is very desirable that a change should be made next year, and that strict regulations should be enforced.

290. Lighthouse and Coast Service..... \$9,451.25

Mr. BOWELL. The House is aware that the lighthouse at Cape Race belongs to, and is maintained by, the British Government; but in order to prevent light dues being charged on vessels coming to the Dominion, this amount is required to provide for the payment of such dues. \$7,000 is required to pay the Montreal Harbor Commissioners for maintenance of buoys and beacons during the season of 1882. This is the second year in which this amount has been voted.

Mr. VAIL. Is this \$451 paid to the British Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; and the other \$2,000 are expenses incurred in connection with the survey to which the attention of the House was called a few nights ago, on Lake Huron, Georgian Bay and other portions of water in the West.

Mr. BLAKE. What are those expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. I only know that \$2,000 are required to cover them for the current year.

Mr. BLAKE. They must have been incurred already.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, by vessels. I will give the particulars on Concurrence.

291. Indians—New Brunswick: To compensate the Rev. Mr. Bannon for services rendered to the Indians of Big Cove, N.B., during the two past years, 1881-82, 1882-83..... \$150.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Bannon has been acting there for some time as chaplain for the Indians of this band, he is now acting as their missionary, and this is to pay him for his past services. In the future he will receive \$100 a year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How many Indians are there here?

Mr. MITCHELL. I may say, that the number of them is very considerable, and this missionary has attended them at all times very faithfully. I know that his services are arduous, and I consider his remuneration very small.

292. Indians—Manitoba and the North-West: To supplement the amounts voted for expenditure on various sub-heads in Manitoba and North-West..... \$200,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is in addition to the vote of last year, which was insufficient. There has been an over expenditure on tools, cattle, seed, and provisions for destitute Indians of \$46,000; and then a sum is required for future expenditure under Treaties 7 and 4, for destitute Indians, and it is calculated that there will be an over-expenditure on annuities of some \$10,000. We think, however, that during the present fiscal year, we will not have to pay more than \$200,000, although this will be most likely overrun after the 1st of July.

Mr. BLAKE. How does the hon. gentleman account for such an enormous over-expenditure under Treaties 7 and 4?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the particulars on Concurrence.

293. North-West Mounted Police—Additional amount required for this service..... \$50,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Owing to the large requirements of the Canadian Pacific Railway survey and constructing party in the North-West, prices have generally increased, and, in addition, the duties of the Mounted Police are of such a nature as to necessitate a larger expenditure than during the previous year. Small detachments have been placed at convenient points along the line of railway, and on various trails by which liquor might be brought into the country via the United States. There will be required for forage and for more field work than was anticipated, \$20,000. The fuel item has increased owing to the unusual severity of the winter, by an over-expenditure of \$5,000; repairs and renewal of equipment, \$3,000; transport of troops to the North-West, \$2,000; increased rates for provisions, \$5,000; and to complete, arms, clothing and accoutrements for the increased strength of the force to 500, making \$15,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the forage will get cheaper up there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but the consumption on the railway, and owing to the influx of immigrants, has been so great, that forage is dearer, much dearer than it was during the previous year.

295. Miscellaneous—To provide for the expenses incurred during the journey of His Excellency the Governor General and suite to British Columbia and return:..... \$10,841.39

Mr. BLAKE. Does this cover the whole cost of the journey?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am quite sure that it does.

Mr. BLAKE. This journey was not all connected with the journey to the North-West?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. It was to British Columbia. This is for the expenses while in British Columbia, except for the eastern portion of the trip, which was borne, of course, by the Governor General himself. The expenses incurred in going out there and in returning, and the expenses up into the interior.

315. To provide for the expenses in connection with the International Fisheries Exhibition..... \$15,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us the details?

Mr. BOWELL. I hope the hon. gentleman will not ask for the details of the expenditure. I may say that \$10,000 was voted last Session and this is an additional \$15,000, and it is likely that another vote will have to be made making the whole appropriation \$40,000. This money has been expended, or is to be expended, in the collection of all the different varieties of fish and other articles which have been sent to the exhibition. I may say that I have no details of the expenditure—that is to say, as to the parties to whom money is to be paid. If the House desires

it I will give a detailed statement of the expenditure on Concurrence. I have a list here, giving the different headings of the articles for the exhibition, such as pickled fish, smoked fish, frozen fish, fish in alcohol, shell fish, specialties, &c., the food upon which the fish live.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, however, when we are asked to vote a sum which will be in the aggregate the hon. gentleman tells us \$40,000, it would be reasonable to know in general terms what proportion of the vote is going in salaries, what is the plan adopted for collection, how much has been paid for the various articles, &c. There is a way of spending a sum of \$40,000 in which you can pay a great deal of money to the individuals for services and very little for the articles.

Mr. BOWELL. I will endeavor to get that information for the hon. gentleman, but I may say that I happen to know that the amount spent in salaries and otherwise for these collections is as moderate a sum as it was possible to cover the work, and I think when the particulars have been read to the House the hon. gentleman will find that there has been no extravagance whatever. I may say that in conversation with the Minister of Marine I know that he has been as economical as possible consistent with making the exhibition one which would be creditable to the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not charging the hon. gentleman or the hon. Minister of the Department with extravagance, but I think he would hardly expect the heads of the Department to say to him. "Now, Bowell, I am really very extravagant in all these expenditures."

Mr. BOWELL. On the contrary, the fear was expressed that he would not spend as much money as was necessary to make an exhibition which would be creditable to the Department and to the country.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will let us know what is the proportionate amount spent in the different Provinces in connection with this work.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you want to see if you got your share?

Mr. DAVIES. No, I do not ask the question from any such low ground, and I hope the hon. Minister will give us some information on this point.

Mr. BOWELL. I will endeavor to do so.

296. Miscellaneous—To provide for a retiring allowance to following members of the Dominion Police Force: Superintendent O'Neill, Sergeant-Major Connor, and Constables Kane, Purcell and Jones; and a gratuity to Mrs. Egan, widow of constable Egan..... \$2,656.95

Mr. BLAKE. Were these men incapable of further service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice of the Department is to allow the rate of one month's pay for every year's service. Mr. O'Neill was about sixty years of age, and had served ten years and 27 days. He was afflicted with asthma which incapacitated him for the discharge of his duties. Mr. Connor suffered from rheumatism, particularly while he was on duty in the police rooms of the Eastern block. He had been on service twelve years and six months. Mr. Kane was sixty-three years of age, and there were otherwise sufficient grounds for retirement. Mr. Purcell was short-sighted and could not read or write. Mr. Jones could neither read nor write, was fifty years of age, and for other reasons it was held that his retirement was necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. When was Purcell and Jones appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1874 and 1873, respectively. Constable Egan was reported to be in ill health, and before the Order in Council was passed he died, so that it is proposed to pay the gratuity to his widow.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BLAKE. Each allowance is calculated on the basis of one month's pay for each year's service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

297. Miscellaneous—To pay the legal expenses incurred in the defence of Mr. John Burgess, steamboat inspector for the district of Montreal, who was tried for manslaughter in connection with the explosion of the boiler of the steamer *Richelieu*..... \$743 50

Mr. BLAKE. What is the meaning of this vote?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Burgess was indicted by the Grand Jury for manslaughter in connection with the explosion of the boiler of the *Richelieu*. He was placed on trial and acquitted, and the Government assumed the costs of the defence which have been taxed by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. On what principle did the Government assume the cost of the defence?

Mr. BOWELL. Because it was thought that he was improperly prosecuted, as the explosion was not his fault, and the Government believed that he, having performed his duty, should not be put to the expense of defending himself. As has often been the case, he was prosecuted for having ostensibly neglected his duty, and it turned out that he had not neglected his duty, and the Government did not deem it advisable that he should be put to the expense of his own defence.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the statement that the Government assumed the cost of the defence is a very unfortunate statement. When a Grand Jury brings in a true bill against a man for a criminal offence, I do not think the Government have a right to form a judgment for themselves as to whether the officer performed his duty or not. That is to be decided in the ordinary courts, and the Government should not be on one side prosecuting and on the other side defending. If after the trial, a case is made, it is possible, though I do not see why, for the Government to say that they will reimburse the officer for the costs of his defence. I am afraid, as a result of this, that the defence of public officers will be conducted at a very large cost. If it is found that the Dominion Government are at their back, the expenses will be charged in a much more lavish manner than if their defence is at their own expense. When I had charge of the Department, several of these cases came up and I do not remember any case on which I recommended that the Government should assume the costs of the defence of any officer. We are all exposed to the risks of indictments in the course of our business, and it appears to me that the Government are setting a dangerous precedent in assuming the defence in this case.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Can the hon. gentleman tell us who was the counsel retained in that defence?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. Perhaps I did not make myself well understood; but the position of the Government is precisely that which has been indicated by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The memorandum placed in my hands states that he was placed on his trial and acquitted, and that the Government then assumed the expense, which was properly taxed by the officer.

Mr. BLAKE. Then are we to understand that in every case in which a Government officer is charged with a criminal offence, and is acquitted, the Government assume the cost of his defence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the principle is well known, both in this country and in England, that each case is to be judged according to its merits. It rests upon each Department to protect its deserving officers, in the performance of their duty when they get into any difficulty. This should be done with great care and caution, and not without a thorough examination of the case; but if the Government want to have efficient officers, they must stand by them. I

do not think this has increased the number of these cases. I do not think the people will get themselves indicted because the Government will pay the expenses of their trial. I do not know anything of the case in question, but I would be sorry to have the rule stated by the hon. gentleman laid down in all cases. For instance a Customs officer in the performance of his duty, might come into collision with smugglers, and through the caprice of the jury, or the failure of the evidence, a verdict might be given against him. If the Department were satisfied, notwithstanding the finding against him, that he was really acting in the discharge of his duty, and that there was a conspiracy to get an indictment against him, I think the Department should defend their own officer. The Government have always done that in England, and I do not think there have been any heavy votes in Parliament in consequence.

Mr. BLAKE. The case cited by the hon. gentleman is an unfortunate one. This is not a case in which there was a conspiracy against an officer, but it was decided by the Grand Jury that he should be indicted, because he had neglected his duty, and gave the certificate without a proper inspection. In the case of a wrong conviction, it would be better for the Government to take proceedings to have the verdict set aside, than to set it aside themselves by indemnifying the officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this case, I understand, the Steamboat Inspector certified that he had examined the boiler, and that the inspection was sufficient, and the vessel was seaworthy. An explosion, however, took place, and he was indicted for it. He was tried, and he must have satisfied the jury that the certificate was a true one, and that he was not guilty of negligence or of misstatement in giving the certificate. If so, it appears to me he should be sustained. A poor man may be found guilty through inability to raise the funds to produce witnesses in his defence, and it would be very little satisfaction to him to say, we believe you are innocent, and to hand a sum of money to his family. If the responsible officer is satisfied the man is innocent, he should be protected.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask on what evidence the Government arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Burgess was entitled to be recouped for the money he paid out. It would not do to act simply on the ground that he was acquitted by the petty jury, but the fact should be ascertained irrespective of any decision of the petty jury.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries examined into the facts.

300. Miscellaneous—To provide for the payment of damages and costs in the suit *Phair vs. Venning* \$707.50

Mr. BOWELL. Acting under the Order in Council of 11th June 1879, Mr. Venning seized the rod and fishing tackle of Mr. Phair while in the act of fishing from his own land in the Mersey River, which had been leased to Mr. Robertson. Mr. Phair claimed the right to fish as a riparian, and the case of the Inspector was dismissed. Mr. Phair then took action for trespass, and got judgment to the extent of \$511, which with costs made \$707.50.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt if the Department, under misapprehension of the law, instructed the officer to take this course they must protect him from the consequences, but an officer is bound to use discretion, and from what I learn there are more actions than this one against him. The proper course would have been to take one case as a test case, and not give occasion for a number of cases. If his instructions were to take the course of laying the Government open to a number of actions, his instructions were not what they should have been.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman says the officer was instructed by the Department to take these actions,

but one case would have been sufficient, because it was well known the right of the Government was to be contested. Since these Estimates have been prepared the verdicts in the other cases have been sustained, and votes, no doubt, will have to be brought down to meet those cases as well. In one of the cases the damages were reduced from \$3,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. BLAKE. If this gentleman was instructed to take steps against three or four different persons, which involved the Government in damages of \$500, \$1,500, \$1,200, and \$1,000 the Department should pay the damages, but if not the officer should pay them.

Mr. BOWELL. You will find the instructions in the papers laid before the House, given to the different fishery officers. Whatever fault there was in the matter lay with the Government and not with the officer, because he acted under the Order in Council passed in 1879. That is the principle on which the Department has been conducted for the last six or seven years. I do not desire to enter into the riparian question, but the late Government carried the principle of the right which they declared the Dominion held over these fisheries, further than their predecessors. When the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) presided over that office he took great care not to interfere with what he considered certain rights which the owners of these fisheries had; but his successor taking a different view of the constitutional question, issued orders far beyond those which had been issued by his predecessor, and it was carrying out in 1879, the principle which had guided the Department from 1873 up to that time, that this Order was passed. Whether the officer exceeded his duty, as the hon. gentleman says, I am not prepared to say; but my recollection of the transaction is this: that this inspector of New Brunswick was acting under instructions from the Department, that he seized these rods and endeavored to enforce what he believed to be the law, as he had been directed. Whether he went further than he ought to have gone, or used that discretion which should characterize all officers when there is a dispute, particularly as to the rights of the people, is a question that I am not prepared to answer at the present moment. There is another vote to pay damages obtained against *Robertson vs. The Queen*, in which the question of the right to lease these fisheries was decided against the Crown.

Mr. BLAKE. The late Government did not carry out this principle, whatever it was, with reference to the riparian rights so far as to bring down in the Estimates votes to pay for large damages recovered against their officers. I should not complain of a test case, I should not complain of the Government deciding to take a proper opportunity of assisting the principle which they thought was right; but I do say—that when it was known that this was a disputed question, when it was known that the riparian proprietors took a different view, when it was known that all that was wanted was an opportunity of testing the case—to make three or four seizures of implements and to make them in such a manner as resulted in such heavy damages, was an act of gross indiscretion on the part of the officer, unless it was warranted by instructions from the Department, and if there were such instructions I would like to see them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just learned that the case was in this wise: the officer found Phair, Hanson and Stedman on the fishing ground. He stopped them, and as regards Hanson and Stedman the interruption was merely nominal. Phair resisted and there was a scuffle and the verdict was heavy in his case. You can imagine the spirit of the officers who were anxious to prevent unlimited fishing. The jury found a verdict for Hanson for \$1,000, and for Stedman for \$3,000, afterwards reduced to \$1,500, for the nominal offence, they having been merely stopped, and I am informed those two cases will go to appeal.

Mr. WELDON. I think Phair and Hanson had previously brought an action against Robertson, or the lessee, who had endeavored to enforce the law, and that question was then pending before the courts. The jury felt that the Government, or its officers, were endeavoring to set the court at defiance, and I believe that is the reason the heavy damages were awarded. Another case is that of a man named Spur. Spur was willing to take a license from the Government, and on making application the answer was, to show his title, and what was he willing to pay for it. The next, the Inspector of Fisheries came and took his rod from him by force and then brought him before the Magistrate. At the very time that was done, there was an injunction in the Court of Equity, confirmed by the Supreme Court of Fredericton, prohibiting the lessee from fishing in that river. Now, on the whole question was pending the case of Robertson vs. The Queen before the Court of Appeal. This action on the part of these officials was very unwise.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister has correctly stated what the real cause of this trouble has been. When we came into Confederation, we found diverse laws existing in the several Provinces. I endeavored to harmonize these laws, and in carrying them out I gave such instructions to the officers in my Department as to prevent any great outrage of the feelings of any of the persons engaged in the fisheries in either of the Provinces. I may say that for the seven years I administered the existing laws of the land in relation to Fisheries, I do not recollect a single case in which any difficulty arose between the Department and the fishermen. The hon. Minister has correctly stated the position I took at the time he commenced issuing these leases. I claimed there was a right in the land bordering on the river, and in the very lease to Mr. Robertson, out of which this litigation has arisen, I put in a saving clause that the proprietors along the river should have the right of fishing off their lands. A warm discussion subsequently occurred in this very place between Sir Albert Smith, late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and myself, in which I claimed the right of the proprietors to fish off their own lands. It was then contended by Sir Albert Smith that I was wrong in my law, and the report of that debate I hold in my hands. The court has since sustained the view I took in relation to that matter. Of course it was a question that any gentlemen might differ upon; there are very nice legal points involved, at all events. I was so convinced that I was right, that I inserted in that very lease, a clause reserving the right to fish off the banks. After 1873, when the then Minister came into the Fishery Department, a different rule was adopted, and instructions were issued to the fishery officers—I will only speak of my own county—which led to a state of ferment and excitement, which has never to this hour been allayed. The present Department is as active on the policy which they found existing, and it is, I hold, by the decision of the Court, the fact that the position assumed by myself in 1867 was proved to be substantially the correct and sound one. As to whether this special officer performed his duties with moderation or not, I cannot say. All I speak of is from what I have heard that he had the direction of the Ministers, both the predecessor of the hon. gentleman representing the Department of Fisheries in this Government, and the hon. gentleman who represented the Department in the Mackenzie Government, to carry out the law, and being a very zealous officer he was, perhaps, somewhat injudicious at times, and adopted means which have led to decisions for damages. But he was carrying out the orders of the Department, and the House is bound to supply the means to pay damages incurred by him in carrying out the instructions of his superior officers.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be correct that the question had been tried in Robertson and the Queen, and would ultimately be  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

definitely determined by an appeal in that case, and an injunction actually existing at the time, what necessity existed under those circumstances to take the rods of three other gentlemen who were fishing? This was to make other test cases, whereas one would have been sufficient. The question having been determined in the case of Robertson and the Queen, I am not surprised that a jury should give heavy damages when they found the Government acted in defiance of what had, up to that time, been laid down as the law.

Mr. WELDON. I do not think the late Government took any active steps. With respect to Robertson, who was a lessee, he undertook to enforce his rights. An action was brought, and the first time the question was tried was on a special case in which the title to the river was admitted to be vested in the Crown. He succeeded, and the case was carried no further. Subsequently an action was brought and the question was then decided by the Superior Court of New Brunswick, that the lease was void. I applied immediately afterwards, in April, 1879, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, stating that I would carry the case to the Supreme Court if the Government would give a certain undertaking. Instead of doing this, they issued an order, in June, 1879, to the effect that no person should fish in any stream, with rod and line, except by license of the Department—and that is the notice which has created all the trouble. Actions were subsequently brought. The Robertson case had been decided, but the case eventually went to the Supreme Court. While all these cases were pending, instructions were issued to Mr. Venning, and seizures were made.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not defending the Government, who are perfectly able to defend themselves, but I rise to show the accuracy of the facts I have mentioned in connection with this case. The hon. gentleman suggests that the difficulty has arisen in consequence of acts done by the hon. Mr. Pope, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but he omits to state that the hon. gentleman was carrying out the policy of his predecessor. There is this fact in favor of the action taken by the Minister, the hon. Mr. Pope. The case of Robertson, which was the first case, was the strongest possible case that could be brought against the Government, because his lease contained special provisions, and the hon. gentleman acted wisely in not taking that case to appeal.

301. Miscellaneous—To provide for the publication of the proceedings of the Royal Society .....\$5,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Royal Society, as is known, has been established for the same purpose as the Royal Society of England, for the promotion of science, and especially natural science. It has commenced under the most favorable auspices. I believe that all Canadians of science and high standing have taken up the subject very warmly, and many of them have already read very valuable papers, which, if they are sustained, they will continue to do in all branches of natural science. That high scientific gentleman, Dr. Dawson, the head of McGill College, is the President of it; and he and the Society assure the Government that their transactions will do no discredit to Canada, nor would they discredit any country in the world. We are fortunate in having within our bounds, men of high scientific attainments, who have already taken the matter up, and promised in the various branches of science to prepare and publish papers; but as the House will understand, there is no object in their preparing these papers, unless they can get them published; and it is proposed, with the sanction of Parliament, to aid them in the publication of their transactions, and to ask that this sum be voted for three years, in order not only that the papers now being prepared, and which have been read, should be published, but also that there should be an assurance given that they would be published



in the future. In order to strengthen the case of the society to assistance of this kind, I received from Dr. Dawson, and also from another source, a memorandum of what was done with reference to the societies in England and the colonies. I will read this memorandum; it is as follows:—

In England the Royal Society has free quarters for its meetings, library and offices in Burlington House, and receives an annual parliamentary grant for researches and publications of £5,000.

In the United States the National Academy is to have its publications paid for by the Government, but I do not know to what precise amount. The Smithsonian Institution receives large public aids. In its report for 1880, I find grants by Congress to the amount of \$164,000—for accumulation and preservation of collections, \$47,500; for buildings, cases, &c., \$88,500; and for researches and publications, \$28,000. This is in addition to the income of the institution from its own investments, and the very large sums spent in Geological Surveys.

The Institute of France is maintained by the public treasury, and pensions or salaries are given to its members, but I have not been able to ascertain the amount.

The old Province of Canada gave subsidies, ranging from \$1,000 per annum to smaller sums, to several scientific and literary societies, and, I believe, these are continued by the Local Legislatures. They cannot, however, provide for the work which a Dominion Society might accomplish.

I am informed that money aids are given to Scientific Societies in Australia, but cannot learn the amounts.

It may be stated as the result of general experience that a National Scientific and Literary Society cannot be really successful and useful without public aid; and in the institution of such a society in a country so widely scattered and with so little of scientific and literary life, this would seem to be peculiarly necessary.

#### GRANTS MADE IN ENGLAND AND CANADA TO LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES.

##### England—

In the year ending 31st March, 1882, the Imperial Parliament voted £17,600 sterling in aid of "Learned Societies and Scientific Investigation," being an increase of £550 over a similar vote in the previous Session of Parliament.

Of this amount, there was allotted to the Royal Society, "to defray the expenses of Scientific Investigations," £1,000. This has been for many years an annual grant.

Similar societies in Edinburgh and in Dublin, as also the Meteorological and the Geographical Societies and Academies of Music, including the Academy recently founded, have been assisted out of the main grant above stated.

##### Canada—

Previous to 1867, grants were annually made by the Legislature to Literary and Scientific Associations in Upper and Lower Canada.

Since Confederation, the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec have continued to assist societies in those Provinces. For instance, the Legislature of Ontario makes annually the following grants:—

Mechanics' Institutes .....	\$26,200
Ontario School of Artists .....	500
Ontario School of Art and Design .....	1,100
London do do .....	1,000
Canadian Institute .....	750
Institut Canadien, Ottawa .....	500
Ottawa Literary and Scientific Society .....	300

The Legislature of Quebec makes the following annual grants:—

Natural History Society .....	\$ 700
Montreal Historical Society .....	350
Numismatic and Antiquarian Society .....	100
Quebec Literary and Historical Society .....	750
Geographical Society .....	300
Académie de Musique .....	100
Towards publication of "Le Naturaliste Canadien." .....	400
St. Patrick's Literary Institute .....	300

These are the evidences of what has been done elsewhere; and I really cannot believe, that we can in any way more promote scientific study and encourage and develop physical and natural science in all its forms, than by encouraging this society, and by giving it this support. Of course everyone knows, that philosophical transactions are not like popular novels; they are not generally interesting, and the publication of their transactions would not yield sufficient to pay for the cost of it. This is not done in older countries, and certainly it would not be so here; for these reasons, the Government take the responsibility of asking Parliament to give this vote.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is it intended to have these publications printed by the Parliamentary Printer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. They will print them and do as they please in this respect. The papers

will be philosophical and very technical, and therefore, they will be issued, I take it, under the supervision of Dr. Dawson or Dr. Sterry Hunt, or of men of that kind, most likely at Montreal; but all we will do, will be to give the vote.

Mr. ROSS. There is no reason I can see why Parliament, which votes the money, should not say that the papers should be printed like parliamentary documents, and by this means a larger edition could be obtained for the same sum of money. Besides there would be the prospect of distributing them among the members of the House like other documents. These papers would be very valuable judging by the indications I have seen of those which are likely to be read. It would be very well, I think excellent, to cause a certain number to be published, and the hon. gentleman should see if they are not printed by the Parliamentary Printers—which, I think, should be done—that, at least, a certain distribution is made among the members of the House. In fact I see no reason why we, who give the money, should not say that these papers should be printed by the Parliamentary Printers, who are quite competent to do the work, which is nothing peculiar but what is done in any printing office.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the number of volumes to be printed and distributed, and how far the vote covers the cost of printing, and how far, of superintendence, &c.?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to do that. The statement made by the deputation, the committee of the society, that communicated with myself and the members of the Government, was, that it would take almost this sum to enable them to bring out their transactions for each year. I take it, as with any other society, that we must trust to them to use the money economically and well; and of course, they will publish the transactions as far as the money will go. We must leave that to them, and I do not see how we can avoid it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the proposal is brought before us in so vague a form, and no information is furnished, so that the Committee may know for what object the money is required. For my own part, the statement which the hon. gentleman has made as to the grant formerly given, and now continued, is a sufficient indication of the difficult path on which it is now proposed we shall start. It is true there were grants for various literary institutions by the old Province of Canada, which was a legislative union, and it is true that these grants, to a larger or smaller extent, have been continued and developed, in some instances, by each of the two Provinces. This is a sort of system of higher education; it belongs to the literary and educational element; but if, to the Provincial assistance, there is now to be superadded a Dominion grant, I fear the true interests of these institutions will suffer. I must say that I have more confidence in the real vitality of an institution of this kind which sought for its support by subscription from those all over the Dominion who feel interested in its object, and was supported mainly in that way, than an institution which begins by proposing that the public shall become its dry nurse. The Canadian Institute of the old time, which is still subsisting, still enjoys a small grant from the Government, and they have been able to carry on for many years the publication of their transactions in a more limited area than is proposed for this society, because they had a constituency who were willing to subscribe for the purpose of getting their transactions published. If you are going to tell the public at first that they are not going to subscribe enough, but you will take it out of their pockets by taxation, I say that you will interfere with the interests, you will not advance the true progress of the society, which must depend for its real

vitality, not upon the interest of a few eminent literary or scientific men, who have their lucubrations published in their transactions, but in the widely diffused interests of those who read and do not write, and unless that stimulus on the part of the promoters of the society—which you are now taking away—is maintained, the society will not succeed in the true sense of the term. The hon. gentleman says that the English Government gives £5,000, and he proposes that we should give \$5,000, or one-fifth of that sum. If our resources or our income were one-fifth of those of England, I could understand such a proposition; but our circumstances are not the same. I think, if the hon. gentleman had been able to show a large subscription list on the part of this society, or that there were a large number of persons sufficiently interested in its objects to take these transactions, there might have been some color for his asking Parliament for a supplement to these other funds; but we are to do what the public should have done in its individual capacity, and the public in its individual capacity is to provide the supplement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman's views were taken before Parliament, we might bid adieu forever to the hope of any scientific society publishing its transactions. When the United States, with fifty odd millions of inhabitants, and England with 33,000,000 of inhabitants, cannot support its scientific institutions by subscriptions, what chance would we have here? The hon. gentleman says there should be sufficient intelligence among the people to subscribe for these books. He might say that there should be a sufficient degree of political curiosity among the people to subscribe for *Hansard*, but he knows that we could have no *Hansard* without Parliamentary assistance; and so we cannot have the transactions of these societies published without Parliamentary assistance. He says there should be sufficient philosophical enquiry in the country to induce subscriptions to these publications; but we must invite the people by letting them know that we have scientific men publishing scientific papers and societies publishing their transactions. They must see these volumes in our public libraries when they go to look into particular subjects in which they are interested, and by degrees there will be generated, even in this young country, a strong desire for the dissemination of science. Persons of scientific tastes who are desirous of pursuing scientific pursuits or studies will have the opportunity of doing so by finding these volumes in our libraries. It is also to be remembered that this is the only subscription which has been given to any society, and if this country desires to have anything like a publication to the world of how much physical science or study exists in Canada, they can only have it by the publication of the transactions of these societies.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me that if we are to pay for the publication of these transactions, the Government should have a considerable number in their own hands for free distribution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to say. But we may make such arrangements as we can without crushing out the energies of the society.

Mr. CASEY. The object of the publications is to get them circulated. I do not understand that they are going to sell them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, they are going to sell them. Every society of that kind sells its publications.

Mr. CASEY. The argument used was that we should assist in the publication because these books could not be sold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; but the sales would not pay the cost of publication. I have no doubt we will get a considerable number.

Mr. BLAKE.

302. Miscellaneous—To meet payments to extra clerks for services rendered in preparation of returns ordered by Parliament..... \$20,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. What is this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Earlier in this Session, when all kinds of returns were being asked for, I said that the returns were very large and numerous, and that they involved such a large amount of work that Parliament must be prepared to pay the cost of those returns. Formerly they were paid out of Contingencies, but the amount of labor and expense involved is so enormous that no Departmental contingencies could stand it. In my own Department alone there has already been paid upwards of \$3,000, and the returns are not one-fourth through yet. They are working with a heavy staff of people put on specially for this work.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible to say what it is going to cost.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a guess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is simply a guess.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that there were always extra expenses for returns, but they were paid out of Contingencies.

Mr. CASEY. If this sum is simply removed from the Contingencies, it ought to be entered as taken from the Contingencies. I would ask whether any part of the duty of preparing returns is expected to be done by the staff of the Departments?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course.

Mr. CASEY. And this is for what the staff could not do themselves?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite impossible to take any considerable portion of the permanent staff and employ them exclusively in making returns. Special copyists must be brought in for the Session.

Mr. BLAKE. That is true; but there are two observations to be made in this matter. One is that the hon. gentleman is transferring to another head that which is and ought to be part of the Departmental Contingencies; but instead of this item being placed under that head, we find the Contingencies as large as ever, and this vote is smuggled into another portion of the Estimates. It is not a satisfactory way, either as to the absolute or relative expenditure, to place under Miscellaneous that which should be part of the Contingencies of the different Departments. The other observation I have to make is this: It must be perfectly palpable to the hon. Minister that Parliament will require information under certain heads; certain returns are moved for every year; and I maintain that a well administered Department would look ahead, and that preparation would be made beforehand to meet the demand of Parliament for these obvious returns. Information is demanded for the proper consideration of public measures. When we have these Estimates, many items of which we are asked to pass and to concur in almost immediately, without sufficient information, it does seem to me that the material for an intelligent judgment upon all these matters ought to be prepared by the Ministers and brought down with the proposals. The newspapers tell us that the Legislature of British Columbia has passed upon some proposals of the Government; and it is rumored that we are to have before us some measure relating to them. I hope that we shall not have to move for the papers, but that the Government will bring down the papers indicating the conclusion of the negotiations which have been going on from year to year. If there has been any conclusion to these negotiations this Parliament should have been the first to know it; but the British Columbia Parliament

knows it, while we do not know any more than is contained in four or five lines of a telegram. I mention these only as examples. It appears to me that intelligent provision should be made for the demands of Parliament in these respects, so that we might be relieved of much of our present difficulty, and would be supplied with the material for a more intelligent discussion of public questions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be all right to introduce a new practice; but I do not know that any Government since Confederation has followed the course the hon. gentleman suggests. A Minister bringing a measure before Parliament should, of his own motion, bring down the necessary papers in connection with it. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, that the expenditures for preparing Departmental returns are properly part of the Departmental Contingencies. The Contingencies of a Department are the contingent expenses of that Department. If Parliament wants to get information, the expense should not form part of these Contingencies. On every political platform they will say: Look at this extravagant Government and at the enormous contingencies in every Department. If hon. members take the responsibility of making motions which we know cause great expense, the responsibility should be put upon them individually, and on Parliament as a whole.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very well to adopt a new practice now, but the other one has been in existence since ten years ago, and this will enable the Government to show not a reduction, but an amount the same as last year for Contingencies, when they should really show a large increase.

303. Miscellaneous—Factory Commission, advance to Mr. Blakely.....\$300.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Blakely was employed to visit Massachusetts, and report before Parliament met, the results and operation of the factory system there.

Mr. BLAKE. There are valuable reports of this issued by the State of Massachusetts, which would have given the hon. gentleman all he required.

306. Miscellaneous—500 copies of the "Parliamentary Companion".....\$1,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. This book is getting smaller and dearer every year. I remember when it only cost \$1.50 and was considerably larger, and, besides, this year I have heard many complaints that it contains a great many inaccuracies. I would like to know what are done with the 200 copies in excess of the 300 required to supply the members.

Mr. CASEY. They cannot be required in the Departments, for a division sheet would give the Departments all the information they require, the names and counties of hon. members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This volume is rather a flattering biography of each of us, but I do not know that it will give much information to the public if every member of Parliament keeps his own volume to himself. In order to make the publication of any value each member should give it to some intelligent supporter in his county. I really cannot tell what is done with the other two hundred. They are not burnt or locked up—I think they must be in use in the Departments. I have not seen the volume this year and cannot speak as to its appearance or accuracy, but I am inclined to think that \$2 a volume is rather a high price. Of course, it depends altogether on whether it is paying or not; if it is not paying the publisher will drop it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not object to the grant for the "Parliamentary Companion" if it was properly prepared. When I was at the head of the Department of Justice fifty copies were taken in that Department. I thought that was unreasonable, and we cut the number down to four copies, which was amply sufficient.

311. Miscellaneous—To pay damages awarded in the case of Robertson vs. the Queen..... \$2,794.32

Mr. BOWELL. This is to cover damages to C. A. Robertson under the fishery lease which the Provincial and Exchequer Courts, and subsequently the Supreme Court, declared to have been illegally granted by the Crown. I am informed this was a test case between the Minister of Justice and the counsel for Mr. Robertson.

Mr. BLAKE. How much of that was damages and how much costs?

Mr. WELDON. The costs recovered by Hanson against Robertson were about \$1,600, the costs in the Supreme Court having been about \$1,100.

312. To pay the Merchants' Bank the cost of suit in the case of Merchants' Bank vs. Regina..... \$1,205.42

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is in consequence of a suit brought by the Merchants' Bank vs. The Queen, for the repayment of slide dues collected on timber that had gone through the slides. I think I stated a few days ago, in introducing a Bill on the subject, that the Government had been unable to force the payment of those dues—not that they were unable to enforce the payment of the dues on the lumber, but in this case, dues had accrued for several years, and an arrangement was made between the parties and the Department that they should pay the highest rate of dues, that is, \$2 per thousand, on the timber that had passed through, until the whole amount was paid off. They paid \$2 the first year after the arrangement was made. They held afterwards that they had paid it unwittingly, not knowing it to be an excessive charge. The second year they received payment, but the Department enforced the full payment of \$2 per thousand. The case went to court, and the Judges took the ground that all that the lumber was liable for was the charge due upon that particular quantity, and that it was not liable for stumpage due on the previous years' cut. Therefore, the case was given against the Crown, and the money paid in under protest had to be repaid.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the Merchants Bank the original defaulter?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Skead was the operator.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the default still exists for those back dues?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The case having failed, the Government will lose that amount. It was almost impossible to collect dues on the passing of timber through the slide. In 1873, 1874, 1875, when the times were hard, no steps were taken to collect those dues. There is no difficulty when one year's dues are alone to be collected, but two or three years' dues had accrued in the case I have mentioned. By an arrangement made between Mr. Skead and the Department, he agreed to pay a higher rate of dues in order to cover his arrears. For the first year the amount was paid, and then the Merchants' Bank stepped in.

313. Post Office ..... \$142,720.00

Mr. CARLING. A large portion of this amount, no less than \$33,720 is to pay the Intercolonial Railway an additional rate of \$20 per mile for post office service. There is something like \$45,000 additional for services in Manitoba and the North-West, and other amounts for an increase of business in all portions of the Dominion, especially in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what was the previous rate on the Intercolonial?

Mr. CARLING. It was \$100 a mile; this year it will be \$120, and next year it will be \$130. The rate paid on the Grand Trunk is \$160; Great Western, \$124.

Mr. BLAKE. It appears as if the increase is made more for the purpose of enabling the Intercolonial Railway to show a balance.

314. Charges on Revenue—To provide for amount required to complete Customs service in the Province of Manitoba.....\$25,000.00

Mr. BOWELL. This is to provide for the extra amount of work devolving upon the Customs Department in Winnipeg, as well as Emerson. In 1871-72 the amount collected was \$433,500. The revenue already paid up to March this year is \$1,236,770, and from information I have received it will reach at least \$1,750,000 for the present year. When it is considered that there have been from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 worth of goods imported, on which no duty is paid, but which pass through the United States, and consequently have to be entered and bonds cancelled in the same way as if they were dutiable goods, with the exception of not collecting duty on them, the Committee will see the amount of extra work devolving on the staff. When in Winnipeg last year I learned that over 600 cars entered the city in one day, and this will give some idea of the work devolving on the officers.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman able to inform us whether the indications are that the importations will continue to be concentrated at Winnipeg?

Mr. BOWELL. As soon as the spring trade opens and we establish offices at Portage, Brandon and Regina a large proportion of the trade will go to those different points, and a large proportion of the business will go direct from old Canada to Thunder Bay, and by the Pacific road to Winnipeg.

315. To provide for the cost of obtaining stamps and for the stamping of imported and Canadian Tobacco, under the provisions of 43 Vic., c. 19 \$13,000.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is required to make up an actual deficiency in the estimate of last year, when \$12,000 were voted; but it seems that this year, the actual cost will be in the neighborhood of \$25,000. During the first two months of the year, the expenditure was \$10,540.23, but this year 1882-83 is not properly chargeable with the whole amount, because some payments of 1881-82 ran into last year. One reason I have for only asking the usual vote this year, is, that we expect it to cost very much less. The denominations of stamps—which, of course, we propose to change—used up to the present, were over 250 or nearly 300, and it is now proposed to reduce them at the outside to thirty-six. The House will see that there will be a very large reduction in the cost; and I think it is quite certain, that the estimate for the present year will be quite sufficient under this head.

317. To pay F. G. Wainwright for extra services in Halifax Office, from 14th October to 20th December, 1881. \$40.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. These extra services were rendered while the Committee was at Halifax. He engaged Mr. Wright to do the work at night and certified that it ought to be paid.

318. To pay H. H. Grant, difference between his salary and salary of his predecessor, as Collector of Inland Revenue, at Halifax, from 1st January, 1882, to 30th June, 1883..... \$300.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Grant was appointed to take the place of an officer named Mr. McLeod, a defaulter, I think, and on a lower salary, with a promise that if he proved capable, he would get the salary of Mr. McLeod. He proved to be a thorough officer, and this \$300 is to make up the salary. Mr. McLeod received \$1,400, I think, and Grant was receiving \$1,200.

Mr. BLAKE. If competent, he should have got his predecessor's salary, and if incompetent he should not have been appointed at all.

Mr. CARLING.

Mr. DALY. I think he was in the office previously, and it was merely a matter of promotion, and of his qualifications to fill the office. I am glad to see that he has done so to very great satisfaction.

319. To pay J. Griffith, Collector of Inland Revenue, Sherbrooke, difference required to increase his salary to \$1,000 per annum, from 1st July, 1881, to 30th June, 1883..... \$1,000.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Griffith has been Collector at Sherbrooke since 1871. He was appointed at a salary of \$400, which, of course, was low then, but the collections of the office at the time were \$1,932. There has been since a steady increase in the collections, and the business of the office, from \$1,900, in 1871, to \$58,416, at the present time. No increase was made in his salary until a year ago, when \$200 more were given him. Of course we recognize the principle in the Civil Service Act, and, by the policy we have pursued, the salaries should be based, to a certain extent, at any rate, on receipts, and volume of business done; and this division seems long ago to have reached the point where this man's salary should have been raised. I dare say that, if the matter had been brought to the attention of the Department, this would have been recommended. This \$1,000 is to bring his salary up to \$1,000 for the last two years, making up the difference between that figure and \$600—to which, I think, he is justly entitled.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to be a very mysterious way of acting. In the first place, the attention of the Department was not called to it, and therefore the Department did not call for more money. In 1882-83 the salary was increased from \$400 to \$600, so either an application was sent in or the Department took the case into consideration, and it was decided that he was entitled to \$600, and to ask Parliament to vote it. But now it is not merely an increase to \$1,000 a year in the future, but to make it up for the past two years to \$1,000 a year. Well, it seems to be a very extraordinary proposal. If no application was made by or on behalf of this officer until last year, and if last year the Department considered the case, and themselves thought that to \$600 he was entitled, how is the salary now raised to \$1,000, and even for two years previous? Besides this is a very inconvenient precedent to increase a salary for two years gone by. Once again you open the door which you will find is very difficult to shut, and by agreeing to this proposal, when we were asked last year to increase this man's salary to \$600, we are now to be told that we were wrong last year, that then a wrong proposal was made. What we ought to have done was to increase the salary to \$1,000, and more, to increase it to \$1,000 a year for two years gone by, and therefore, we are just in the same position as if we had done him what is now deemed an injustice in the earlier years. Under what misapprehension was the hon. gentleman? Under what circumstance did the hon. gentleman or his predecessor propose what is now said to be wholly inadequate, the increase of 1882-83? Who misinformed him? Did the officer make that proposal, or somebody else on his behalf? How does the hon. gentleman now come to increase this salary in the future, which may be all right; I have not analyzed the accounts. I say nothing adverse to it—but judging the Department and the Government by its own proposals, and the salary assigned, I think a little more explanation is required before we should be called upon to adopt a very inconvenient precedent, of a lump increase to an officer's salary for two years back.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not quite two years—last year and this year.

Mr. BLAKE. From the 1st of July, 1881, to the 1st of June, 1883, appears to be somewhere about two years. Of course, the individual case may be all right, and I do not condemn it, but I say you could not set a more dangerous precedent than to say to the Civil Service that you can

make a claim to-day if you think you have been underpaid for a number of years, and Parliament may allow you a grant of \$1,000.

323. Inspection of Petroleum—To payment to Martin Battle for extra services performed by him for the six years preceding 1st July, 1882, in connection with the establishing of an uniform method of inspecting petroleum.....\$400.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Battle was a collector of Inland Revenue at Ottawa. He was employed for several years by Mr. Brunel to assist him in perfecting the mode of inspecting the oil, and Mr. Battle rendered valuable services in that direction. The claim would have been settled long ago only that Mr. Battle always insisted that he was entitled to \$100 for each year that he had done this extra work.

334. Public Works—Maintenance and Repairs: Telegraphic lines, British Columbia.....\$3,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The service has only been for the daytime, and as there was no communication at night for the convenience of the press and business men, petitions and letters were forwarded to me asking for a night service.

Mr. BLAKE. This will add \$5,000 a year to the cost? How does this service work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The revenue is \$33,000, instead of \$1,000 or \$5,000 as it was a few years ago. The lines have all been put in good order, and they do not require a large amount to keep them up. The salaries are larger, of course, because the number of stations is greater. But we expect that the service will be self-sustaining before very long.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman should consider, though, of course, not in a close or churlish way, whether there is a reasonable ground for continuing this night service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is my intention to do so.

345. Dominion Lands—Chargeable to Capital..... \$150,000.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I took a vote in the Estimates of 1883-84, and this is for surveys up to the 1st of July. I may say that the date of making up the estimates for this service depend entirely on the time surveyors reach the scene of their operation, and, as I stated to the House the other night, this promises to be an exceptionally favorable season in that respect.

346. Unprovided Items.....\$542,992.32

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There are so many items in this aggregate that perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow us to discuss them fully on Concurrence if the vote passes now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

#### THE ORANGE DEMONSTRATION—EXPUNGING FROM THE DEBATES.

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

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before you adjourn the House, I desire to call your attention to an incident which took place this afternoon. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), contrary to your ruling, continued to read to the House some newspaper extracts which, I think, would have been better left aside altogether. As his address was not concluded with a motion, I think the whole matter, which may not appear in our Journals, but which may appear in the *Hansard*, ought not to appear at all. I think that your ruling ought to be followed, because if the hon. member for Montmagny did not make a motion, I think the subject to which he drew your attention ought to be dropped, and ought not to appear at all.

Mr. DALY. I think, in justice to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), who may have desired to make some explanation of the report read in this House, that the suggestion my hon. friend has just made should be listened to. It is quite possible that the report which was read was not an accurate report of what was said, and no opportunity was given for the explanation which I really hoped the hon. member for East Hastings would have been able to give. I believe, in justice to that hon. gentleman, that the proceedings should not form any part of the Debates of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite impossible that you, Mr. Speaker, can give any direction to the reporters what shall or shall not appear in the *Hansard*. The *Hansard* is a report of what is said in this House. We may use disorderly expressions; but what has been said must be left there. A motion made may be removed from the Journals of the House, though the formal expunction of a motion from the Journals is very rarely done. I remember one case in the Senate of the United States, where they were about twenty years at the task, and one in England, in which a motion of Sir Robert Peel was removed at the instance of Mr. Cobden; but I do not know of any others. But to expunge the report of those proceedings from the *Hansard* is out of the question. I think it must remain there, although I am very sorry for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Without some direction from the House, I cannot take action.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2 35 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 15th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*,—That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company from time to time as the work of constructing the undertaking of the company progresses, as certified by the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, sums of money by way of loan not exceeding 80 per cent. of the amount expended for such construction, and not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$100,000, such loan to be subject to the following conditions: The company to pay interest annually on the amounts advanced at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, and to execute a deed of mortgage to the Crown constituting the loan hereby authorized a first charge upon the undertaking; the company to be entitled to pay off the loan with interest at any time within fifteen years from the making of the first advance; the Governor in Council to have power within five years from the same date to assume possession of the undertaking, on payment including advances already made and interest thereon, of the sum expended, and 10 per cent. in addition thereto; and also to assume such possession in the event of the Company failing to carry out the undertaking as provided by their charter, on payment to the Company of the difference between the amount advanced and interest and 80 per cent. of the outlay on the works when the same are assumed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The resolution explains itself. I will go into particulars when it comes up for consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman does not offer some explanation of this resolution. Of course, the

wisdom of the various stages for money resolutions which Parliament has prescribed is entirely thwarted if the explanations are put off to the later stages. I should like the hon. gentleman to inform us at the earliest time, if he cannot now, what the chartered power of this company is, what its capital is, what its borrowing power is, and whether it has power to execute a first charge of the description proposed in this resolution. It is a local company, and we have no means of knowing anything about it, from our own reports.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that the assent of the Crown has been given to this resolution. Some legislation has recently been had by the company in amendment of their powers. I shall be able, to-morrow, to state what the amendments were, and to lay on the Table various information with reference to the company.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. BOWELL, in the absence of Mr. McLelan, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 101) further to amend the Fisheries Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WELDON. This clause, read with the new subsection 6, practically prohibits fishing in private waters without a license from the Government, and it is a question whether that is within the powers of Parliament. The section which proposed to repeal that section provided that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had the right to grant licenses where the exclusive right by law already existed. Under that section leases were issued for nine years on various rivers, giving the lessee the exclusive right to fish. Under these leases arose disputes between the owners of land and the lessees. Under the old Statute fishing by nets was prohibited, and certain regulations were made with regard to a close season, fishing with a rod and line being allowed. But the effect of this section is to prohibit a person from exercising his right of fishing on waters of his own land. Now, I consider the principle upon which the right of fishing exists is an incident of property and resides in the land. Although it comes under the head of property and civil rights, that right can be interfered with by the Dominion Legislature in so far as necessary for the purpose of carrying out the regulations of coasting and inland fisheries; beyond that it is not within the power of this Parliament to interfere with that property. I am not opposing the Bill generally, because I am well aware that riparian proprietors in New Brunswick are rather desirous to further the views of the Government with regard to the fishing regulations. We believe it will eventually make their properties more valuable. At the same time there is no doubt the difficulty has arisen with respect to the fisheries, which sprang from the unfortunate order in June 1874 with regard to fishing. Now, my view is that the right of private fishing is a right incident to the property in the land. If a man owns the banks on both sides of the stream he has the exclusive right of fishing in that stream during the time the fish pass. If, on the other hand, he only owns the bank on one side of the stream he is entitled to one-half the stream for the same purpose, and his neighbor on the opposite bank has the same right with regard to the other portion of the stream. This is an incident of property which goes with the soil and which passes with the grant of the soil. It may be covered by a separate grant, but without the separate grant it passes with the rights of the property. That doctrine has been very clearly established by the decisions which have

Mr. BLAKE.

already taken place. The question, then, amounts to this: Whether prohibiting a person entirely from using that stream without a license is not simply an appropriation of his property. The Government may define a close stream within which he may exercise his rights, and may prescribe the manner in which he may exercise it; but to say that he shall not exercise it at all except under license from the Government is in effect an appropriation of his property. Then the question arises whether that is within the powers of this Parliament, because the principle laid down is that where the regulation of a particular thing is left to Parliament, that body can only interfere with the power of Local Legislatures in so far as is necessary in carrying that principle out. I would call the attention of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the *Queen vs. Robertson*, when this matter was fully discussed. I know that the riparian proprietors are very desirous that this question should be settled so as to prevent any more difficulty. There is no doubt that the decisions of the court have established the rights of the riparian proprietors, and the only question is whether this is a matter within the powers of Parliament. The learned Chief Justice, in the case of the *Queen vs. Robertson*, on page 110 of Supreme Court reports, says:

"In construing the British North American Act I think no hard and fast canon or rule of construction can be laid down and adopted by which all Acts passed, as well by the Parliament of Canada as by the Local Legislatures, upon all and every question that may arise, can be effectually tested as to their being, or not being, *intra vires* of the Legislature passing them. The nearest approach to a rule of general application that has occurred to me for reconciling, apparently conflicting legislative powers, under the British North America Act, is what I suggested in the cases of *Vanin vs. Langlois*, and the *Citizens' Insurance Co. vs. Parsons*, with respect to property and civil rights, over which exclusive legislative authority is given to the Local Legislatures: That, as there are many matters involving property and civil rights expressly reserved to the Dominion Parliament, the power of the Local Legislature must, to a certain extent, be subject to the general and special legislative powers of the Dominion Parliament. But while the legislative rights of the Local Legislatures are in this sense subordinate to the rights of the Dominion Parliament, I think such latter rights must be exercised so far as may be consistently with the rights of the Local Legislatures, and, therefore, the Dominion Parliament would only have the right to interfere with property and civil rights, in so far as such interference may be necessary for the purpose of legislating generally, and effectually, in relation to matters confided to the Parliament of Canada."

That is the general principle which the Chief Justice laid down in the case. Applying that principle, we may ask, is it necessary for the purpose of legislating generally and effectually in regard to matters entrusted to the Parliament of Canada, to adopt such legislation as is proposed. The Chief Justice further says at page 119:

"Previous to Confederation many enactments were passed by the Legislature of New Brunswick for the general regulation and protection of the fisheries in that Province, but no Act, I will undertake with confidence to assert, can be found in the Statute-books of New Brunswick, from the date of the erection of the Province to the day of Confederation, taking away or interfering with (except as such general regulations might interfere with) the private rights of the individual proprietors of lands through which such rivers run, still less to take from them the enjoyment of their rights of fishing and to authorise the leasing of the same to others to the exclusion of the owner."

The learned Chief Justice goes on further to say, at page 120:

"Such being the state of matters at the time of Confederation, I am of opinion that the legislation in regard to 'Inland and Sea Fisheries' contemplated by the British North America Act was not in reference to 'property and civil rights'—that is to say, not as to the ownership of the beds of the rivers, or of the fisheries, or the rights of individuals therein, but to subjects affecting the fisheries generally, tending to their regulation, protection and reservation, matters of a national and general concern and important to the public, such as the forbidding fish to be taken at improper seasons in an improper manner, or with destructive instruments, laws with reference to the improvement and increase of fisheries; in other words, all such general laws as enure as well to the benefit of the owners of the fisheries as to the public at large, who are interested in the fisheries as a source of national or provincial wealth; in other words, laws in relation to the fisheries, such as those which the Local Legislatures were, previously to and at the time of Confederation, in the habit of enacting for their regulation,

preservation and protection, with which the property in the fish or the right to take the fish out of the water to be appropriated to the party so taking the fish has nothing whatever to do, the property in the fishing, or the right to take the fish, being as much the property of the Province or the individual, as the dry land or the land covered with water. I cannot discover the slightest trace of an intention on the part of the Imperial Parliament to convey to the Dominion Government any property in the beds of streams or in the fisheries incident to the ownership thereof, whether belonging at the date of Confederation either to the Provinces or individuals, or to confer on the Dominion Parliament the right to appropriate or dispose of them, and receive therefor large rentals which most unequivocally proceed from property, or from the incidents of property in or to which the Dominion has no shadow of claim; but, on the contrary, I find all the property it was intended to vest in the Dominion specifically set forth. Nor can I discover the most remote indication of an intent to deprive either the Provinces or the individuals of their proprietary rights in their respective properties; or, in other words, that it was intended that the lands and their incidents should be separated and the lands continue to belong to the Provinces and the Crown grantees, and the incidental right of fishing should belong to the Dominion, or be at its disposal. I am at a loss to understand how the Dominion, which never owned the land, and therefore never had any right to the fishing as incidental to such ownership, without any grant, statutory or otherwise, without a word in the Statute indicating the slightest intention to vest the rights of property or of fishing in the Dominion, without a word qualifying or limiting the right of property of the Provinces in the public lands, can now successfully claim to have a beneficial interest in those fisheries, and authority to deal with such rights of fishing as the property of the Dominion, and claim to rent or license the same at large yearly rents and appropriate the proceeds to Dominion purposes."

He also says, at page 123:

"To all general laws passed by the Dominion of Canada regulating 'sea coast and inland fisheries' all must submit, but such laws must not conflict or compete with the legislative power of the Local Legislatures over property and civil rights beyond what may be necessary for legislating generally and effectually for the regulation, protection and preservation of the fisheries in the interest of the public at large. Therefore, while the Local Legislatures have no right to pass any laws interfering with the regulation and protection of the fisheries, as they might have passed before Confederation, they, in my opinion, clearly have a right to pass any laws affecting the property in those fisheries, or the transfer or transmission of such property under the power conferred on them to deal with property and civil rights in the Province, inasmuch as such laws need have no connection or interference with the right of the Dominion Parliament to deal with the regulation and protection of the fisheries, a matter wholly separate and distinct from the property in the fisheries."

Justice Strong, at page 133, says:

"The question next presents itself, did the British North America Act either directly effect these vested rights of property, or did it authorise Parliament to interfere with them by legislation? There is no pretence for saying that the Act contains anything in the slightest degree derogating from the rights of fishing belonging to the proprietors of the beds of non-navigable rivers. By the thirteenth enumeration of the ninety-second section the exclusive right to legislate concerning property is conferred upon the Local Legislatures, to whom also by the sixteenth sub-section are granted similar powers concerning matters of a local and private nature. The provisions must necessarily exclude the right of the Parliament of the Dominion to legislate to the prejudice of the rights of fishing vested in the proprietors of beds of rivers and streams, unless we can find in section ninety-one, defining the powers of Parliament, some exception to the general effect of the word 'property' as including such a proprietary right. The only words in the last mentioned section which it can be suggested may have such an operation are those of the twelfth enumeration 'sea coast and inland fisheries.' It is a sound and well recognised maxim of construction that in the interpretation of Statutes we are to assume nothing calculated to impair private rights of ownership, unless compelled to do so by express words or necessary implication."

At page 135, the Judge says:

"Again under this provision Parliament may enact laws for regulating and restricting the right of fishing in the waters belonging to the Dominion, such as public harbors, the beds of which have been lately determined by this court to be vested in the Crown in right of the Dominion, and also for regulating the public inland fisheries of the Dominion, such as those of the great lakes and possibly also those of navigable non-tidal rivers. There is therefore no unreasonable restriction of the power of Parliament in constraining the twelfth sub-section as I do, as not including a power to legislate concerning the right of property in private fisheries."

Again he says:

"These fisheries, although often in practice not conserved by the Provinces, are certainly not public fisheries open of common right to all who may choose to avail themselves of them, as is the case with regard to the fisheries in tidal waters and the great lakes, but the Provincial Governments may, without special legislation, and in

exercise of their right of property, restrict their use in any manner which may seem expedient just as freely as private owners might do. In short, the public have no more right in law to take fish in non-navigable rivers belonging to the Provinces than they have to fell and carry away trees growing on the public lands; in the one instance, as in the other, such interferences with provincial rights of property are neither more nor less than illegal acts of trespass.

"This being so, it seems very clear to me that no well-founded distinction, as regards the power of legislation by Parliament, can be made between fisheries in rivers which, at the date of Confederation, were the property of private owners under grants from the Crown and those which remain the property of the Provinces as part of the public domain. In both cases the right of fishing is a profit of the land, an incident of the proprietary right in the soil, and is as much property in the hands of the Province as in that of a private owner."

I have called attention to these opinions of the learned Judges, opinions which were concurred in by Justices Four-  
nier, Henry and also Gwynne in the Exchequer Court. The section of the proposed Bill reads as follows:—

"2. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may issue, or authorise to be issued, fishery leases or licenses for fisheries and fishing where-  
ever situated or carried on, but leases or licenses for any term ex-  
ceeding nine years shall be issued only under authority of an order  
of the Governor in Council; and provided that where an exclusive  
right of fishing exists by law, no lease or license shall be issued  
other than a license to fish at a certain time, or in a certain mode,  
and then only to the person in whom the exclusive right is vested."

That is, no person entirely by implication can fish on his property until he obtains a license from the Government; and then there is this difficulty: Suppose there are five riparian proprietors on a stream, by a whim of the inspector, or of a subordinate, licenses might be granted to three and refused to two, the result being that three persons, not by virtue of their right as owners of the soil, but of licenses from the Government, would have the right to fish there, while the other two who owned the soil would be excluded. Therefore, this at once conflicts with the powers of Local Legislatures and the rights of property, beyond what is necessary for the preservation of the fisheries in the Dominion. Prior to this, and by the law of 1868, angling was allowed upon our streams, and the use of nets was prohibited, and under the seventh sub-section of the old Act, salmon could not be caught in New Brunswick between the 15th of August and the 1st of March. The effect of the amendment is to do away with the exception of the rod and line; but we know, so far as fishing in New Brunswick is concerned, that fishing with the rod and line is not destructive to the salmon fishery. In fact, the class of persons to which this relates, is interested in protecting this fishery and in associating with the Government to a certain extent in this regard. It would be well that the question I raised with respect to it being impolitic to deprive riparian owners of the privilege of fishing with the rod and line, and whether this exception should not be allowed to continue is worthy of consideration. This is a matter of very great importance as far as New Brunswick is concerned, and, also, I may say the lower portion of Quebec, because the wealthy Americans who come to these places every year to enjoy fishing, are a large source of revenue to the people of the Province. But practically if they are to obtain their rights as riparian proprietors, they are obliged, under this Bill, to take out a lease and license, and to have their rights made subordinate to and entirely dependent on the pleasure of the Department, or, perhaps, of its subordinates. The effect would be to interfere very much with this privilege, because, as is well known, the rod and line are simply used for pleasure, and not to make large captures for the purpose of business as is the case with nets and other instruments. Many of the large riparian proprietors are extremely anxious that the Government regulations should be enforced, and they are perfectly willing to aid the Government to protect the fisheries, to be preserved for the uses of sportsmen and visitors. I know of a case which actually occurred to a gentleman owning an interest with others in a New Brunswick river. Some two years ago, in 1880 or

1881, he endeavored to comply with the regulations of the Order in Council of June 14th, 1879, and applied to the Government, although a riparian proprietor, to give him a license, stating that he was willing to observe the regulations—he was also a great friend and supporter of the present Government—but the only answer he received, was to furnish his titles to the Government, and to state what he was willing to pay to fish on his own property. This having actually happened, they naturally fear that this clause will be used unfairly and unjustly, and to their disadvantage. I fear that the only result of the present clause, if left as it is, will be that we will not get rid of the litigation, which has already been to too large an extent increased in consequence of the manner in which the fishery regulations are carried out. The four subsections of the third section gives great power, and reverses the general rule of law, that a man is presumed innocent until proved guilty, the burden of proof in case of seizure being thrown on the accused, and this in case of seizure, not only by a fishery officer, but by any other person. With regard to the sixth clause, I have a very strong opinion that this is also beyond the powers of this Legislature. It provides:

"6. No action, suit or proceeding shall be brought against any fishery officer or person employed for the prosecution of contraventions of the Fisheries Act or regulations made thereunder for anything done in the exercise of his office, or by virtue of his employment, unless within three months after the act committed, and upon one month's previous notice thereof in writing; and the action shall be tried in the county or judicial district where the cause of action arose; and if upon the trial of any such action the defendant shall be condemned, but the Judge shall be of opinion, and, in case of a trial by jury, shall certify, that the defendant acted upon probable cause, the plaintiff shall only be entitled to recover the actual value of anything of which he has been deprived by the defendant and not any vindictive or general damages or any costs of suit."

This is civil procedure; and I take it that when an action is brought in the courts by the course of civil procedure, it is purely within the powers of the Local Legislature. My legal friends on the other side of the House will recollect that in the case to which I have referred, *Cushing vs. The Queen*, which was before the Privy Council, in referring to the question of bankruptcy and the effect of procedure on bankruptcy, as it interferes with that section, it was stated that only so far as was necessary for the purpose of carrying out the requirements of the law, the only procedure in civil rights was necessarily implied, but beyond that it was not. It was not necessary that they should set out where, or when the action should be brought, or where it should be tried. I think, however—and I may say I speak for the riparian proprietor—that section should be looked at with great care as to the powers of Parliament in that direction. While I am anxious to have the latter satisfactorily settled, I know that these parties are prepared to comply with all the regulations, and that so far they find no fault with the regulations with regard to the season for the mode of fishing, only that the provisions with regard to fishing in tidal waters might be more strictly enforced than they are. I think if the Act passes as it is, we will find ourselves in a greater difficulty than ever.

Mr. FORTIN. I am not going to make any remarks on the legal question, because I think it is beyond redemption, the Supreme Court having decided that the rivers above the tide wave are the property of riparian owners. I am very sorry that that judgment has been rendered, because the salmon fisheries, that is to say the commercial fisheries, those which give food to the people and furnish an important article for export trade, will be liable to disappear. But this law is enacted in order to prevent their destruction. How will the new order of things act? As there are some hon. members in this House, and many people in the country, who are not well acquainted with the salmon fisheries on our Maritime coasts, perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words with regard to those fisheries. We have the

Mr. WELDON,

salmon fisheries there as in other parts of the world, where the fishermen toil hard day and night to catch the salmon with nets, in some countries they catch them with seines, to supply food for this country, and an article of exportation which goes into several foreign countries, and for which a large sum of money comes back for the benefit of the fishermen. The fisherman who inhabits the coast, and gains his livelihood by this occupation, must be looked to and protected. In order to protect the salmon from the net fisheries, we oblige the fisherman to set his net in such a particular way, we oblige him to leave all the main channels open, and to raise his net on Saturday night and not set it again until Monday morning. These men are restricted as much as possible, in order to allow a sufficient quantity of salmon to go up to their resting places, where the important function of reproduction has to be performed in quietness, instinct giving the salmon power to go hundreds of miles, perhaps, to go up rapids, and even falls, fifteen or twenty feet high, in order to restock the rivers. That is the commercial side of the salmon fisheries. When the salmon has escaped the net and a lot of them gone up the rivers, the females full of eggs, and the males full of milt, they are exposed to encounter another class of fishermen, who catch them by means of flies for sport or pleasure. They do not catch them for the purpose of food, and when caught they do not make an article which is worth \$1 for exportation. The sport is carried on in those parts of the rivers which by the judgment of the court fall to the riparian owners or to the Local Government, where there are no riparian proprietors, and, therefore, the danger to the salmon is augmented a thousand-fold, because what does the riparian owner care for preserving the salmon for the benefit of the net fishermen who may be many miles distant from him. What he wants is either sport for himself, or he may rent his property for \$100 or \$500, or, perhaps, \$1,000. I know that in one of the rivers of Gaspé, a gentleman who had this stream for a few hundred dollars made \$1,000 by sub-letting it. The danger is that the riparian owners or the Local Governments will be so anxious to make money by renting these places for fly-fishing that the rivers will be depleted of salmon in ten or twenty years and the net fishermen will be obliged to abandon their present fishing places, and, perhaps, have to go to a foreign country to get their living. I understand that the purpose of this Act is to prevent the destruction of salmon in the upper parts of rivers by giving the following power to the hon. Minister of Marine:

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may issue, or authorize to be issued, fishery leases or licenses for fisheries and fishing wheresoever situated or carried on, but leases or licenses for any term exceeding nine years shall be issued only under authority of an order of the Governor in Council; and provided that where an exclusive right of fishing exists by law, no lease or license shall be issued other than a license to fish at a certain time or in a certain mode, and then only to the person in whom the exclusive right is vested."

This means, as I understand it, that no net or fly-fisherman will be allowed to fish unless he gets a license from the hon. Minister of Marine, and I suppose the riparian owner himself will have to procure such a license before he can fish. I suppose it will be stipulated in the license that the licensee shall only fish at certain times. If this law goes into operation and is carried out, as I think it should be, no riparian owner or lessee of a riparian owner should be allowed to fish without permission of the hon. Minister; and, besides, I would stipulate in the license that he should not fish above a certain part of the rivers, or in certain pools. Petitions have been sent to this House from the county of Gaspé, and from various counties in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, asking this House to declare the close time for fly-fishing to be the same as the close time for net-fishing, that is the 31st of July; and I believe that if the Government granted the prayer of the petitioners, they would remedy one of the greatest evils in the country. When the salmon has escaped the hands of the net-fisher,



has gone over rapids and jumped many falls, and when it is exhausted and is looking for a pool in order to lay its eggs, or if a male, to fecundate them, gentlemen with hooks and lines are then ready to catch that fish for mere sport, and thus destroy thousands and hundreds of thousands of eggs, which if left alone, would produce hundreds of thousands of salmon to enrich the country. If you allow the fly-fishers to go on as they have done during the past fifteen or twenty years, fishing after the net fishers, they will soon deplete the rivers of the salmon entirely. I hope the Government will make this law as stringent as possible against the fly-fishers. I am not opposed to fly-fishing or sport of any kind, but sport must be carried on in such a way as not to injure any trade or industry. I have a reproach to make, not against this Government, but against past Governments, with regard to the salmon fisheries. Some ten or fifteen years ago fly-fishers came on the coast, some from England, some from the United States, and some from this country, and I have seen poor fishermen turned away from a river where they had got their living for years, in order to allow gentlemen to enjoy their sport in that river. We are a people of liberty and equality, we have no aristocracy, and no landlords, and we do not want landlords, in this country. If you go along the coasts and talk to the fishermen, you will hear them speaking against the Government—not the present Government, but past Governments—for giving the rivers to gentlemen for a few hundred dollars. One of the rivers of Gaspé was given to one gentleman for \$200 or \$300, and he managed to make about \$1,000 a year by sub letting. I may be asked why I have not brought these matters up before. I would have done so, but I should not have been heard, as the fly-fishers were stronger than I; but now I can speak before this august tribunal—I can speak before the country on this question. If this House does not take strict precaution against the destruction of our salmon fisheries, they will go on decreasing from year to year to such an extent that they will come to nothing, as they have come to nothing in the United States. Now, I will ask that the licenses be confined to river fisheries, because I maintain that sea fisheries should be free to all fishermen without licenses. I believe that nine years is too long a period for leases or licenses; I think five years is long enough, as the Government usually make these grants to friends and favorites, I hope the Government will take steps to prevent the destruction of our river fisheries. The Local Governments and the riparian owners will, no doubt, try to make as much money as they can out of their salmon fisheries by giving as many permits for fly-fishing as they can, because they are not interested in the net-fishing, which are leased, and the money for which goes into the Federal Treasury. The Local Governments will try and get their fees from the fly-fishers, and if this goes on the depletion will continue in the salmon fisheries. I hope the Government will bring in a law by which the close time for fly-fishing will be assimilated to that of net-fishing; for I tell you it is the granting of prolonged time for fly-fishing that is the main cause of the destruction of the salmon.

Mr. DAWSON. Our inland fisheries are extremely important, especially on the great Lakes Superior and Huron. But they are very easily exhausted, and this Bill, so far as it goes, is an excellent Bill, because it will have a tendency to protect these fisheries. This stringent clause to which the hon. member for St. John objects will apply very well, I think, to the great lakes. Of course, with such an extent of fisheries from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the same rules may not apply to all, but in the great lakes it is highly important that stringent rules should be adopted to prevent fishermen using undersized mesh nets. On the American side of these great lakes the fish are almost exterminated

through the use of small meshes, but the fisheries on our side, are, as yet, pretty well preserved. On the Georgian Bay the fisheries are becoming exhausted as on Lakes Erie and Ontario, but on Lake Superior and the upper parts of Lake Huron, on the British side, we still have abundance of fish. The provisions in this Bill will likely, if properly enforced, result in the preservation of our fish to a great extent, and the fishery officers should be compelled to see that the law is enforced.

Mr. WELDON. I call the attention of the Committee to a resolution which was passed in the Local Legislature of New Brunswick at its last sitting, and was moved by the leader of the Government and seconded by the leader of the Opposition:

"Whereas, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has introduced into the House of Commons a Bill entitled 'An Act further to amend the Fishery Act.' which Act, with the amendments proposed to be made in Committee of the Whole, contain provision prohibiting riparian proprietors exercising their right to fish for salmon above tidal wave by any apparatus whatever, without a license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to fish at a certain time or in a certain mode; and

"Whereas, in the opinion of this House, such legislation is not necessary for the protection of the fisheries, and will injuriously affect the value of the fishing rights, the property of this Province, also the rights of Provincial proprietors; and

"Whereas, such legislation is in direct course with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the Province, and of the Supreme Court of Canada; therefore

"Resolved, That this House would approve of the Government bringing under the notice of the Minister of Justice, the objections entertained in the Province to the proposed legislation, and providing against such legislation by the Parliament of Canada as an interference with the rights of the Province and the inhabitants thereof."

A copy of this was forwarded to the Department of Justice, to show the views taken by our Province.

Mr. McISAAC. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what scale of fees chargeable for licenses is especially as regards fishing along the sea coast?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter of regulation.

Mr. McISAAC. It is necessary that this matter should be attended to immediately. During last Session a discussion took place on this subject. It was shown that, great as the hardship was in exacting licenses for salmon fishing along the coast, greater was the hardship arising from the mode in which the fees were charged. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries then intimated that licenses would be abolished altogether, or granted free of charge. I expected to see either change made in this Bill. I went in the beginning of the Session to the proper authorities, and found no change was made. The only purpose the Government can have in view in exacting these licenses, must be to make revenue. It cannot be simply the protection of the fisheries, for free licenses would not interfere with that purpose, as a person could be punished without making him pay for a license. The salmon fisheries seem to be singled out for the special disfavor of the Government. The outfit for a salmon fisher along the coast costs from \$200 to \$400, and this year an additional tax of 10 per cent. is imposed on cordage, which is a considerable tax in view of that cost, and these fishermen are excluded from sharing in the bounty. Some protection may arise as far as the rivers are concerned, but along the sea coast it is no protection. As far as the sea coast is concerned, I hope the licenses will be granted free, or a regular fixed system of fees established. As the law is now, an arbitrary authority is given to the fishery officer, who may charge what he likes, just as he likes or dislikes the applicant. I do not mean to cast a reflection upon any official, but I know that in Nova Scotia complaints have been made that the fishery officer may charge what he likes for a license. I hope that an Order in Council may soon be issued restraining these officers in the arbitrary exercise of their power, so that that body of fishermen may not be

made the victims of the whim or prejudice of the servants of the Department.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not intend to enter into the constitutional argument presented by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), but I am advised by the law officers of the Crown that this Bill was framed expressly for the purpose of meeting the constitutional objections which my hon. friend has taken. This law is to be changed for one object only, and that is the better protection of the fisheries, to prevent an unnecessary destruction of that valuable article of commerce, and to regulate the taking of fish at a period when such fishing would be very destructive to the supply of fish. I understand from the Department of Justice that it has been decided by the Supreme Court that a lease or license may not issue where the exclusive right of fishing exists by law; but the decision recognizes the right of Parliament to regulate and protect both inland and sea coast fisheries, and for that object alone these amendments are proposed to the Bill. As I understood the hon. member for St. John, he objects to this clause on the ground that riparian difficulties may arise in the granting of licenses to every riparian proprietor. To my mind this clause is very explicit that the Government, while it takes power to issue licenses, is not compelled to issue them upon every occasion or to any riparian proprietor. It will be seen, on reading the section, that the license of lease to fish at certain periods of the year can only be given to riparian proprietors. The hon. gentleman referred to a suppositious case in which four or five holders of land along the shore of a stream applied for licenses to fish, and that the fishery officer only granted them to two or three. The clause is, no doubt, open to that interpretation; but it will be apparent to any mind that a license cannot issue except to the riparian proprietors, and if there be five farmers living alongside each other, owning the right of soil to the centre of the river, or owning the bed of the river, the license can only issue to the proprietor, so I cannot understand how the difficulty could arise.

Mr. KIRK. Where the licensee has riparian rights will a fee be charged for the right to fish?

Mr. BOWELL. That depends altogether upon the regulations which may be made by the Department. A small fee may be exacted in order to cover the expenditure, but this is apart altogether from the point I was discussing a moment ago. I differ from the opinion enunciated by the member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), that the object of the Government in this matter is one of revenue. The only object the Government has in view is to protect the fisheries from total destruction, in order that an important branch of commerce and source of wealth may not be destroyed. Considering the decision of the Supreme Court as to the right of the Dominion Parliament to control the fisheries, the question of revenue sinks into insignificance in comparison to the protection of this great industry, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that the fees imposed for licenses will be very small. This clause does not say, nor is it intended to provide, for the compulsory taking out of a license. It simply provides that the Government may issue licenses for the purpose of exercising a certain supervision over these fisheries, in order to protect them. The riparian owner may refuse to take out a license, and all the Government can do in that case is to say, by law, that at certain periods of the year he shall not fish. I take it that, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the Dominion authority has the right to make such provisions. If a riparian proprietor desires the full protection of the law over his fisheries, then he will pay a small sum for the purpose of obtaining a license, which would not give him any rights he did not possess before, but which would give him the aid of the Government in protecting him against the inroads of those who desire to poach upon his fisheries. Really that is the whole provision, as I am informed by the

Mr. McIsaac.

law officers of the Crown. The objection taken to fly-fishing by the hon. member for Gaspé is one upon which there would not be great diversity of opinion; but I am inclined to think there is a large section of people interested in these fisheries who would object *in toto* to the provisions my hon. friend desires to embody in this Bill. There is another fact in connection with fly-fishing. As I understand it, fish caught with hook and line cost three or four times their value, and many of the fish caught that way are caught by foreigners. Whether the destruction of salmon fisheries in particular is so extensive as my hon. friend indicated by fly-fishing, I am not aware, but I am of the opinion that if fishing was confined exclusively to fly fishing, very little damage would be done at almost any season of the year. Of course, the Committee will understand that outside the three-mile limit everyone has a right, under treaty, to fish without taking out any license. The object of the Bill is to make provision which can be worked under the Constitution as interpreted by the Superior Courts of the country, and not to go in any way beyond that, and the difficulty anticipated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) will not arise.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman's view is correct, the present Bill will not interfere with the rights of riparian proprietors, but the fishery officers will construe it in a different light.

Mr. BOWELL. We will not allow them to do so.

Mr. WELDON. With respect to section two, if the construction put upon it by the acting Minister is correct, a proprietor would not need to have a license, and it would be practically useless, because the proprietor would fish without a license; but reading the whole Act together, fishery officers will complain that such persons will be obliged to take out licenses. The Committee must look at the Order in Council of June, 1879. In 1881, a gentleman named Spur, applied for a license, and he received the following answer from the Department.

"FISHERIES DEPARTMENT,  
"OTTAWA, JUNE 15th, 1881.

"SIR,—Your telegram on behalf of Mr. Spur has been submitted to the acting Minister, who thinks the proper course is for the party to make application to this Department setting forth the grounds of his claim to license and the limits, also referring to title on which such claim is based.

"The application should specify what license fee the applicant offers.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. F. WHITCHER,  
"Commissioner of Fisheries."

In that case Mr. Spur was asked to state his title, and then make it good.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that this letter was written when the Department contended that they had full right to control the fisheries, not alone to regulate the periods when fish should be taken. Moreover, a license already existed for that particular fishery; the hon. gentleman cannot apply this application and answer to the state of things existing at present, in view of the decision given by the Superior Courts, and the intentions of the Government, and the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. WELDON. The letter was not written on the ground that Mr. Spur had applied for a license for a fishery where a license already existed. If the view of the hon. Minister is correct the difficulty I have pointed out may be obviated; but I very much doubt whether the same construction will be put upon the law by the fishery officers.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government take this view, and I may present it to the House by an illustration. The Local Government's pass laws regulating the mode in which a farmer shall sell his beef and pork on market days, but it does not thereby take from the farmer, or the person having

the commodities to sell, his property. Neither is it the intention, under this Bill, to take from the riparian proprietor any right he possesses in law to the soil or bed of the river. The only object of the Government is, by the provisions of this law, to try and regulate the mode and manner of taking the fish, and to protect them at certain seasons. If a riparian proprietor declines to take out a license, then he fishes in the river at those seasons when it is lawful to fish; but the object he should have in obtaining a license would be to bring the power and authority of the law to bear in assisting him to protect his property, and in doing so to preserve the fish from total destruction. That is the interpretation of the law officers of the Crown, and the interpretation of the Department under the decision given by the Superior Court, and the regulations will be in accordance with these views.

Mr. FORTIN. From the tenor of the remarks made by the acting Minister, I am inclined to believe that it is not the intention of the Government to limit the time for fly-fishing. These strangers, the fly-fishers, do not bring much money into the country—of course they pay their board, and people to take them out in canoes; but I have been for thirty-three years on that coast, and know that they do not spend there much money. I am afraid that the Government is not posted as to what has taken place. I will tell the Government and the House, that gentlemen have lately bought, from the Local Government, thousands of acres of land on some of the salmon rivers, either for salmon fishing or to speculate in salmon fishing; and more, that some Americans have sent agents to buy the net-fishing rights in some of the rivers on the coast, not to fish with nets, but to abolish net fishing in order to promote fishing for mere sport in the upper part of the rivers. Millionaires from the States can come into this country and get hold of our rivers for sport, and drive out the net fishermen; and this is, as I know, what they are trying to do. We know what is occurring in the United States; there are many millionaires who do not know what to do with their money, and as there is not enough sport in that country, they come here and obtain it at the expense of our river fishermen, a hardy class who are ready at all times to defend the country and enrich it by their toil and labor. I hope that the Government will pause before they allow such a thing to be done, and will have this question studied with great care. If I am wrong, I will be glad of it; but I am not in error. I have been studying this question for many years, and this is the state of affairs. These American millionaires wish to possess our rivers for sport, and to become landlords; but this is not a country for landlords. We will never have them, and our people will not sustain or support them, or allow them to be in our midst; but this is not the beginning of it. Twenty years ago the Government granted the River Godbout to one gentleman, who has had it since, and who, perhaps, will have it forever, and for that the Government drove away two or three fishermen, who, I suppose, had to go to the States to earn a living—and what was so done twenty years ago, is now being tried more strenuously than ever, because a lot of men have more money to spend than they know what to do with; and the Government will not do its duty, if it allows this to be done at the expense of the river fishermen of this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are just two points, regarding which I wish to ask the hon. Minister in relation to this matter. I may say, of course, it is necessary that legislation should be had with regard to the fisheries, and that the Dominion Statute which governs them should be amended and altered so as to suit what is now believed to be the law of the land, but which is very different from what was believed to be the law of the land some time ago. I think the Ministry deserves credit for en-

deavoring to meet the case as it has arisen; but it is a very difficult one indeed. While the courts have decided that the riparian right exists in the owner of the soil to fish along the shores of the rivers where the lands are so owned, the duty of protecting the fisheries and of regulating them is thrown on the Dominion Government. With reference to the resolution which the hon. gentleman from St. John county read, and which emanated from the Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick, I would say, I think, that those hon. gentlemen have not given to the case the reflection which I consider they should have given, when they condemn in a wholesale manner the provisions of the Bill now under the consideration of this Parliament. I have given to this Bill, in conjunction with several other gentlemen interested in the fisheries, much attention. I have not publicly proclaimed the interest which I have taken in this matter. I have made no speeches concerning it while the Speaker was in the Chair, but I have given, in private Committee, a great deal of consideration to it, in conjunction both with the hon. gentleman from St. John county and other gentlemen interested in this matter, for the purpose of endeavoring, in the difficult circumstances in which the Government are placed, to get the Bill so amended and improved as will best meet the requirements or necessities of the case without doing any injustice, if we can possibly accomplish it, to the riparian proprietors in the different Provinces. I do not know very well how we can very much amend this Bill. It is time that my hon. friend from the county of St. John puts forward a point, in which there is a great deal, that the Government of the day under this Bill have the right to prohibit fishing except under a license. The point taken by my hon. friend is, that the Government may exercise an arbitrary power, and that where a dozen or twenty proprietors are on the stream, they may grant the privilege of fishing to six or ten, and refuse it to the other six or ten; but, at the same time, the hon. gentleman will perceive that unless there is some power vested in the Government every person may come in, whether under a license or not, and exercise the right to fish. The complaint which the hon. gentleman from Gaspé makes may then become a grievance, that the small streams which is the breeding bed of the great fisheries, that supply the commercial fisheries of the country, may be depleted; and I think it is not unwise, and that my hon. friend from the county of St. John, on consideration, will see, that between the choice of two evils, whether we shall allow unlimited fishing by these proprietors, or require of all persons desirous of fishing, having proprietary right to fish, to go to the Government and ask for a license, and that whether one horn or the other of the dilemma be adopted, I think that my hon. friend will say that, in the interest of the protection of the fisheries, it is better to trust to the Government of the day, whoever they may be, than to allow the unlimited fishing which proprietors will naturally exercise if no restriction be placed upon them. The acting Minister of Fisheries, in answer to some hon. gentleman on the other side, who enquired as to what the fee should be, spoke on a subject on which I presume my hon. friend is not very well prepared, because it requires consideration; and as he is only an acting Minister, perhaps he has not had an opportunity to give it that consideration which he shows that he is always prepared to give to matters in connection with his own Department. I do not know whether I caught aright the statement of my hon. friend, when he spoke of limiting largely the licenses, not so much for the purposes of revenue as for the purposes of regulation. I would suggest this to my hon. friend with regard to the right to license fishermen. Years ago, when a different rule prevailed as to the recognition where the right to fish, and the proprietary right existed for fishing prevailed, it was quite a different

thing. Then the Government were supposed to have the property of these fisheries, and they had a perfect right, under those circumstances, to raise a revenue from it, as the property of the country; but the rule held to-day is, that the proprietary right exists in the owner of the soil on the fresh-water streams; and on those streams my hon. friend will see—and I am sure he will admit the justice and force of the remark—that in such a case any fee imposed by way of license money would be simply a nominal sum for the purpose of regulation, and not for the purpose of revenue. I think that my hon. friend will agree with me in that. I am sure every one in the House will approve of it, and I am glad to hear assent coming from every seat on the Treasury benches. When the imposition of the fees for salmon nets was proposed by myself in this House years ago, and when it was objected to by some hon. members, I took the ground then, as I take the ground now, that these fisheries along the coasts and the bays of the Maritime Provinces have existed from grandfather to father and grandson—they have been occupied for years by a recognised law which, whether it is part of the common or Statute law or not, is a Statute law from one end of the Atlantic coast of the Dominion to the other, and which has always been acted upon on those coasts. Under these circumstances I put this to the Government: Whether or not in granting these licenses, they would feel it desirable, in the interests of peace and harmony—the more so because it does not affect the public interests of any kind—to recognise the principle that licenses should be granted wherever occupation has existed for years, and exists to-day, to the occupants of the land upon the shores in front of which they fish. I am sure that this is a point which will be conceded by the acting Minister of Fisheries, and that he will recognise the fact that the fee which was imposed years ago, and is in force to-day, is merely a nominal one—one which with regard to net-fishing was to be so much up to fifty fathoms, and a reduced sum beyond that. This is a system which has not worked at all badly. It does not bring in a revenue, because it was imposed not for revenue but for regulation; on that principle, I trust the hon. gentleman will continue to carry out in his Department—because it had not given dissatisfaction in the country, and while giving to the Department power to regulate and control—the power of being able statistically to keep the run of the fisheries, it does not bear hardly on the toilers of the sea, whose interests have been so ably advocated on many occasions by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin.) These are the two points which, speaking from the standpoint of a fishing county, I have thought it my duty to state to the House, and to press upon the Government; and I am glad to see, from the tokens of assent with which my remarks have been met while I have been speaking, that in both these points hon. gentlemen coincide with the views I have expressed, and the practices which have been in vogue ever since I can recollect, and which I know, if continued, will give satisfaction to the people. It is only within the last five or six years that the people of the country have recognised the fact that it was desirable, in order to get Governmental and legal recognition, that they should consent to turn to the Government so far as to get licenses at all, but they have done so pretty generally now. The matter is pretty well settled in the Maritime Provinces, at least; and if the policy of years ago is continued by the hon. gentlemen, I think the passage of this Bill will combine with it in giving the security which the Government have endeavored to give to the fishermen, and, at the same time, maintain that control which it is so desirable that the Government should maintain, whenever the duty is imposed upon them, of protecting the fisheries. So much for the Bill itself. I think, on the whole, that my hon. friend from the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), having stated his

Mr. MITCHELL.

views to the House, will not feel called upon to press on the Government the necessity of making a change in the particular feature to which he has alluded. I think an expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Bill, in response to the remarks of the hon. member for the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), that no favoritism shall be shown in the matter of licenses, that people applying for licenses shall be dealt with equally, that no refusal or assent shall be given on any other ground than the public interest, such as the possibility of a stream being over-fished—will be accepted by him as sufficient. There is one point more which I think requires some little attention at this particular moment. What is to become of these fisheries as they stand to-day? The Local Governments claim the right to control the fishermen on their own vacant lands on the different streams within their jurisdiction. The individuals owning the lands upon these streams claim the exclusive right of fishing off their lands, while not one of them spend \$1, or do a single act to protect or propagate the fish at their breeding points, which are at the head of these streams. Occasionally you will find a gentleman of property who has the spirit of a sportsman, and who may take some pains to protect the fish by putting guardians in the rivers or by other means, but these are isolated cases. Had it not been for the large sums which the resources of Canada have enabled Parliament to place at the disposal of the Government for the protection of this great salmon industry, there is no doubt that this important source of wealth would by this time have been almost annihilated. While I do not desire to give arbitrary powers to the hon. Minister to deal with matters such as these, yet I feel it to be necessary when the matter has been fairly considered, where objections have been presented on one side and fairly dealt with on the other, to give that support to the passage of all measures such as this, which will strengthen the hands of the Government in protecting this industry. I believe we are on the right track in doing this, and I think it is important that we should legislate in that spirit. Within the last ten years we have seen the salmon industry of the country advance to an enormous extent. Ten years ago you could get at our fishing banks or stations—and there are dozens of them in my own county—salmon for 40 cts. or 50 cts. apiece. That was all they were worth for salting down or smoking, to be sent to the United States market. What can you get them for to-day on the river which runs through my own county, the greatest salmon river of this continent, and exhibiting the greatest amount of production? You cannot buy them for less than twice as much, and very likely you would have to pay three times the price I have mentioned. I think it is the duty of the Government to give facilities for transporting those fish in a fresh condition from the points of production by connections with the Intercolonial to the centres of commerce in the United States and Canada. The Intercolonial has provided refrigerator cars to carry the fish in a fresh condition. If they have connections by steamboats or other means of communication by which the fresh fish packed in ice and snow could be carried, in place of their being worth what they are worth to-day, they would be worth in New York from \$3.50 to \$5, according to the supply, and that for fish which were only worth 40 cts. apiece a few years ago. I take this opportunity of pressing on the Government the necessity of giving to our coast fishermen these facilities, by means of which they will not only utilize to the best advantage this great source of wealth, but will realize interest upon the investments they have made in the railways of the country by increasing their traffic, thus producing a result which will be alike beneficial to the country and to the interests of the fishermen. I trust that my hon. friend from St. John will withdraw his objection to that part of the Bill, and accept from the Government the assurance that, in dealing with this question, they will show no favorit-

ism, but only refuse licenses when the refusal is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. BOWELL. In reply to the question put by the hon. member for Northumberland in reference to the granting of licenses to proprietors of land on tidal waters, I may say that the policy of the Government is, in all cases, to give the preference to the owners of the soil.

Mr. WELDON. In case a license is granted to a person, will it extend to persons fishing under him?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly; if he obtains a license he can allow his friends, or any one under him, to fish under it.

On section 2,

In answer to Mr. WELDON,

Mr. BOWELL. I understand this clause simply to provide for defining the limits for fly-fishing or net-fishing, as the case may be. It simply gives the Department power to declare that net-fishing shall be unlawful in one river and lawful in another, as the necessity may arise in the protection of the fisheries.

Mr. KIRK. I wish to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland. He stated that this was an old system, which had prevailed for years in the Maritime Provinces. It has never been applied in Nova Scotia. We have had no licensing system there, but people were at liberty to fish under the law without requiring a license or paying a license fee. I know of only one instance in which people were required to take out a license, and the action of the Government in that case was so unpopular that after the licenses were issued, the officers of the Government were instructed to cancel them and pay back the money. I can assure the Government that this system will be exceedingly unpopular in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I can say is that the Order in Council creating the charge was applied to Nova Scotia as well as to New Brunswick.

On section 4,

Mr. WELDON. The fourth sub-section will permit any person, not necessarily a fishery officer, to seize a fisherman's nets or other appliances for a contravention of this Act. It also enables any person to throw the burden of proof on the individual who is charged with the offence. That is opposed to the whole principle of justice which pervades our law.

Mr. BOWELL. That principle is recognised in almost every law regulating the collection of revenue, but I have no objection to striking out the words "or any person."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1884.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LOBBE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1884, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
OTTAWA, 15th May, 1883.

Ordered, that the said Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

#### TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TIMBER SLIDES.

Mr. COSTIGAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 126) to make further provision respecting the regula-

tion and collection of tolls on Government timber slides and other works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber, lumber and saw-logs, said: The object of this Bill is to collect dues and tolls on timber and logs passing down slides and through public works of the Government, or rivers under the control of the Government of Canada. This Bill proposes to give the same power to enforce payment of tolls as is possessed by the Local Governments. The original Act only covered square timber; this also applies to saw-logs which have been taken down in great quantities. Many years ago, when timber was passed through in cribs, the tolls were easily collected; but there is a great difference now between the cribs of timber passing through the slides over the various branches of the Ottawa and the loose logs which come down in such large quantities. This Bill provides for collecting the dues on those logs in the same way as on square timber. Another feature in this Bill is to give power to follow the timber, whether it be manufactured or not, until the dues are collected. As hon. gentlemen are aware, the law provides for the collection of a stumpage, and gives a right to the Crown to follow the lumber in the same way until it is collected, and we propose to adopt, to some extent, the same principle. But we do not propose to go so far as the present Act does with regard to the collection of stumpage, because we do not intend to hold any portion of the timber, which may be sold off or held for stumpage, liable for more than double the amount of the stumpage dues. By the present laws relating to the collection of stumpage, I think we can hold any quantity of timber for the payment, and follow the stumpage due from the owner of that timber. This Bill provides that we can follow the logs, or the lumber manufactured from the logs, and we can hold that lumber for an amount not exceeding double the stumpage due on the lumber.

#### CANADA AT THE INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXPOSITION.

Mr. BOWELL. As every one is interested in the success of our fishery exhibit in England, I take the opportunity of reading to the House a cablegram just received from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He says:

"Exhibition a great success. Ours very favorably noticed by the Press and referred to by Prince of Wales at Fishmonger's dinner as remarkably good, and Duke of Edinburgh as ahead of all the colonies, and in some respects ranking with United States. Maps of Canada attract great attention and enquiry.

"MOLLELAN."

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

#### After Recess.

#### TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TIMBER SLIDES.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very unsatisfactory to give such extensive powers to the Governor in Council. It is impossible to tell whether the regulations so made will be under this Act, or under another Act. If it was intended to give the Governor in Council such extensive powers, it would have been better to have stated them in one Act, and then we would be able to know under what authority the resolutions were being made. Those powers include that of imposing fines and penalties up to \$500. That is highly objectionable. Parliament is asked to give power to the Governor in Council to create offences by determining what the regulations shall be, and to give the Governor in Council power to impose penalties up to \$500, for the infraction of those regulations.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It must be remembered that this Bill was not prepared by myself, but by the law clerk, who is supposed to be thoroughly acquainted with the Acts now in force, and who has given a careful examination to the whole subject. By other Acts similar powers are given to the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. We do not know what regulations the Governor in Council may make for the recovery of penalties. The ordinary custom of the law should not be departed from, and if special powers are required in this case they should be defined in the Bill. The hon. gentleman says the Bill was prepared by the law clerk. If we have not the right to discuss measures, we might as well pass a short Act, setting forth that the Bills prepared by the law clerk should become law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I merely stated that the Bill was prepared by the law clerk after a very careful examination of the subject. The law stated that certain matters shall be done by regulations; those regulations must, however, be within the law itself, and not contrary to the Act, or going beyond the powers of the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. The regulations, of course, will not be contrary to the Act, but the Act gives excessive power to the Governor General in Council.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think that any very great evil will arise under the operation of this clause. It does not give the Governor in Council power to impose any other than a money penalty, and this is restricted by the Act itself, to a sum not exceeding \$500. It seems to me that the mere mode of recovering this penalty is not a question for very material consideration. At all events, the Governor in Council cannot frame any regulation by which any greater penalty than the immediate payment of money for the infraction of any regulation adopted by the Governor in Council, can be enforced, nothing more severe can be done; and I do not think that anything in this Act enables the Governor in Council to make regulations by which any person may be imprisoned.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite true that it provides only a money penalty, limited to the sum which the hon. gentleman may consider wholly light and frivolous, \$500; but to some people this might be rather an important sum, and a rather serious question, though it might not be so to the hon. gentleman; and, under the regulation which may be framed, this could be recovered by immediate procedure, without any judicial trial, without any enquiry, without any proper provision for ascertaining the facts relating to the subject. All this could be done under the legislation proposed. Now, what seems to me objectionable is that it is proposed to hand over to the Governor in Council power to prescribe rules contrary to the ordinary course of the law, because, if that were followed, well and good, we would not then want any regulations; and, therefore, these may be more severe, and how much more you cannot tell. There is no limitation whatever. It might be by immediate process of distress, without trial and without enquiry.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The subject always has remedy against the Crown for improper execution. If there has been no infraction of the law, the subject can recover against the Crown.

Mr. BLAKE. With all deference to the hon. gentleman, I think it would be very difficult for him to establish that proposition. With regard to the second sub-section, I wish to say I think this is only adopting what is contained in recent, though not so very recent, legislation. My own opinion is very strongly against the multiplication of these voluntary and extra judicial oaths. I think that a solemn declaration is what ought to be substituted for an oath. It accomplishes all proper purposes, the person being liable as for perjury. We have an Act, if I remember aright,

Mr. BLAKE.

on the Statute-book for the suppression and mitigation of voluntary and extra judicial oaths, and here it is proposed to multiply them. I would ask the hon. gentleman before he takes the third reading—for I will not now, after what he has said, make an amendment on the moment—on these and other points about which I make suggestions, to consider them; and to see whether it would not be as convenient and as efficient to substitute a solemn declaration under an existing Act of Parliament for the proposed oath.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. The first sub-section of this clause, as I mentioned to the hon. gentleman privately a moment ago, is somewhat contrary to the hon. gentleman's statement on the introduction of the resolutions, in that it strikes at property after it has passed from the hands of the person liable to pay the dues. The property in question is to be liable to pay at any rate to the extent of double the dues, although it may be converted into lumber and sold, and passed away from the original proprietor or person, who passed it through the booms, slides or dams, and the person who ought to have paid it, seems to me that this is rather objectionable. I quite admit, speaking from memory, that there is a provision with reference to stumpage, that the timber shall continue liable, and it is continuing that step further, I think, to provide that stuff, after it has been cut up and become boards and sold in that condition, and passed out of the hands of the original person, shall be liable to be followed and seized not merely for single dues, but also for double the amount that may be due.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the Consolidated Statutes, power was taken for the collection of stumpage; and I suppose it will not be argued that the Government have not the same right to protect itself in connection with tolls due upon timber which has passed through slides and public works that the Local Government have in connection with stumpage. In fact the same officer collects both dues.

Mr. LAURIER. Abolish that provision regarding stumpage also.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They have the power to follow the timber until the stumpage is paid, and also to follow the lumber sawn from that timber. They can go into any lumber pile or yard, where they believe any portion of the timber, liable to stumpage is mixed up with other lumber, and seize the whole of this lumber, while the burden of proof rests with the owner to establish what is and what is not liable. Now we do not ask the Committee to go that far in connection with toll dues. We ask only to hold the timber liable, and liable for double the amount of the dues chargeable upon the timber which passed through the slides.

On sub-section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Once again, this provision seems obnoxious and open to a good deal of objection. This timber, which as timber passed through the slide, is afterwards cut into lumber and gets into other hands altogether; but the innocent purchaser is liable to have the whole of his lumber chargeable *en masse* with whatever may be due on the part of the original owner.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A similar provision exists with regard to the collection of stumpage.

Mr. LAURIER. Would it not be more advisable, instead of making this Bill similar to the Stumpage Law, to soften these provisions. The law on stumpage is now in force, and is an old law passed before Confederation; but now the lands belong to the Provincial Governments, except, perhaps, in the North-West Territories. If so, it is in very rare instances, and I, therefore, suggest that it would be advisable to amend the law in that direction.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman will remember in regard to the Ottawa river in particular, and a

portion of its tributaries where a considerable portion of the slides and booms are constructed by, and are under the control of the Government, some of these tributaries have been improved by the Government and some have not. Let us take for example the case of a mill owner here at Ottawa who draws his supplies from the different tributaries of the Ottawa river; a portion of his logs are subject to slide and boom dues and others are not. How would the hon. gentleman distinguish them; that part of the lumber which is cut from those logs which were subject to tolls under this Act and those which are not. For that reason it seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that all the lumber in the yard of the mill owner should be held liable for the dues which accrue on any portion of the logs that go to make up that lumber.

Mr. LAURIER. But this goes further, as they will be held liable for the logs after they are converted into lumber.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Only to a limited extent.

Mr. BLAKE. Only to the extent of double the dues.

On section 5,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it that in the collection of dues by suit these dues may be sued for "by the collector of tolls and dues in his own name or in the name of Her Majesty." Why lay down two modes of recovery?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is for the purpose of meeting the wishes of those engaged in the trade. For instance, a large quantity of lumber might be sacrificed if only one mode were prescribed, whereas if the person against whom the claim lay was solvent it might be collected in the ordinary way without sacrificing any large amount of property. Experience has shown with regard to such powers though a provision is made for them, they are not as a rule enforced very rigidly.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is very sound constitutional doctrine for Parliament to surrender general powers to the Executive on the ground that they will not find it necessary to use them very often.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause constitutes the resistance or obstruction of an officer, or person acting in his aid, a felony, which seems rather a severe result to follow such an offence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A similar clause exists, I think, in other Acts with reference to the collection of the Inland Revenue and the collection of Customs.

On section 8,

Mr. BLAKE. In this case I have to make the same objection as before, and there is the additional feature that here there is no limitation to a pecuniary penalty. Why not describe the offence and the penalties in the law itself instead of leaving it a matter of general regulation. Why not state the maximum penalty which will follow each offence?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will consider this suggestion before the third reading.

On section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. This section seems to me to be rather objectionable. I know that in other Acts the onus of proof is put on the party and not on the Crown; but in this case there is provision for a prosecution not merely by the officer of the Crown but also by some other party—the third person who is authorized under the ninth section to make the seizure. I think that in these sections which are subversive of the general rule as to the onus of proof should be rigidly limited, and should not apply to this third person who may be influenced by other motives. If an officer makes a false charge, or an improper seizure, he knows he is liable to

correction or dismissal, but not so in the case of the other party, who, I think, should be subject to the ordinary rule which applies between subject and subject. I throw this out for the consideration of the hon. gentleman before the third reading.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have already explained that; but for a clause of this kind it would be impossible to collect tolls and dues on timber, as timber which comes down rivers, on which there are no slides or booms, is liable to get mixed, and it would be impossible for the Department to establish a proof of non-payment. I agree with the hon. gentleman in the point raised—especially since the discussion took place on the Fishery Bill, in which the same principle was involved—and that particular provision may, perhaps, be struck out.

Bill reported.

#### CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada, said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to explain briefly the object of the various amendments that are contained in it. In the first place, I may say that, rather by an oversight than otherwise, the Railway Act in the first instance, and the Consolidated Act of 1879, both failed to bring under the operation of the law a large number of important railways, and it was found impossible to carry out the views of Parliament in relation to railways because of that omission. The reason of it was that the second section of the Act, 42 Vict., to amend and consolidate the Act of 1868 and the Acts amending it, provided that the said sections shall apply to any railway constructed or to be constructed under the authority of any Act passed by the Parliament of Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway and a number of other railways were entirely outside of the operation of the Consolidated Railway Act, and I think every member of this House will agree that it is highly desirable that this Act should apply, at all events, to all our great leading lines of railway, and every day's experience has proved the importance of this. For instance, the attention of the House and the country was forcibly drawn to the necessity of requiring greater headway under bridges, owing to the large number of fatal accidents which were caused to persons on the top of freight cars, and Parliament passed an Act requiring every company within a certain time to provide a certain amount of room between the top of the highest car in use on the line and the overhead bridges, except in a few cases that required to be dealt with by Order in Council. Of course, in the case of the Victoria Bridge, and in the case of tunnels built at great expense, it would be impossible to carry that provision out literally without causing great hardship to the companies; consequently provision was made by which the Governor in Council had power to exempt certain very important structures from the operation of that law. But so far as the Grand Trunk Railway was concerned it was entirely exempt. That company could maintain its overhead bridges without any reference to the deliberate action of Parliament on the subject. I merely give that as an illustration of the necessity that forced itself upon the Government of having these leading lines of railway brought under the control of this Parliament, so that we might make such regulations as in the judgment of this House might be from time to time considered necessary in the interest of the public. Consequently it is proposed to amend this Act by declaring that the Consolidated Railway Act shall apply to every railway and railway company subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada; and, after that, it is proposed in a subsequent clause to name all these leading

lines of railway, and to bring them within the authority of this Parliament by declaring, as the Union Act requires, that they shall be considered to be works for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more Provinces. The next amendment to this Act is merely a verbal one; there is a clerical error in the eighth sub-section of section eight of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, by which the words, "map or plan, or book of reference," occur in the first line of the said sub-section where the words "map or plan and book of reference" should occur. This amendment is such as not to enable parties to file either a map or a plan or a book of reference; but to require them to file either a map or a plan and book of reference, and that plan shall mean a ground plan and profile. The next amendment proposed is one to which the attention of the Government was drawn, and in fact I had a clause prepared before the present Session, but during the present Session the necessity of companies having power to take a larger amount of land for their stations than is provided for by the Consolidated Railway Act, forced itself upon the attention of members generally, in connection with one or two Bills that were before the Railway Committee. I stated to the Committee that the Government proposed to deal with that difficulty. I propose, therefore, to amend section nine of the Consolidated Railway Act by substituting the words:

"Six hundred and fifty yards in length by one hundred in breadth for the words 'two hundred and fifty yards in length by one hundred and fifty yards in breadth,' in the seventh and eighth lines of the said section nine, and inserting immediately thereafter the words, 'except for town and city stations, depots or terminal stations, or for protection against snow drifts (in which cases such greater quantity of land or land covered with water may be taken, as may be approved of by the Governor in Council.)'"

In the third section it is proposed:

"3. For the avoidance of doubts, the words 'working expenditure,' in the thirtieth section of the said *The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879*, are hereby declared to mean and include all expenses of maintenance of the railway, and of the stations, buildings, works and conveniences belonging thereto, and of the rolling and other stock and moveable plant used in the working thereof, and also all such tolls, rents or annual sums as may be paid in respect of property leased to or held by the company, or in respect of the hire of engines, carriages or waggons let to the company; also all rent charges or interest on the purchase money of lands belonging to the company, purchased but not paid for, or not fully paid for; and also all expenses of or incidental to working the railway, and the traffic thereon, including stores and consumable articles; also rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accidents or losses; also all salaries and wages of persons employed in and about the working of the railway and traffic; and all office and management expenses including directors' fees, legal and other like expenses; and generally all such charges, if any, not above otherwise specified, as in all cases of English railway companies are usually carried to the debit of revenue, as distinguished from capital account."

It is the practice of the Government to carry all such items as are here included, under the head of working expenses, to the charge of revenue in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I believe all these charges will be regarded by the House as proper charges to be made against the working expenses of railways. That part of the clause for compensation for accidents and losses is in order to make chargeable to the working expenses of a railway, all accidents to the person, whether involving loss of life or injury to the person as well as injury to property. It is the intention of the Government to look carefully into all these accidents that occur in such a way as to involve a legal liability against the road, for the purpose of providing what is considered due compensation for such accident. The next amendment is one that has been forced on the attention of the Government and Railway Committee by the number of accidents that have occurred in connection with railways crossing highways. It is here provided that:

"In any case where any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorized or proposed to be constructed, upon or along, or across any turnpike road, street or other public highway, on the level, the railway company, before constructing or using the same, or in the case of railways already constructed, within such time as the Railway Com-

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

mittee shall direct, shall submit a plan and profile of such portion of railway, for the approval of the Railway Committee, and the Railway Committee, if it appears to them necessary for the public safety, may, from time to time, with the sanction of the Governor in Council, authorize and require the company to whom such railway belongs, within such time as the said Committee directs, to carry such road, street or highway either over or under the said railway, by means of a bridge or arch, instead of crossing the same on the level, or to execute such other works as under the circumstances of the case appear to the said Committee the best adapted for removing or diminishing the danger arising from the then position of the railway, or to protect such road, street or highway by a watchman, or by a watchman and gates or other protection; and all the provisions of law at any such time applicable to the taking of land by railway companies and its valuation and conveyance to them, and to the compensation therefor, shall apply to the case of any land required for the proper carrying out of the requirements of the Railway Committee. For each and every day after the expiration of the date for the completion of the works fixed by the Railway Committee, during which the works remain uncompleted, the company shall forfeit and pay to Her Majesty, a penalty of fifty dollars to be recovered by information, with costs of suit, in the Exchequer Court of Canada by the Attorney-General of Canada on behalf of Her Majesty."

The law has provided that where one railway crosses another, and there was danger to life and property through collision, the Railway Committee had authority to require such works as might be best adapted to remove or diminish the danger. This Bill is intended to extend the same provision to cases in which it is equally necessary, in which railways cross public streets, and for which there is no provision in the law by which the Railway Committee or the Government of the day could exercise the same wise and wholesome control that they do in the case of one railway crossing the track of another. After the serious accidents that have occurred in connection with the want of sufficient provision in such cases, this will be regarded as a wise and judicious amendment.

Mr. GILLMOR. To what railway does this apply?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To all railways under the control of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman will find a clause, to which I will come by-and-bye, which will be pretty extensive in its operation in bringing the leading lines of railways under the control of this Parliament. The next clause gives power to the Committee to order the necessary repairs at such crossings:

"Whenever that portion of any railway which crosses or is constructed upon or along any turnpike road, street or other public highway on the level, is out of repair, the chief officer of the municipality, or other local division, having jurisdiction over such highway, may serve a notice upon the company in the usual manner, requiring the repair to be forthwith made."

If a road is out of repair the municipal authorities will have power to intervene and require the railway company at its expense to provide such repairs as are necessary:

"And if the company do not forthwith make the same, such officer may transmit a copy of the notice so served to the Secretary of the Railway Committee; and thereupon it shall be the duty of the Committee with all possible despatch, to appoint a day for an examination into the matter; and the Committee shall by mail give notice to such chief officer, and to the company, of the day so fixed; and upon the day so named the said portion of the railway shall be examined by an engineer appointed by the Railway Committee; and any certificate under his hand shall be final on the subject so in dispute between the parties; and if the said engineer determines that any repairs are required, he shall specify the nature thereof in his certificate, and direct the company to make the same; and the company shall thereupon with all possible despatch, comply with the requirement of such certificate; and in case of default the proper authority in the municipality or other local division, within whose jurisdiction the said portion of the railway is situate, may make such repairs, and may recover all costs, expenses and outlays in the premises, by action against the company in any court of competent jurisdiction, as money paid to the company's use: Provided always, that neither this section nor any proceeding had thereunder shall at all affect any liability otherwise attaching to such company in the premises."

Then, Sir, the next amendment proposed is one for the purpose of providing a penalty for parties who refuse to furnish the statistics required by law:

"And any such railway company shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$50 per day for every day of wilful neglect, omission or refusal, to obey the provision aforesaid."



In the next clause it is intended to bring under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, a number of railways which are not now under its jurisdiction :

"Whereas, it is in and by the British North America Act, 1867, among other things in effect enacted, that the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to such local works and undertakings as, although wholly situate within a Province, are before or after their execution declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more Provinces : and whereas, not only the main lines of the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the North Shore Railway, the Northern Railway, the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, the Canada Southern Railway, the Great Western Railway, the Credit Valley Railway, the Ontario and Quebec Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but also all branch lines or railways connecting with or crossing them or any of them, are works, and each of them is a work, for the general advantage of Canada ; and whereas, for the better and more uniform government of all such works, and for the greater safety, convenience and advantage of the public, it is desirable that Parliament should so declare : Therefore, it is hereby declared, that the said lines of railway, namely : The Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the North Shore Railway, the Northern Railway, the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, the Canada Southern Railway, the Great Western Railway, the Credit Valley Railway, the Ontario and Quebec Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, are works for the general advantage of Canada, and each and every branch line or railway connecting with or crossing the said lines of railway, or any one of them, is a work for the general advantage of Canada."

I do not think that it will be considered any stretch of meaning of terms to declare that all these leading lines of railway and the branches connected with them, and the roads crossing them, are roads for the general advantage of Canada, and in more than one Province they are for the advantage of both Provinces. As I have stated before, it is provided that the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act, shall only apply to railways that are hereby covered by the amendment I have just read to the House. But it may be said that a great many of these railways have local charters only, and that the provisions and guarantees and pledges in respect of these railways are local, and in some cases municipal. I have provided by this Act, that while bringing them under the control of this Parliament, in so far as necessary for the safety of the public, they shall not be free from any obligations that have been incurred by the agreements made as it were with the Local Legislatures who may have subsidised these railways or granted them their charter :

"Nothing in this section contained shall be construed as rendering inoperative the provisions of any Act of a Local Legislature heretofore passed, authorizing the construction and running of any such railway or branch line, but hereafter the same shall be subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada."

The next clause is one in connection with the collection of statistics. Doubts have been raised on this point, though in my mind there can be no question that the collection of statistics is given by the Union Act to the Dominion Parliament, and I believe we are in a position to require statistical information with regard to railways, whether they are under the control of this Parliament or not. But some parties are under the impression that this Government have no right to require statistics from them unless they have a charter from this Parliament. It is therefore provided that :

"Whereas, it is desirable to collect railway statistics, therefore sections twenty-nine to thirty-four, both inclusive, and fifty-five to fifty-eight, both inclusive, of the said Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, shall apply to all railway companies operating lines of railway in Canada, whether otherwise within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada or not."

That clause will set at rest any doubt on the matter, and will enable us to compel them to furnish a response to a requisition of this Government for such statistical information as is absolutely needed to carry out the design of Parliament in having these railway statistics annually compiled. Then the nineteenth sub-section of the ninth section of the said Act, the Act of 1879, is hereby repealed. The

object of this clause is also to remove doubts which have been expressed from a somewhat vague statement of the intention of Parliament with reference to arbitration, and it provides that :

"If by an award of arbitrators made under this Act, the sum awarded exceeds the sum offered by the company, the costs of the arbitration shall be borne by the company ; but if otherwise, they shall be borne by the opposite party, and be deducted from the compensation : and in either case the amount of such costs, if not agreed upon, may be taxed by the Judge."

That is practically already in the law, but stated a little obscurely, though, I think, there can be doubt as to what Parliament intended. The ninth sub-section provides with reference to calls for stock :

"The twentieth section of the present Act is hereby amended by adding to the first sub-section thereof, at the end of the said sub-section, the following words: 'But nothing herein contained shall prevent the directors from making more than one call by one resolution of the Board,—the intervals between such calls, the notices of each call and the other provisions of this Act and of the special Act (if any) being duly observed' "

That is to say that a company may make more than one call at one meeting and by one notice. It may provide for two calls at the same meeting without being obliged to meet again for the same purpose, although at the time of their first call they know perfectly well it will be necessary to make a second call at an early period. It avoids the necessity of having a special meeting to make a second call, all the notices and information to the public and everything of that kind being complied with, and the public and shareholders being perfectly informed of the intention of the meeting to provide for more than one call at that meeting. Clause ten reads as follows :—

"Section sixty of the said Act is hereby amended by adding at the end of the first sub-section of the said section, after the word 'proxy,' the words 'and also to the approval of the Governor in Council.' And also by the addition of the following provisions, a, b, c and d' :

This embodies a provision contained in a Bill introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), which was withdrawn by him in consequence of an undertaking given on the part of the Government, that they would embody the provision he proposed in the Consolidated Railway Amendment Act, as it is undoubtedly more convenient to have all the amendments, if possible placed in one Statute. The following provisions are also added :—

"(a.) Provided, that before such approval shall be given, notice of the application therefor shall be published in the *Canada Gazette* for at least two months prior to the time therein named for the making of such application, and such notice shall state a time and place when the application shall be made, and that all parties interested may then and there appear and be heard on such application."

"(b.) That the like approval, applied for in like manner, shall be necessary in order to the validity of any purchase or lease of any railway or portion of railway :

"(c.) That unless specially authorized so to do, it shall not be lawful for any railway company, either directly or indirectly, to apply any of its funds to the acquisition of any shares, bonds or other securities issued by another railway company, nor of any interest in such shares, bonds or other securities :

"(d.) That every Director of a railway company who knowingly permits any of such company's funds to be applied in contravention of the provisions of the next preceding provision, shall be liable to a penalty of one thousand dollars for each contravention, which penalty may be sued for and recovered on information filed in the name of the Minister of Justice of Canada, and one-half of the said penalty when recovered shall belong to the Crown, and one-half thereof to the informer ; and the acquisition of each share, bond or other security, or interest therein, as aforesaid, shall be deemed a separate contravention of the provisions aforesaid."

The next sub-section is one to which I should like to direct the special attention of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) because he directed the attention of the House very forcibly to the necessity of making our Act comply more fully with the English Act. The hon. gentleman, as the House will remember, drew our attention to the fact that whereas in the Canadian Act, railways were compelled to give equal facilities to other lines, the English Act com-

pelled the companies to give equal facilities under the same circumstances to individuals as well. With a view to meet the hon. gentleman as far as possible, and to embody the suggestion he threw out, he will be glad, as his own Bill was not proceeded with, to have the same provision embodied in the Consolidated Railway Act, and this amendment is proposed, and I trust the hon. gentleman will find that it meets the points which he impressed on the House, and that it will, in his judgment, meet the case so far as it can be met by the tribunal of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The section is as follows:—

"Every railway company shall, according to its power, afford all reasonable facilities for the receiving, and forwarding and delivery of traffic upon and from the several railways belonging to or worked by such company, and for the return of carriages, trucks and other vehicles; and no such company shall make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to or in favor of any particular person or company or any particular description of traffic in any respect whatever, nor shall any such company subject any particular person or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever. And any railway company having or working railways which form part of a continuous line or railway, or which intersect any other railway, or which have the terminal station or wharf of the one near the terminal station or wharf of the other, shall afford all due and reasonable facilities for receiving and forwarding all the traffic arriving by one of such railways by the other, without any unreasonable delay, and without any such preference or advantage or precedence or disadvantage as aforesaid, and so that no obstruction may be offered to any person desirous of using such railways as a continuous line of communication, and so that all reasonable accommodation may by means of the railways of the several companies be at all times afforded to the public in that behalf; and any agreement made between any two or more railway companies contrary to the foregoing provisions shall be unlawful, null and void."

The next is a provision to meet the case of the sale of a railway or part of a railway to a party not having the necessary powers to work it. There is no provision in the existing Statute under which a railway so sold and becoming the property of an individual—purchased, not by a company, but by parties not having corporate powers—can be worked. This is a clause intended to provide means for working a railway under such circumstances by authority of the Government, until the assembly of Parliament, and an opportunity has been offered to obtain corporate powers. The clause is as follows:

"If at any time any railway or any section of any railway be sold under the provisions of any deed of mortgage thereof, or at the instance of the holders of any mortgage, bonds or debentures, for the payment of which any charges has been created thereon, or under any lawful proceeding, and be purchased by any person or corporation not having any corporate powers authorising the holding and operating thereof by such purchase, the purchaser thereof shall transmit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, within ten days from the date of such purchase, a notice in writing stating the fact that such purchase has been made, describing the termini and line of route of the railway purchased, and specifying the charter under which the same had been constructed and operated, including a copy of any writing preliminary to a conveyance of such railway which has been made as evidence of such sale; and immediately upon the execution of any deed of conveyance of such railway the purchaser shall also transmit to the Minister of Railways and Canals a duplicate or an authenticated copy of such deed, and shall furnish to the Minister, on request, any further details or information that he may require."

Section 14 is as follows:—

"Until the purchaser shall have given notice to the Minister in manner and form as provided by the last preceding section, it shall not be lawful for the purchaser to run or operate the railway so purchased, or to take, exact or receive any tolls whatever in respect of any traffic carried thereon; but after the said conditions have been complied with, the purchaser may continue until the end of the then next Session of the Parliament of Canada to operate such railway and to take and receive such tolls thereon as the railway company previously owning and operating the same was authorized to take, and shall be subject in so far as they can be made applicable to the terms and conditions of the charter of the said company, until he shall have received a letter of license from the Minister of Railways and Canals, which letter the Minister is hereby authorized to grant, defining the terms and conditions on which such railway shall be run by such purchaser during the said period."

I believe these clauses will be found to fully meet the case; but the party is obliged to apply to Parliament at the earliest possible moment, in order to obtain corporate

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

powers the same as any other company. The next clause is as follows:—

"It shall be the duty of such purchaser to apply to the Parliament of Canada at the next following Session thereof after the purchase of such railway for an Act of incorporation or other legislative authority, to hold, operate and run such railway, and if such application be made to the said Parliament and be unsuccessful, it shall be in the discretion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to extend the license to such railway until the end of the then next following Session of Parliament and no longer. And if during such extended period the purchaser does not obtain such Act of incorporation or other legislative authority, such railway shall be closed or otherwise dealt with by the Minister of Railways and Canals, as shall be determined by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council."

I trust that these amendments, many of which have been suggested by hon. gentlemen on the Railway Committee, and all of them, I believe, or most of them, certainly have been brought under the notice of that Committee, and its approval will meet with the approval of this House, and enable us to obviate a number of serious difficulties and objections which have been met with in carrying out the Railway Act, and many difficulties which have presented themselves in the management of the railways, so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that the hon. gentleman intends to refer this Bill to the Railway Committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I am very sorry the hon. gentleman takes this course. This is a very important Bill. It contains very numerous provisions, some of them of a startling character, and one of them in particular very startling. It was introduced six days ago, and distributed in English only one or two days ago. It is not yet distributed in French, and the Government announced that they would likely, to-day, take Government Notices of Motion and Concurrence, and not Bills. I have not excepted to a number of things taken in the ordinary course, and which did not involve discussion; but the hon. gentleman announces now, that he proposes to take up this Bill without referring it to the Railway Committee, to which the original Railway Act, to which this is an amendment in many important respects, was referred. Under these circumstances, I think that the hon. gentleman's proceedings are unfair. He is exposing the House to a surprise to read this Bill the second time at this stage, without the preliminary steps being taken, which we have a right to rely upon according to the Rules of the House; and, under these circumstances, I object, as the Bill is not distributed in French.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, it is quite competent to the hon. gentleman to obstruct the progress of the Bill, but I am sorry that at this late period of the Session, he feels it to be his duty to do so, because I think I am in the judgment of the House, or of a very large portion of it, the members of the Committee on Railways and Canals, when I say that these, with the exception of one single clause in the Bill, which I admit is a clause of very great importance—

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But one that is very easily comprehended—

Mr. BLAKE. It is very comprehensive, I admit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is very comprehensive and very easily comprehended. It is a very simple proposition, although I think that it is a very necessary and very important proposition; yet it is a very simple one, and, with the exception of one, not one single clause in the Bill has not already been considered by the Committee of Railways and Canals; and I think I may say further that not a single clause in the Bill has not virtually received the approval of the Committee of Railways and Canals. I have no intention to have the Bill read the third time at this

sitting. I think that if the hon. gentleman allows us to go into Committee and consider the Bill, without introducing a technical objection, he will forward the business of the House and not lie open to the charge of having neglected in the slightest degree that careful scrutiny which the high position he occupies certainly causes to devolve upon him in relation to the legislation of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be very glad indeed to comply with the wishes of the hon. gentleman, but I would like to know how many members of the House have read this Bill, besides the hon. gentleman, and how many comprehended its provisions, before the hon. gentleman moved the second reading of it. We are very busily engaged, to a late hour every morning, in discharging our customary duties. The Government are asked every night—I take pains to ask them—what they are going to do next day; they do not announce that they are going to read this Bill, which is a very important Bill; and we knew that, according to the Orders of the House, they could not read it. I have not information on many points which I would like to have, for which I will have to ask the hon. gentleman at a subsequent stage, when the Bill goes on; and there are many other things. I think you have brought no list of the railways, which, with one fell swoop, permit me to say, you propose to bring within the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. We have no such legislation which I would notably like to have. If the hon. gentleman had referred the Bill to the Railway Committee I would not have been disposed to take exception; but as it is now proposed to take the Bill through the Committee of the Whole House, I feel constrained to say I do not think that the real business of legislation will be forwarded by that course.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope that my hon. friend will not persist.

Mr. BLAKE. There is plenty of other work to do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But we have had other Bills before us, and the hon. gentleman did not insist that they should be printed in both languages—several Bills belonging to private members as well as public Bills—and my hon. friend has just stated, it is not intended now to take the third reading.

Mr. BLAKE. But we are not prepared to discuss it in Committee. It is not reasonable to read it a second time to-day and to take it through Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This Bill has been on the Table for several days.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg pardon. It has been there about two days. Yesterday, this Bill was distributed in English—only yesterday; and we were engaged in the House from three o'clock yesterday until two o'clock this morning.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This Bill has been distributed for several days.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so—since the 9th.

Mr. BLAKE. It was introduced, but not distributed, on the 9th.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the 15th—six days.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not then distributed, but on Monday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is Tuesday and the Bill has been, at all events, for the last two days in the hands of hon. members. As my hon. friend (Mr. Blake) I think understands English, and the Bill is printed in English, I do not think he should make this objection. Of course, he is perfectly in his right. This is legal according to the Rules of the House, but sometimes an hon. member insists upon his right and then allows a Bill of this kind to be discussed. All the time possible may be given to the discussion of these clauses; and at this time of the Session,

it would be better, I think, to allow the Bill to go through. Of course, however, if the hon. gentleman insists, we cannot do otherwise than submit, and pass to some other item.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As a matter of fact regarding the distribution of this Bill, I remember distinctly having a conversation with my hon. friend from Renfrew, as to whether the Bill which was being introduced with relation to fences was embodied in this Bill; and he had looked over the Bill at that time and found that clause. As to members not reading it, I am satisfied that more members have read this Bill up to this time than is usually the case, in regard to Bills brought in, in consequence of the great interest which this Bill has excited.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course if the hon. gentleman insists, we cannot go on.

### LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved, That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the following Resolution:—

*Resolved*,—That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance a sum or sums not exceeding in the whole \$100,000 to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners towards the completion of the Lévis Graving Dock, bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum in addition to, and on like terms as to sinking fund as the sum of \$500,000 the advance of which is authorized by the Act 38 Victoria, chapter 56.

He said: As many hon. gentlemen are aware, a resolution has been passed by Parliament authorizing the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec to borrow \$500,000 for the construction of a graving dock. It appears from a communication from the Harbor Commissioners to the hon. Minister of Public Works, that in order to complete this dock they will require at least \$50,000, and possibly between \$50,000 and \$100,000; and therefore they asked the Government to give them authority to borrow a sum not exceeding \$100,000 at 4 per cent.

Motion agreed to; and resolution considered in Committee and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act 3 Vic., chap. 56, intituled: An Act respecting the Graving Dock in the Harbor of Quebec, and authorizing the raising of a loan in respect thereof.

Bill read the first time.

### QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That in order to assist the Quebec Harbor Commissioners in the improvement of the harbor of Quebec, it is expedient to amend the Act thirty-six Victoria, chapter sixty-two, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Acts to provide for the management and improvement of the harbor of Quebec," and the Act forty-third Victoria, chapter seventeen, intituled: "An Act to authorize the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to complete their tidal dock, so as to provide that the rate of interest payable by the said Harbor Commissioners to the Receiver-General upon the sums raised under the said recited Acts shall be four per centum per annum, instead of five as therein specified.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be remembered that in the Session of, I think, 1881, the Quebec Government asked Parliament to reduce the rate of interest paid by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal on the sums expended in deepening Lake St. Peter, amounting to upwards of \$1,700,000. The rate of interest was 5 per cent., and Parliament was asked to reduce the rate to 4

per cent., which it did. It appears that the Government had advanced to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec, I think, about \$1,400,000 for harbor improvements, as well as a tidal dock, upon which they had been paying 5 per cent. This resolution is for the purpose of placing the Commissioners of Quebec in precisely the same position as those of Montreal, by reducing the rate of interest from 5 to 4 per cent.

Mr. VAIL. Will the hon. Finance Minister tell us how much these two transactions, as well as that in connection with the bridge of St. John, N.B., will cost the Dominion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the Finance Minister explained to-day, this loan is made to a company in St. John upon which they will pay interest, and there will be no cost to the Government. In so far as the graving dock in Quebec is concerned that amount is provided for under an Act passed, I think, by the late Government some few years ago, and the work has been progressing since then, but the amount of money at the disposal of the Commissioners was not sufficient to meet the engagements under that contract—extra works which were required since the contract was signed. That is the reason my hon. friend asked Parliament to vote \$100,000 upon which interest is to be paid at 4 per cent. by the Commissioners. In the present case the interest is reduced from 5 per cent. to 4, as that is the rate which was paid by other bodies at that time and is the rate at which the Government borrows its money. This involves no charge upon the Government.

Mr. VAIL. I do not wish to be understood as objecting, but I merely wish to know whether the Government could borrow money at 4 per cent. and lend it at the same rate without loss?

Mr. LAURIER. Has this proposed Bill, with regard to the reduction of interest, any retroactive effect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the aggregate amount of advances which were proposed by these resolutions and the two former Acts—the original Act and the one increasing the amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the Graving Dock, the amount which was authorized was, I believe, \$500,000 by the previous Act, or \$600,000 in all. For the other works on the Quebec side, there was an amount, at first, of something like \$730,000 or \$750,000, which the Commissioners used in redeeming debentures which had been issued under the old Commission. Then there were two other sums amounting to, I think, something like \$600,000, which have been expended in the purchase of wharves, and building a large dock at the mouth of River St. Charles. The amount altogether will be \$700,000, but that will not be sufficient to complete the works. Most likely \$250,000 more will be required to complete the tidal dock, so that these works will not be completed, I think, before two or three years.

Mr. BLAKE. All the sums the hon. gentleman has named are advanced at 4 per cent interest?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That will make a total of about \$2,000,000 already, and the hon. gentleman expects \$250,000 more?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it will be about \$2,000,000 altogether, with the money that will be borrowed.

Resolution reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 130) to amend the Act 36 Vic., chap. 62, and the Act 43 Vic., chap. 17, respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.

Bill read the first time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 236,

House of Commons—To meet additional expenses of witnesses, shorthand reporters, &c., ..... \$1,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. We were to have a statement on this item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The books in the Accountant's office show the following amounts to have been paid to witnesses and reporters, in connection with Committees:—Witnesses, Inter-provincial Trade, \$199.50; Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island, \$401.20; Public Accounts, \$37; total, \$637.70. Reporting—Immigration Committee, \$189.70; Inter-provincial Trade, \$144.90; Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island, \$183.80; Privileges and Elections, \$10.25; Railways, \$121.20; total, \$649.85. The two together make \$1,287.55.

Mr. BLAKE. Then this vote of \$1,000 is additional. Will the hon. gentleman state how much was included in the former estimate for this service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to meet the additional expense. The amount was not exactly known and there may be something else before the Session is over. If there is a balance it will remain there like other balances in the Public Treasury.

Mr. BLAKE. If I recollect aright, the hon. member for Richmond, when moving for a Committee, said he would only require one or two witnesses, and he has had \$200 worth of witnesses.

Mr. PAINT. I consider the expense is very small, considering we had twelve witnesses.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member told the House he would have but one or two.

Mr. PAINT. I said I would not have less than four.

Mr. BLAKE. According to my reckoning, twelve is three times four.

Mr. PAINT. I might have incurred \$200 in obtaining two witnesses, and instead of that I made it extend to twelve.

Mr. BLAKE. We are much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the economy he has exercised.

On Resolution 240,

Immigration—To pay the Winnipeg General Hospital for patients, not being residents of Manitoba, between the 8th April, 1880, and the 31st March, 1883. \$14,387.10

Mr. BLAKE. Will the charge of this description continue, and has some satisfactory arrangement been made to ascertain the number of resident patients and the length of their stay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt an arrangement has been made; some officer is charged with that duty. The hon. Minister of Agriculture might probably give more details than I can just now, but I will take care a statement is brought down.

On Resolution 246,

C.P.R.—Dawson Route: To pay James Dick the official arbitrators' award..... \$4,423.92

Mr. BLAKE. Some portions of the material which was before the official arbitrators in this case have been laid on the Table by the hon. Minister of Railways, pursuant to the arrangement made when the House was in Committee of Supply. These materials, which do not, of course, give a history of the case, are, however, interesting. They show that an agreement was made in March, 1871, between Captain Dick and Charles Perry and the Queen to construct two side-wheel steamboats, one for the Lake of the Woods and the other for Rainy Lake, both to be completed the 1st

October, 1871. Mr. Isaac Buchanan makes the following report:—

"In now reporting on this case, I beg to quote the words of the reference, being Mr. Braun's letter to Mr. Ennis, of the 2nd July, 1879: 'By direction of the Hon. the Minister, I refer to you for examination and report by hon. Mr. Buchanan, one of the official arbitrators under the Act 41 Vic., chap. 8, a claim preferred by Captain James Dick for losses alleged to have been sustained in connection with a contract for building steamers for the Red River route,' and I am anxious to explain, that although the name of Captain James Dick is alone used here, the contract alluded to (made in the spring of 1871, see Exhibit I), was made by James Dick & Co., composed of Captain James Dick and Captain Charles Perry; and that it was in the name of this firm that the account was always kept by the Public Works Department. Captain James Dick, however, seems to have been the only person looked to latterly, as in little more than a couple of months from the signing of the contract, Captain Perry withheld his co-operation in restoring the supplies of the firm which were consumed by the fire at Kashabowie Portage, and practically retired from the firm, so that it was only through Captain Dick's personal attention and exertion that the contract was carried on, and it is, of course, to him alone that any consideration of the Government is due.

#### "CAPTAIN JAMES DICK'S CLAIM.

From its unusual nature and its voluminous papers, the investigation of this case, so as to get a perfect understanding of it and all its extraordinary vicissitudes, has consumed much time and given great trouble.

"But as almost every explanation can easily be got from the few exhibits herewith, my report on it need not be so very extended.

"A very short history of the case will show that James Dick & Co. have been fully paid for all the work they did and all the materials they furnished, so that on the strict letter of their contract with the Government, Captain Dick has no right to make any claim. But Captain Dick has lost a large sum by the contract, as the Government engineer in charge, Mr. Dawson, is well aware, having put into it all the money he himself had and also his wife's fortune, with three thousand dollars belonging to others for which he is still bound; and no doubt some part of his loss is due to the absence of any civil or military authority in the territory beyond Thunder Bay. It is for this part of his loss that Captain Dick has been making a claim since 1872, the justice of his claim never having been denied, although no consideration has ever been given it. As will be seen by Exhibits B, he states his claims somewhat loosely, thus:—

1. For actual loss by bush fire .....	\$1,662.00
2. " 25 per cent. for transport .....	415.50
3. " loss of wages, &c. ....	800.00
4. " loss by men returning .....	3,871.00
5. " claim for cattle, &c., supplied to Government camp .....	1,500.00
	\$8,248.50

#### "MY MORE MINUTE INVESTIGATION OF IT.

"Captain James Dick, I find, has ever since 1872, when he was relieved from his contract and his account made up, rendered accounts amounting to about the same as his present account, but with no similarity of details except that all of them had the item No. 1 \$1,662 and No. 4 \$3,871—of course, all the items have always been held by the local authorities *ultra vires*, as forming no part of the strict contract, while I think these two items Nos. 1 and 4 have been regarded as the most moderate view of the part of Captain Dick's loss and as the amount which should be placed to his credit in a final settlement, a list of Captain Dick's other claims which the local authorities refused to settle, as not being in their power, will be seen at end of James Dick & Co.'s account with the Department, which is Exhibit J, and which amount to about the same as the present Nos. 2, 3 and 5. But before going on to give the account of my Arbitration Courts and their results I had better go on with the history of the case, so as to simplify the sequel.

"In the spring of 1871 James Dick & Co. contracted with the Government for \$35,120 to construct and supply with machinery two steamers, one for Rainy Lake and the other for the Lake of the Woods. There was little or no ground for calculation, for we know now that the offers for the same work went up to \$64,000. And at the very off-go, Captain Dick being too sanguine, was brought home to time, for we found few men who would venture into such an outlandish country, and none without more than ordinary wages.

"Freights also and transportation were double his anticipation. A most serious calamity also occurred at Kashabowie Portage, were all the provisions and tools were consumed by fire. This required a renewed supply, which Captain Perry refused to purchase, thus leaving Captain Dick to struggle on alone. The second stock of supplies, however, went forward, but arrived only to find that the shipbuilders had all deserted Captain Dick, being frightened away by the excited condition at that time of the country. There being no civil or military authority established, Captain Dick had neither security from the Indians nor control over his men. And after he had sent his son to Quebec and secured a second gang of shipbuilders, by paying great wages besides all expenses, on came Colonel Wolseley and his troops on their way to the insurrection at Winnipeg, with whom Captain Dick allowed any of the men to go, in the emergency.

"By-and-bye, another unforeseen source of expense, caused by the breaking out of scurvy, so that eventually Captain Dick's means became

exhausted and the contract was cancelled, the Government going on with the ship-building by day work.

#### "MY ARBITRATION COURTS HELD IN TORONTO.

"I now send you the minutes of these, also the evidence taken and the exhibits. And, in the first place, I may mention that I afterwards completed at Ottawa, with the assistance of Mr. D. A. Grant, who had been accountant and paymaster at Thunder Bay, the certain matters which were left to me to find out, as will be seen in the account of the closing of my last court in Toronto. I found that the 10 per cent. had been kept back from the progress estimates, but, since only the reduced amount was charged to the contractors, it made no difference in the account which was afterwards balanced by payments to them by the Government, in fact overbalanced, as the account now shows a balance against James Dick & Co of \$1,109.08.

"Full particulars of the account can be seen in Exhibit J. This was No. 57,503 of the Departmental papers, and I have added it to the bundle of exhibits, thus having all the evidence together and at hand.

"I am now fully satisfied that the contractors got credit with the Government for any provisions of theirs furnished to the Government gang of men at Fort Francis, also that the fresh provisions which comprise Captain Dick's claim No. 5 formed no exception to this rule; and that therefore the amount, \$1,500, is not due by the Government. I may remark that this claim never appeared before, in this shape, in any of the money accounts presented. In a word, so far as the strict letter of the contract is concerned, the account, corroborated by Captain Dick's receipts, shows that James Dick & Co. have been fully paid for all the work they did for the Government, and for all the material they furnished—indeed, have been overpaid \$1,109.08, as above. I have also discovered, among the miscellaneous (not numbered) papers of the Department, and put among the Exhibits as 'K,' the account, hitherto supposed to be missing, of the loss by fire, and the greater loss by the desertion of the first mechanics, which Captain Dick swore had been rendered by his foreman, the late Mr. Walkerlee, who had in his possession the original invoices and accounts. Of the \$1,662, the loss by fire of the provisions and tools, Mr. Dawson, in his report of 3rd June, 1874, No. 41,811, says: 'They (the contractors) claim to have suffered a loss of \$1,662 by a bush fire, and I can corroborate their statements in this regard, in so far as to say that their loss by the fire referred to was considerable, and as it arose from an accident which no one could have foreseen, I would respectfully submit to the consideration of the Department whether this item might not be carried to their credit in account.'

"And on the subject of \$3,871 (the loss by the desertion of the first gang of mechanics), I think it will appear from the uniformly appreciative tone of Mr. Dawson's reports, that the claim should be considered anything but large as an amount to represent the rest of the additional loss suffered by Captain Dick, from the absence of the means of law and order in the Territory. I see that it is not a large allowance, if not very much the contrary, for the difference which the absence of civil and military authority made to the contractors, causing as it did, Captain Dick's utter failure, and the ruin of himself and family.

"And I therefore feel that it is of less material consequence than from the death of Mr. Dick's foreman, Mr. Walkerlee, and the loss of the papers through him, some details cannot now be furnished which would have been desirable if there were any doubt as to the amount which may in justice be claimed for this particular source of injury.

"With regard to the other three items of Captain Dick's claims, per account now rendered, I think them inadmissible. I have already explained this in regard to item No. 5, \$1,500; and with regard to item No. 2, \$415.50, which he claims should be added to the \$1,662, I cannot adopt Captain Dick's theory, in the absence of the papers, that Mr. Walkerlee had not also before him the accounts of transportation when he made up the account. I am the more disinclined to do so as this is the first appearance of the claim in this shape; nor can I support Captain Dick's item No. 3, \$800, additional loss of wages. This is another charge never before made in this shape; and my view is that in all the circumstances it should be held to be covered by the \$3,871, as made up by the late Mr. Walkerlee; while I must admit that the account struck my mind as being extremely reasonable.

#### "DEPOSITIONS.

"I would now refer shortly to the evidence which will be found to bear out the foregoing report.

"The only witnesses were Mr. S. J. Dawson, the Engineer in charge of the work, and Captain Dick, the claimant, Mr. Pierre Brunelle, the Government Inspector of the ship-building, who came from Quebec, and Mr. Duncan Chisholm, the sub-contractor, who, with his men, deserted the work.

"With regard to the last named witness, the counsel for the claimant (see Exhibit F), says: 'It is submitted that the evidence of Mr. Chisholm is utterly unworthy of belief, and contradicted as it is by that of the petitioner and Mr. Dawson, and by his own letters of August 10th, 1871, to the latter, should be altogether disregarded.'

"Without exactly going that length, I think it evident that Mr. Chisholm's memory, at this distance of time, has proved much at fault, and that, in the circumstances, his evidence possesses little value, as it is contradicted in one point or another by all other witnesses. To show, for instance, a very different account of Mr. Chisholm's and his men's desertion of his sub-contract from that which his evidence gives, I may quote the following from Mr. Dawson's report of 24th April, 1875, now confirmed by him under oath, (See the close of his

deposition.) 'The workmen who had left endeavored to extenuate their fault by saying that the Indians had prevented them from using timber.' But this charge was indignantly denied by the Indians, who, on the contrary, asserted that they had shown them every evidence of their goodwill and friendship; and on enquiry it was found that they had actually done so in their accustomed manner. They had marshalled their painted warriors, and with war-whoop and scalp dance, dog-feast and medicine-drum, welcomed the strangers, who were to build the big canals to their country. But their advances were not appreciated, in fact, excited alarm; the men becoming apprehensive, besides feeling that they had taken an unremunerative job, for they had a sub-contract, left the work."

That is the statement made in 1875 by the engineer in charge. So far from the difficulty being due to the Indians frightening the people and being hostile to them, the Indians welcomed them in their accustomed manner. They indignantly denied any statements that, except that they prevented the men from using the timber, that they threatened to scalp or maltreat them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Their friendly demonstrations were misapprehended.

Mr. BLAKE. These were not Mr. Dick's workmen; they were sub-contractors who found that they had taken an unremunerative job, and having found that out, they abandoned the work and set up a story to Mr. Dawson that the Indians prevented them from taking lumber; but this was not so, because Mr. Dawson found that the Indians were friendly to the scheme, that they wished to see the big canals built, and that they welcomed strangers to their camps. He said that, alarmed by those demonstrations, and finding they had an unremunerative job, the men left their work. And it is because of those peaceful and friendly, but alarming demonstrations, and because those sub-contractors found they had an unremunerative job, that the country is now called upon to pay, after an interval of ten years, \$3,000 or \$4,000; it is, I say, because the country did not provide a civil and military force to prevent the men being alarmed by the friendly demonstrations of the Indians, and to prevent the sub-contractors on an unremunerative job from deserting their employment, that the country is called upon to make this payment. This is the gist of it. In the same report Mr. Dawson continues:

"I have been particular in noticing this matter, because if the contractors have any claim at all it is the fact that they had a right to expect that the Government would provide the means of enforcing law in the district where the work was to be carried on."

That is to say, that the contractors had the right to declare that in the Red River country at that time the Government should have established courts and means of justice whereby Mr. Dick, when his contractors deserted him, could have arrested them, or taken steps against them. The report proceeds:

"The people whom they had brought at great expense to a remote and uninhabited country, mutinied, and they had no means of compelling obedience."

The idea is preposterous. If such an occurrence had taken place within 100 yards of this building, all Mr. Dick could have done would have been to resort to the Civil Courts and enter an action for damages—which contract having been made in Ontario, he could have done as it was. Then Mr. Buchanan says:

"The loss and embarrassment arising from this cause are, I think, matters which might be favorably considered. When the contractors undertook the work the question of having a Magistrate with a certain civil force at Fort Francis was, as I have reason to believe, under the consideration of the Government; and if it should be admitted that the Government was in any way bound to provide the means of maintaining the law at a point where the public works were under contract, and did not do so, then the contractors might have some reasonable claim for compensation for the losses arising from the desertion of their men. Mr. Dawson's present evidence, as will be seen, is even stronger than the foregoing. His examination in chief closes in these words: 'up to the time that the first lot (of shipbuilders) left, they (the contractors) had exerted themselves with commendable energy to the work under way, but their men had not been long there before they struck and left, from this blow to their undertaking the contractors never recovered.'"

Mr. BLAKE.

"They did what they could to replace the men by bringing other mechanics from Quebec, but their funds were exhausted, and their efforts proving inadequate, the contract was cancelled, and the work carried out by day labor." And on his cross-examination the question was put: 'Should not the contractors have anticipated the large cost of freight and trouble of transport at the time of tendering?' And Mr. Dawson replied: 'The enterprise was so entirely new in its character, and the country so little known at that time, that the contractors had really no data upon which to go in forming the estimates.'

"I remembered at the time when Mr. Dawson made this reply, that when trying to master the Departmental papers, I was struck with a remark in Captain Dick's letter of 30th April, 1873, (No. 30,627), to the Minister of Public Works, which corroborates and explains it. 'Had I taken my machinery (60 tons) by Fort Garry I could have had it at Fort Francis much earlier, but desired more to establish our own route and encounter its difficulties. Another delay arose from the fact that the Nequaquon Portage was not finished, and I had to wait six weeks before I could transport my machinery across it, so that in point of fact it was of little consequence whether it arrived at Thunder Bay in 1871 or 1872.'

"THE ARGUMENTS OF BOTH COUNSEL.

"These will be found among the Exhibits, being marked F and G. As will be seen, they evince much talent, and shew all that can be urged on each side.

"CONCLUSION.

"As I have indicated above, I think that the evidence shews that the case of Captain James Dick requires consideration, unless it be held not to be the duty of Government to furnish the means of enforcing law and order wherever public works are going on. But I think that even if the principle for which he contends is admitted (which, of course, it is not my business to decide) he will be sufficiently remunerated by the payment by the Government of \$4,423 92, being the first and fourth items of his claim—\$5,533, less \$1,109.08, the balance against him in the account current made up, as it has been, on the strict terms of the contract taken by James Dick & Co. In all the circumstances, however, I do not see that he should be entitled to interest further back than the date on which Government decides on the principle."

So it is proposed to grant an award covering the first and fourth clauses, that is done by bush fires and loss by men leaving the work. The first item is a loss caused by an accidental bush fire. In my opinion it is no part of the Government's duty in providing means for enforcing law and order in the North-West to pay for loss by a casual bush fire, and I feel apprehensive on this point, unless it is part of the duty of the Government, where public works are going on, to provide an electric fire alarm and steam fire engine or their equivalents. Then follow the minutes of the proceedings for the arbitrators, and with them I need not trouble you, and then we find a joint report of two of the arbitrators, Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Simard, who say that they have heard the arguments of counsel and read the evidence, and they take the same view as was contained in Mr. Buchanan's report, and think that Captain Dick is entitled to the favorable consideration of the Government, inasmuch as the loss sustained by this man in the execution of the work was caused by the absence of any organization. Once again, Sir, a casual bush fire is attributed to the want of a civil or military organization in that district. Well, Isaac Buchanan and J. Simard signed and assented, and Jas. Cowan signs dissenting. Then the hon. Minister of Railways reported to Council on July 24, 1882, stating that:

"The undersigned represents that James Dick & Co. entered into this contract, that the enterprise was new in its character and the country so little known at the time, that the contractors had scant data to guide them in making their arrangements; that difficulties soon arose; that their supplies were burned; and their laborers, frightened by the demonstrations made by the Indians, left the works."

The hon. gentleman makes not the slightest allusion to the trifling circumstance, that they were sub-contractors engaged in an unremunerative contract. Other contractors were engaged in an unremunerative contract; but I see by another paper, with which we will presently deal, on another item, that they are certainly treated in a different way. Amongst the appliances of law or order which the Government has in the more civilized parts, is the system of giving a contract to some men at higher prices, when it was taken at too low a price. I find that here, these poor people in these remote territories had not a benevolent and paternal Government to apply to, to

make the contract go, and so they had to go themselves; and it is the Indians, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, who, by their demonstrations, frightened them away. The report thus proceeds:

"And the occurrence of the Red River troubles, and the consequent passage of Colonel Wolseley and his troops along the route, resulted in the loss of numbers of a fresh gang of men who had been got together with great difficulty. Finally an outbreak of scurvy broke down the means at the disposal of contractors. The contract was thereupon cancelled, the Government completing the work by day's labor, and the firm being paid for all work done, and for all materials furnished, by them.

"That Captain Dick, the leading and practically sole member of the firm, subsequently made a claim, setting forth that he had sustained severe loss by this contract, and urging the exceptional nature of the circumstances by which he had been affected as grounds for the grant of compensation.

"That the matter was referred to one of the official arbitrators for examination and report, under the Act, 41 Vic., chap. 8, and a report was duly received from him, based on a close investigation of the case.

"That the arbitrators found that it was only through Captain Dick's personal attention and exertion, his partner having practically retired, that the contract was carried on, and that, the firm having been settled with, any consideration to be shown, by the Government is due to him alone; further,

"That the absence of the means of maintaining law and order, there being neither civil nor military authority available, and the contractor having neither security from the Indians nor control over his men, led to the desertion of the laborers first brought, and to the necessity of paying high wages in order to secure a further supply, the ultimate issue being, in the words of the arbitrator, his utter failure, and the ruin of himself and family."

"That whereas the claims put forward by Captain Dick amount to \$8,243.50, the arbitrator, while disallowing certain items, is of opinion that though, under the contract, no right exists for a claim, yet should the Government consider that means of enforcing law and order ought to have been provided, payment should be made of certain other items, the total amount which he found to be so payable being \$1,239.2.

"That the matter was subsequently referred to the decision of the full Board of Arbitrators, whose report, dated the 6th of June, 1883, from which one of them, Mr. Cowan, dissents, adopts the view taken by the arbitrator above cited, and recommends to favorable consideration this claim.

"The undersigned, holding that the exceptional circumstances of the case entitle Captain Dick to consideration at the hands of the Government, recommends that he be authorized to place the said sum of four thousand four hundred and twenty-three dollars and ninety two cents in the Supplementary Estimates for 1882-83, to be laid before Parliament at its next Session, and that, further, a special warrant of the Governor General be now issued for that amount to be applied in settlement of this matter."

That last recommendation of the hon. gentleman was, fortunately, not acceded to. It was referred apparently to the Minister of Justice, who reported that the provision for a special warrant, was not, as was obvious, applicable in the slightest degree to this case, and that, according to law, no special warrant should issue; and so, I assume, a special warrant did not issue; but the sum is placed in the Supplementary Estimates. Now, it seems to me that which I have read indicates the position of danger and difficulty of the course which the Government propose to pursue, yet we find the arbitrators telling us, and, no doubt, the papers here corroborate it, that Captain Dick at various times sent in accounts whose statements varied each from the other; that they contained different items of claim altogether; and that the account last sent in, and on which the arbitrators acted, contains several items which were never in any account before at all in that shape. You find him stating the aggregate about the same, but the details are wholly different in sums, and in the nature of the claims; but the sum he proceeded to consider, and he says, that if the Government consent that they are responsible for the consequence of not providing a civil or military organization up in that remote district, and the means of providing law and order, then he thinks that some redress is due to Captain Dick. Well, I have shown in what the statement of Mr. Dawson was within a reasonably short time after the occurrence. I have shown you that these Indians were friendly, not hostile; that what the men complained of, and complained wrongly, to extenuate their conduct, that the Indians prevented them from taking timber, was not correct. The Indians did not prevent them from doing so, and the

demonstrations at which they professed to be frightened, were friendly; and it is quite obvious that the true state of the case was this: they were sub-contractors who had taken an unprofitable job, and they took the first opportunity of leaving the work. I say that no provision at all, moral, legal or equitable—that no obligation devolved upon the Government to provide special means for dealing with these persons. The civil law applicable to the ordinary course of justice was open to Captain Dick, in the courts of the Provinces where he hired, engaged, or contracted with these men, and they have been so open ever since, except so far as they are barred by the lapse of time; that the only part of the claim allowed—the rest of the claim amounts to \$16,000—arose from a casual bush fire which cannot be pretended to be due to any of the causes referred to. Of these two aggregates, the claim which it is proposed to pay, is allowed; and I say that the claim made in 1871, and not listened to from that time until the fall of 1873, when the Government which made the contract with Mr. Dick, and to whom the claim was preferred, left office, nothing was done but decline it during the whole period of the succeeding Government, five years; and it is only brought under consideration once again after the resumption of office by these hon gentlemen, and even then after the lapse of years, when Parliament is asked to make this vote. I say you have no protection at all, if claims so stale as these, so old as these, and with respect to what the items of the claims as the arbitrators say, vary in every account of the claim, are to be allowed at this distance of time; and I say, lastly, that this claim itself on the evidence I have read, is not a claim with respect to which any legal—and that is admitted—or any moral objection on the part of the Government exists; even to compensate him because sub-contractors left the work, there is none, and there is still less to compensate him, because a bush fire which burned some supplies, occurred. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has made out a case for this wholly exceptional proposal made ten years after the event, to pay this sum of money.

Mr. DAWSON. Perhaps I will be allowed to make a few remarks on this subject, as I was rather familiar with it at one time. This claim cannot be considered properly without taking into consideration the then condition of the country. At the time this claim arose that country was in a very disturbed condition, and although I and others who knew the Indians perfectly well might not be apprehensive of them—I had been among them for a very long time, and knew perfectly well their manners and customs and habits—still these demonstrations might be very alarming to strangers. At the time this contract was entered into it was just after a rebellion had been suppressed in the North-West.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. DAWSON. The contract was entered into in March, 1871, and the military expedition had gone through in 1870, and in 1871 the Indians were still in a very excited state.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that the papers before us prove that the second gang of workmen was principally employed by Colonel Wolseley before he went through, so he could not have gone through the year before.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman will pardon me. There may be some mistake in the transcription of the documents; but if the hon. gentleman will allow me to go on I will explain Colonel Wolseley's expedition presently. Colonel Wolseley went through in 1870. That was the year of the expedition, and the contract for building the boat was given out in 1871. The Indians were in a very excited condition at that time, and it must be borne in mind that these Indians were a community by themselves, cut off and isolated from

all the world besides, they had seen little of white men. The number of these Indians amounted to about 4,000. They must have mustered nearly 1,000 armed men, and so formidable were they considered by the military authorities that one of the officers who went through with Colonel Wolseley informed me that if they had been hostile the expedition would have been obliged to turn back. There were emissaries among these Indians from the insurgents at Red River, so that they were in a very unsettled state, so much so that the Government in the previous year—in the spring of 1869—had sent out an agent to reside among them in order to keep up a good feeling and prevent them from becoming hostile. I shall now explain the expedition to which the hon. gentleman referred, which was not Colonel Wolseley's, but one composed of Canadian volunteers in the following year. In 1871, the men who were to build the boats came forward and went to work. The Indians happened to have assembled at Fort Frances at that time; and they often assemble there in considerable numbers. I have seen as many at one time as 1,000, but on this occasion I fancy there were no more than 500. They came to welcome the strangers who were to build the big canoes in that country, and they extended their welcome in a way which rather alarmed these workmen. Let anyone imagine thirty or forty mechanics who never had seen Indians before in their lives, surrounded by 500 painted savages whooping and yelling and dancing throughout the night around blazing camp fires, and exhibiting the scalps they had taken—for the Indians in those days were in the habit of exhibiting these trophies. We had numbers of them in those days dancing around and showing scalps at their great meetings at the Portage, when a big chief would get up and tell how many scalps he had taken, and how he had drunk the blood of his enemies. Fancy a scene like this kept up for a whole night among these mechanics, and hon. members will not be surprised that they were a little alarmed. This was in 1871, and the men ran away from whatever cause, though I think they had no good reason. I had men there at the time, but they were accustomed to the Indians, who, I have no doubt, indulged in these manifestations in a friendly spirit and partly, perhaps, to get presents from the workmen in the way of a good dinner, or something of that sort. The truth is, these men became very much alarmed. Mr. Chisholm afterwards left, and though he made a great many excuses, I believe the truth was that he was thoroughly frightened. Immediately when this occurred, Captain Dick sent back for shipbuilders, and, of course he could not send ordinary men, as he had to get mechanics who were fit for the work he had to perform under his contract. The hon. gentleman has spoken about law as if there were courts of law there as in Toronto. But it must be borne in mind, that this was in the middle of the wilderness, a thousand miles from courts of law, and at that time there were only two steamers plying on the great lakes, the *Algoma* and the *Chicora*, instead of the numerous beautiful steamers that traverse these waters at the present time. But Captain Dick, as I have stated, set to work to get forward other men, and he got them on the ground towards fall. They were good men, much better adapted to the country than the first lot, and there were among them a number of Iroquois voyageurs and other men of that sort. I happened to be going through from Manitoba at that time, and waited there, leisurely examining what was going on on the route and making preparations for the winter, when there came an express messenger from Governor Archibald then Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba—hon. gentleman will please remember that this was in 1871, and that Colonel Wolseley was then in England—telling me that he had sent an express to Ottawa making a demand upon the Government for troops, as the Fenians were threatening to invade Manitoba, and as a mat-

Mr. Dawson.

ter of fact they did make a demonstration about that time. I immediately put all the force that I could muster on the road to prepare for getting through these troops. Captain Dick came forward and offered me all the men he had, and under the circumstances I considered it incumbent upon me to place them along the route so as to hasten the progress of the troops when they came. The result was that they went through in a little over a week, while Colonel Wolseley's expedition of the previous year had required nearly six weeks to get through. Captain Dick acted very patriotically on that occasion, but I had no means of recompensing him further than by paying the men for their day's work during the time they were employed. I had no power to take into consideration the losses he had sustained further than make a report upon the subject to the Government. An officer of the Government, Mr. Brunel, a very respectable man from the Province of Quebec, was sent to inspect the steamboats, and the contractor was paid for the work which was actually done under the strict letter of the contract. All that we could do beyond that was to promise to report the matter for the consideration of the Government. Now, as to its being incumbent on the Government in such cases to provide means for maintaining law and order, I think it will be readily admitted that that duty was incumbent on the Government. Here was a large force of Indians totally unaccustomed to law and able to muster a little short of 1,000 armed men, while the greatest number of men that worked on the road was from 300 to 400 white men all unarmed scattered here and there along the route. Fortunately we were able to get on pretty well with the Indians and to keep on amicable terms with them, as our men were accustomed to Indians; they had seen many before, as they were boatmen, or men who had been working in the woods all their lives. These mechanics were not in that position. The nearest troops were distant from them 200 miles, in a direct line, on one side in Manitoba, and a much greater distance by any road which was practicable at that time, and the nearest on the other side were in Toronto. There was no Magistrate in the country to whom they might appeal, and finding themselves unprotected they became alarmed. I do not think, as I said before, that there was any occasion for their alarm, because I believe the Indians would not have harmed them; but, at the same time I think the Government is perfectly right in taking all the circumstances into account, and I may say that I recommended the Government of that time to place some sort of force there, together with a Magistrate, so as to give confidence to the people employed in that section. But in order that it may be understood that everybody did not consider these Indians to be so harmless as I did, I may say that when Colonel Wolseley was absent with the troops at Fort Garry, he left a company of soldiers at Fort Frances to take care of his supplies. I happened to go there at the time and the officer in command was in the greatest state of alarm. I told him that he was perfectly safe among these Indians, that they never would attempt anything aggressive, and that all they wanted was to get a dinner or a piece of tobacco or something of that kind. I mention all this in order that the House may understand that the circumstances were somewhat extraordinary. According to the strict letter of Captain Dick's contract, he was paid what he was legally entitled to, and the only claim he could possibly have was for an allowance on account of the losses he sustained under circumstances which no one could have foreseen.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think it will be necessary for me to say much on this subject after the very succinct and clear statement made by my hon. friend, who had better means of knowing the facts in relation to this subject than any other man in this country, because he was in charge of the work, and acquainted with everything in connection with it. Nor do I believe that the House will



accept the hard-and-fast lines which the hon. leader of the Opposition has laid down in this and other cases. That hon. gentleman, if I understand him, takes the ground that if the Government of the country make a contract with an individual for the performance of a certain work, they are entitled to pay public money under that contract, provided it is carried out, and under no other circumstances. I ask the hon. gentleman, am I right in understanding him to take that ground, that Parliament is only warranted in paying public money for the services rendered under the contract made between the individual and the Government?

Mr. BLAKE. No; I never took such a position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to say what he means.

Mr. BLAKE. I tried to explain it, but I despair of explaining it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I want to know what the hon. gentleman's long address has reference to. The Government took every means to ascertain what amount the man was legally entitled to. If he was legally entitled to this money, the Government would have paid it without waiting to ask Parliament for it; but the hon. gentleman takes the ground that Parliament should refuse to pay the money because it was not earned under the contract. If he does not take that ground, he has no ground to stand on. The hon. gentleman has gone into the details of this matter at great length—for what purpose? I am extremely obliged to him. When Captain Dick claimed that he had an equitable claim on the Government for a certain sum of money, and we had no means of ascertaining it by testimony under oath, we called upon the means provided by the law, a Government arbitrator, to investigate the claim and report to the Government. He investigated it under oath, and made his report; and the details the hon. gentleman has read prove that Mr. Buchanan went most laboriously to work, and took the utmost pains to have all the facts placed clearly before him. With what result? With the result of arriving at the conclusion that, although Captain Dick had no legal claim on the Government, he had a just and equitable claim. What did we do? We did not then agree to pay it. The hon. Minister of Justice reported that there was not a legal claim, in view of the facts as reported. Then Captain Dick asked that to which every man has a right at the hands of the Government, when they dispute a claim, that is a reference to a tribunal chosen and paid by ourselves; and that reference was made to a full board of arbitrators, as the Government were bound to refer the claim, if they had a doubt as to the propriety of payment on the report of a single arbitrator. What was the result? The result was that a majority of the board that sat upon the case, and went exhaustively into it, again reported, in the light of the sworn testimony in their hands, that Captain Dick had an honest and just claim on the Government for the payment of so much money. I ask, what else could we do but come down to Parliament and say, There are the facts and we ask you to pay the money. My hon. friend has told you the condition of the country, and the condition that Captain Dick was in; and he has told you that, notwithstanding all his sufferings and losses, the moment his patriotism was appealed to, the moment the Government of Manitoba called on the men under him to abandon their work for the protection of the country, Captain Dick at once, loyally and regardless of his own interests, placed every man at the service of his country. I am astonished that the hon. leader of the Opposition should, for a single moment, question the justice of this claim. It must be obvious to every hon. member in the House, that the Government and this House should either refuse to permit a dollar of public money to be paid to anybody unless he faithfully and com-

pletely carries out his contract with the Government, or they should not. If they are only to pay what has been earned under the contract, I ask the hon. gentleman why the Government of which he was a member, paid Captain Dick this money? He says they overpaid Captain Dick \$1,100. Why did they do it? He had not completed his contract; he had not built a boat.

Mr. BLAKE. What Government paid it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Your Government. If the hon. gentleman refers to the papers he will find that it was in 1876 that these payments were made to Captain Dick. It is perfectly obvious, from the statement of Mr. Buchanan, that this contract was taken at an extremely low rate, and that if Captain Dick had not got it the work would have been done at an enormous amount above that at which he took it. These forty or fifty mechanics went into the country under the unusual circumstances as described by my hon. friend; they found themselves surrounded by 500 painted savages with tomahawks, and were entirely at their mercy, and this was when the country was in a most excited condition, full of emissaries from a country in rebellion who were exciting these Indians to warfare; yet the hon. gentleman says these men were not alarmed in the slightest degree. It was simply the fact, he said, that they had undertaken an unprofitable contract that caused their alarm. But if that were the case they need not have waited. The sub-contractors could have run away and deserted the work. The state of the country would have excited most people, though it is possible men accustomed to the Indians and their habits, might not have felt alarmed, but other people could not help feeling much alarm and anxiety. I do not believe any hon. member of this House will take the position that the Government is not entitled, not merely to use the hard, dry, legal construction of the contract, but to deal out fair and just treatment to Captain Dick, for the energetic and determined efforts he had made to carry out his contract in the face of such an extreme condition of things in the country. Is Canada so poor that she is compelled to keep this money which should go to the poor contractors who could not carry out their contract, owing to circumstances over which they had no possible control? I do not believe it. There is not an independent member of this House who will not say the Government would have been wanting in their duty, if, with the fact placed before them, they had refused to investigate their claims, and when it had been declared fair and just, and deserving the consideration of Parliament, by their own court, they should have refused to ask Parliament to provide for it.

On Resolution 247,

To pay Jos. Whitehead, Contract 15, the difference between cost of work and contract prices..... \$86,200.00

Mr. WATSON. Is any of this money paid out yet, and what arrangements will be made to pay it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. None of this has been paid. Measures will be taken to see that all the creditors receive their due share, and all the creditors will be treated on the same basis.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose notice will be given by some officer limiting the times in which claims may be brought in and investigated. The Government will act as a trustee?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely.

On Resolution 252,

To refund to Mr. H. G. O. Ketchum amount of an overcharge for the conveyance of rails, &c., in 1866-67-68, over what is now a portion of the Intercolonial Railway..... \$1,637.70

Mr. BLAKE. A portion of the papers in the case have been brought down, and they show that the hon. member

for St. John was right when he said Mr. Ketchum was a sub-contractor. The contract was made by the Government of New Brunswick with the Intercolonial Contract Company of England. Mr. Ketchum was a sub-contractor with that company, and as that company was settled with in full, it is clear Mr. Ketchum had no claim on the Government but had to deal solely with the Intercolonial Company. I agree also with the view that these claims could not properly come to this Government, that it really arises out of the application of the Government of New Brunswick; and it seems to me an extraordinary thing that the Intercolonial accounts should, at this date after the construction, be added to by this item. I think the hon. gentleman stated in Committee that the claim had been continuously pressed. I do not find evidence of that in the statement. As well as I can make out it was pressed in 1868, again in 1876, and then upon the present occasion, which has resulted in this reference. It does not appear to me, therefore, that the claim was continuously pressed, and I fail to see why, if the claim was just, it was not attended to by the Government in 1868, and it seems to me a very extraordinary item now to ask our concurrence in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see by the papers in his hands that Mr. Ketchum had continuously pressed his claim. In his application to the Government he reminds me of the fact that the Attorney-General and leader of the Government of New Brunswick, Mr. Fraser, had come to me with him—of which I have a distinct recollection—and had stated that Mr. Ketchum had continuously pressed this claim on the Government of New Brunswick; that they recognized the claim as a just one, but they did not consider they ought to pay it; that the railway upon which the charge was made had passed into the hands of the Government of the Dominion, that the money had gone into our Treasury, and that under these circumstances they thought the amount should be paid by us. I do not see that there can be any question about the parties from whom the claim came, and there can be no question that under the Union Act the claim necessarily has to be dealt with by this Government, who had the railway in their possession on which the charge was made. There is no question that under the Union Act we became responsible, whether the ultimate amount should be charged back on the Government of New Brunswick or not, for these claims in relation to the Intercolonial Railway. Under these circumstances, with the fact of the Government of New Brunswick themselves declaring, the parties with whom the contract had been originally made, that the amount was due to Mr. Ketchum, we proceeded at once to dispose of the point as to whether Mr. Ketchum, being a sub-contractor, stood in the position to avail himself of that clause of the contract made with the contractors from whom he had taken it. Having ascertained whether Mr. Ketchum's claim was well founded, and the amount of it, I took every possible means to have that matter carefully investigated. I had the report of Mr. Frank Shanly, who had gone thoroughly into the question as to the amount of overcharge that had been made beyond what the contract authorized, and I had that report confirmed by the present general manager and chief engineer of the Government railways, Mr. Schreiber, who reports that Mr. Shanly's figures were correct, and that the amount overcharged was as stated. The hon. gentleman says it was not continuously pressed; I say it was continuously pressed; but I had not entertained the substantial charge until after the leader of the Government declared to me that his Government arrived at the conclusion, not only that Mr. Ketchum was the person to be paid, but that the charge was a legitimate one.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement of the hon. gentleman amplifies the statement made in the petition. We have no record  
Mr. BLAKE.

of what the Attorney-General of New Brunswick said, or in what capacity he accompanied the claimant to the hon. gentleman; but this is the statement:

"That your petitioner, accompanied by the Hon. John J. Fraser, Attorney-General of New Brunswick, had an interview with your Honor in July last, when the Attorney-General explained in full the reasons why the Province was not liable for the claim, and that he believed there was an overcharge, and that it was payable to your petitioner."

Now, what the leader of the Government of New Brunswick said, was, that New Brunswick was not liable for this claim, and having said that, his admission that this Dominion was liable to the claim was an admission of very little consequence. If the Government of New Brunswick admitted that this was a debt of the old Province of New Brunswick for which that Province was liable, unless it was an extraordinary amount, he might, in such a case, have consented to charge it, but we find the Attorney-General says that the Province is not liable, and he proceeds to point out that he thinks Mr. Ketchum has a claim against this Government. He does not acknowledge that it is a debt against New Brunswick; if it is to be charged against New Brunswick it is to be charged, not as the leader of the Government said it should be, but because it ought to be charged, because it makes a legal charge against the Government of New Brunswick. The Attorney-General of New Brunswick, far from admitting that, said the Province was not liable, and therefore that it was not properly chargeable against New Brunswick. That being so, the hon. gentleman had to make up his mind irrespective of any statement of Mr. Fraser.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman did not understand me. I take the ground that under the Union Act this Government is compelled to pay the claim, and the hon. gentleman does not controvert that. If it was a matter of £100,000, a contract in connection with property that came into our hands under the Union Act, we would be liable therefore, because we took that property with all its liabilities. That specially in regard to the Intercolonial we were liable for all the contracts that the Local Government had made touching that work. We have to pay it; as to whom it may ultimately be charged is a question of law, and a question that may be dealt with at any period. I may tell the hon. gentleman that, inasmuch as the Government of New Brunswick claim now that we ought to pay them \$150,000 more than they received, the hon. gentlemen will see that it is hardly worth while, in relation to the small amount of this account, to refuse to pay it; because the question might arise as to whether it, or some portion of it, could legitimately be charged against the Province of New Brunswick—I think it would be a very extraordinary thing to do so, and compromise our claim against New Brunswick. I think it would be a very harsh construction of that contract, when the railway had passed into the hands of this Government to say that we would not recognize that, and insist upon charging a higher rate than the Government of New Brunswick, who owned the road to the 1st of July, 1867, agreed that they would carry it for. I think it would be pushing things to an extreme. But assuming that to be the case, still the liability rests upon us and we are obliged to pay the amount. We have taken means for ascertaining what the amount is and we ask Parliament to provide the money.

Mr. WELDON. There is no liability against Mr. Ketchum assuming there is a liability under the arrangement made by Sir Albert Smith and the present Chief Justice Allen of New Brunswick; it is entirely with the International Contract Company. Mr. Ketchum did not take the contract, but was simply a sub-contractor, who was settled with by the International Contract Company. Mr. Ketchum was not recognized; and I find, in a despatch from Mr. Beck,

worth, addressed to the Secretary of State for the Provinces at Ottawa, the following language:—

"This line of railway is in course of construction by the International Contract Company, Limited, \* \* \* under a contract with the Province of New Brunswick, \* \* \* the International Company, is, I am informed, quite ready to negotiate on liberal terms for the transfer of the road to the Federal Government, and the Government of New Brunswick are willing and anxious that such transfer should be made; but it is expected that the subsidies advanced will be returned, and that the Province will be relieved from any further responsibility, excepting so far as they are liable under Confederation for their portion of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway."

I quote this to show that the New Brunswick Government were dealing entirely with the International Contract Company. According to Mr. Ketchum's own petition he made an application to Mr. Beckworth, who merely handed the matter over to the Dominion Government, with a request to examine into the facts. The matter was referred to Mr. Carvell and Mr. Boyd, who reported against it; and a curious fact to be remembered is that Mr. Ketchum refers to Sir Albert Smith and attaches a certain letter written by Sir Albert, and that the Government of which he was a member, on 1<sup>th</sup> May, 1876, declined to re-open the question and rejected the claim. We know that the company made a final arrangement with Mr. Ketchum, by which they held the road, and if any claim exists against the Dominion Government, it is on the part of the International Contract Company, and not by Mr. Ketchum, who was a sub-contractor.

On Resolution 260,

To pay award in favor of Heney, Stewart & Co.,  
Contractors for works at Greece's Point,  
Grenville Canal ..... \$17,370.00

Mr. BLAKE. Some further explanations were to be given on this item, and the hon. Minister has laid on the Table a statement. From that statement it appears that these works were let to John Stewart and John Heney, under the name of Heney, Stewart & Co., on 20th July, 1880, at schedule rates, which, when figured out, amounted to \$280,251. Then the works were taken out of their hands, and were re-let in January, 1881. The first contractors fell into arrears because they took the contract too low, and this award represents, in the opinion of the arbitrator, the value of the work they performed in excess of the amount of money they received. The Government was at a considerable loss on the contract. The contract for the remainder of the work let for \$251,014, being about 25 per cent. in excess of the rate to be paid for the work under the original schedule; so that the Government will lose something like \$40,000 or \$50,000 when the work is completed, assuming that the new contract is completed within the estimates. It seems also from the papers that the new firm to whom the contract was let, was composed of Mr. Brecken, who was a sub-contractor with the original contractors, and John Nicholson, who was one of the original contractors, from whose hands the work had been taken. So one of the original contractors obtained the work at an enhanced price of 25 per cent. over the original rate, and it seems since that time another person has replaced Mr. Nicholson by arrangement. Thus the chain of transactions is this: Mr. Nicholson associated with others and contracted to do the work for \$280,000; they gave security to the amount of \$14,000 for the due execution of the contract; they failed, the work was taken out of their hands and re-let at an advance of prices which amounted to an additional sum of \$40,000 or \$50,000; the contract was re-let to one of the original contractors and to a sub-contractor. If that is the rule with respect to these transactions I do not see there is any advantage in taking security, because in this case, not merely is the security not forfeited, but also the amount which the contractors have expended in excess of what has been paid, is repaid to them, although

no less than \$40,000 or \$50,000 increased cost is rendered necessary on account of the enhanced cost under the contract which is re-let to one of the same parties. First, this party gets back his security; second, he is repaid all he lost, whatever he lost by having taken the contract too low; and third, he becomes a contractor once again at enhanced prices for the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The transaction is simply this: the contract was let to Messrs. Heney, Stewart & Co. They were the lowest tenderers, and their tender was accepted. The course that is invariably pursued by the Government in relation to these matters, is to accept the lowest tender, provided the security demanded is given. The Government have fixed the test of the *bona fide* tender by requiring a certain sum of money to be put in with the tender, and they then say to the lowest tenderer, "Deposit 5 per cent., which is required as security for the performance of your contract, and it will be awarded to you." These parties made the deposit. In the first place, their tender was formal and regular, and the lowest. Then, when we called upon them, they deposited the security within the time stated by the Government, and the Government gave them the contract. Their prices were very low, and they were not skilled contractors; still they were the lowest tenderers, and they deposited the necessary amount of security. The cost of labor, of material and of everything became enhanced; they became embarrassed, and were not carrying on the work with vigor; and when called upon by the Government to make greater exertions, they stated that unless we increased the prices, it was quite impossible to go on. They were utterly incapable of fulfilling the contract. Under these circumstances, the contract was taken out of their hands, and we re-advertised for fresh tenders. The lowest tender was Brecken & Co. Now, as to Brecken, my hon. friend has laid some stress upon the fact that he was a sub-contractor; but I do not think that this is anything to disqualify him. It was an additional reason for giving him the contract, because we knew that he had had practical experience of the work. He had had no connection with the contract so far as the Government was concerned, but he was intimately acquainted with the work, and Mr. Stark, the superintending engineer, declared him to be an exceedingly capable man, and a person who, he believed, would be a very successful contractor; and this was an additional reason for accepting their tender. Again, Brecken and Co. were the lowest. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman whether because we found that one of the parties to the former tender formed part of this company, we should have refused to accept the tender of a person who, we had reason to believe, would be a good contractor. I think I will settle that in a moment by reading the report of Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of Canals, which was sent in with that tender, and leave it to the House to consider whether, with this report in my hands, I could do anything else than to ask the Government to accept the lowest tender. It is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1882.

"The Secretary of Railways and Canals.

"Sir,—As requested, I have examined the tenders sent in for the Greece's Point Works, Grenville Canal, the extension of the three lowest of which I have checked carefully, and find them to be correct, viz. :—

Tender B, in the aggregate amounting to.....	\$251,014
do K do do .....	267,115
do H do do .....	267,835

"The lowest, or tender B, is from Brecken & Nicholson, and amounts to about 25 per cent. more than the old contract rates, when applied to the quantities used in extending the new tenders. The old prices were, however, for the most part wholly inadequate; but those in tender B, although still low, are believed to be such as the work can be done for, and, with good management, leave a small margin of profit.

"Mr. Brecken is said to be a thoroughly practical person who, I believe, had undertaken to do the masonry for the firm of Heney, Stewart & Co., and from all I can learn would be likely to complete the work if allotted to him. I am not, however, aware that Mr. Nicholson has much, if any, practical knowledge in the way of executing such works.

"It may further be said that Mr. Brecken, under his agreement with the late contractors, quarried and prepared the stone provided for the masonry: consequently, it might be more easily arranging these matters with him than with a person unfamiliar with the present condition of affairs.

"I therefore advise that as the tender of Mr. Brecken is the lowest, that the work be awarded to him, if he is prepared to show that he can make satisfactory arrangements to carry out the undertaking."

Brecken was called upon under these circumstances, as I am sure the hon. gentleman would have done in my place—to deposit his security. He did so, and the contract was awarded to him. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the security of \$14,000 deposited by Stewart, Heney & Co. is still in the hands of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. So I see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, so far as this amount is concerned, these parties made a claim for a certain sum. The Government refused it, and they then said that they would abide by Mr. Page's decision as sole arbitrator, as to what their final estimate should be. It had to be settled in some way. Mr. Page, therefore, as sole arbitrator, decided that this amount, \$17,370, was due and ought properly to be paid to these contractors. This was the award; and the hon. gentleman will see that we could not very well have better means for settling this point than by reference to the chief engineer, who had the contract in his hand, and under whose hands the work had been performed. Under these circumstances we have retained the security, and we ask for this vote to enable us to pay the amount of Mr. Page's award to the former contractors. We did not feel warranted in rejecting the tender of a man declared by Mr. Page to be well fitted to do the work, and at whose prices he thought, with good management, would enable him to do it although they were very low, at a small margin of profit, he being the lowest tenderer, because one of the other parties appeared associated with him. This other party now, however, has no connection with this contract. Mr. Nicholson is replaced by Mr. Stewart, a man of a different family, and no connection of Mr. Stewart of the former contractors; and so the present contractors, Brecken & Stewart, are an entirely new firm. I did not feel, with Mr. Page's report in my hands, that the work could be done at these figures; that the man was a good contractor; that his tender should be rejected because he had associated himself with one of the former contractors.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that the deposit is there, and also that the security is not to be used, because the hon. gentleman distinctly stated that this award was made by Mr. Page, on the matter being referred to him to ascertain what the amount of the value of the contractors' work was in excess of what they ought to have been paid. He said it would not do to carry on the public works of the country at the expense of contractors; that these contractors had not received the value of their work in the contract price, and that the difference between what the contract price would give them and the real value of their work was to be ascertained, and was ascertained; and that this was the sum of \$17,000 odd. It was not a final estimate, but a statement of what the work was supposed to be worth by Mr. Page; therefore, the hon. gentleman adopted the view with reference to them, that the contractors were not bound by the contract, although the Government would have been.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman certainly led me to believe so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had no such intention. I will tell the hon. gentleman exactly how the case stands. Mr. Page had no such instructions given him. A claim was made by these contractors; they had to be settled with. Mr. Page had given a final estimate, which they said was below what it should be. They made a claim on the Government,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and the question was referred to Mr. Page under the contract, as to what these parties were entitled to; but the security originally deposited stands in our hands to-day, it is not surrendered, and it will not be surrendered until the final completion of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Then am I to understand that the sum which we are now called upon to vote, is the statement of Mr. Page of what would be due to these contractors according to the strict terms of the contract, irrespective of the question of default?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Page had the whole question before him, and knew exactly how it stood.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what the hon. gentleman understands from Mr. Page's award. Of course nothing is due under the terms of the contract, because the contractors are in default; but waiving the question of default, and seeing that they have gone on a certain distance with the work, am I to understand, that this amount is coming to them irrespective of their default under the contract, and is not at all the real value of the work to which Mr. Page's award relates?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I have to say is that Mr. Page, the sole arbitrator, had the whole case before him; and the contract was in his hands, and these parties made a claim. The hon. gentleman knows that that is the usual course which has been pursued; but I will give him a case which occurred under the Government of which he was a member and which he will recollect at once—that is, the case of Messrs. Cook & Co., contractors on the Carillon canal. The hon. gentleman knows that my predecessor took that work out of their hands, because, as he stated, they were not pushing it with sufficient vigor and rapidity, and he re-let the contract at a much higher rate than that of Messrs. Cook & Co.'s contract, yet he paid them a large sum of money though it was taken out of their hands.

Mr. BLAKE. I am merely trying to get at the facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but why should the hon. gentleman present these facts as if our course in this respect was unprecedented. There were no instructions given in this case. Mr. Page is an old and skilled engineer, who is thoroughly familiar with these works, and he had no instructions whatever, except that there was a claim made by the contractors after the work was taken out of their hands, and they agreed to leave it to Mr. Page to say what amount should be paid. Mr. Page found this amount as the amount which should be paid—a smaller amount than they claimed.

Mr. BLAKE. I think I must have misapprehended the statement which the hon. gentleman made in Committee, as his present statement does not quite agree with what I understood him to say. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will lay the submission to the award and Mr. Page's award on the Table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

On Resolution 321,

Fisheries—Prince Edward Island Railway—To be paid to Mrs. A. A. McInnis, re compensation for the death of her husband, without prejudice to the defence of the case..... \$ 400.00

Mr. DAVIES. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was his intention to bring down a vote in the Supplementary Estimates to cover possible damages which might occur on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, but I am unable to find such a sum in these Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to bring down such a sum. As I stated in speaking upon the amendment to the Consolidated Railways Act which I endeavored to read the second time to-day—unsuccessfully, I am sorry to say—I provide that accidents

which cause loss of life or injury to the person shall be treated as part of the working expenses; so that the whole vote taken for the working expenses of the railways will be properly chargeable for any amount the Government decide should be fairly paid to any person who is entitled to compensation, on an equitable view of the question as these accidents occur. They will refer to the past as well as the present, and it will be my duty to consider these cases at an early day.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the vote for the current year will be available for compensation for accidents which occurred in prior years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may ask the indulgence of the House—without re-opening the discussion on the subject to be allowed to read part of a letter from Mr. McNab, dated 11th June, 1879. Does the hon. gentleman remember when the accident occurred?

Mr. DAVIES. Not exactly, but I think it was the 10th of August, 1880.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. McNab wrote, on the 11th of June, 1879, as follows:—

"I am happy to be able to report satisfactory progress in regard to railway matters, and I only wonder that the duties of superintendent and engineer were not long ago combined, as one officer can so readily discharge them."

So that the Government had no apprehension that the writer was being overworked at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say one word on this subject that I intended to have said on a former occasion, and that is, that a strong impression was left on my mind by some letters or papers which were submitted in the Public Accounts Committee with reference to the superannuation of Mr. McNab, that there was a letter from that gentleman, written in view of a leave of absence in which he stated as a ground—I cannot give the phrase—but something to the effect that over-work, and extreme anxiety, occasioned by the arduous character of his duties, was the ground on which he made this request. The impression was left that the extreme nervous prostration was due to over-work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is right. That did appear, but at the particular time in question this letter was the only information I had. I had no information at variance with this statement down to that period. Afterwards there is no doubt that Mr. McNab was completely broken down, and came to be in the state of extreme nervous prostration which disqualified him for this work.

#### On Resolution 287,

To provide for extra services and expenses in connection with the Act granting bounties to fishermen..... \$3,000.00

Mr. PAINT. In giving bounties to fishermen to encourage them in the prosecution of their calling, it is understood that we should afford them protection. I have been requested to bring a matter before this House. The papers should have reached me earlier, in February, but they have only come to hand within a few days. If it is any discourtesy to the Ministry to bring it forward in this manner, I beg their pardon, but I wish to get the matter before the public. It presents itself in the shape of an outrage committed on Dominion fishermen by Newfoundland fishermen; and to introduce the matter intelligently, I shall read from the document that has been placed in my hands:

"That your memorialist resides at Port Mulgrave, in the County of Guysborough, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and there carries on a large business of catching and curing fish

"That your memorialist is owner of the schooner *Sea Flower*, of one hundred and thirteen tons, and last summer fitted her out for a fishing voyage to the Labrador Coast, for the purpose of catching and curing herring.

"That said schooner was fully equipped for said voyage and had a crew of fourteen hands all told, under the command of Captain Edmund

Purcell, of Port Mulgrave, aforesaid, and was supplied with salt and barrels sufficient for curing a complete cargo.

"That said schooner left on said voyage on the sixth day of August, A.D. 1882, and arrived at Sizes Harbour, on the Coast of Labrador, about the twentieth day of that month.

"That said Sizes Harbour is on that part of the Coast of Labrador over which the Government of the Colony of Newfoundland has, as your memorialist is informed and believes, territorial jurisdiction and control, and over which the said Government exercises the right and power of exacting and collecting Customs and other duties.

"That when said schooner arrived at said harbour there were a large number of vessels there hailing from St. Johns, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Catilina, Spaniards Bay and other places in said Island of Newfoundland, and were manned by a large number of seamen belonging to those places.

"That on Friday, the twenty-fifth day of the said month of August, the crew of said schooner run out their seine one hundred and ten fathoms long, and enclosed therein in said harbour at least three thousand barrels of herring and had them secured in the said seine already to dip out and remove to said schooner, when a large number of men and boats from said vessels came, and notwithstanding the resistance of the crew of said schooner *Sea Flower*, with force and violence drove the said crew away and dipped out and carried away the said herring and deprived your memorialist thereof.

"That the said crew again on Monday, the twenty-eighth day of said month, hove said seine and enclosed and had secured at least five hundred barrels of herring, and were again by said men from said vessels in the same manner deprived thereof.

"That on Wednesday, the thirtieth day of said month, your memorialist's crew again hove said seine and enclosed at least five hundred barrels of herring, and the captain of said schooner seeing the same men coming again to deprive him of said fish, and they having in their wantonness before much injured and destroyed said seine, the said captain, in order to save the said seine from total destruction, was compelled to take the same up and allow all the fish taken to escape.

"That said schooner could have brought home twelve hundred barrels of fish, and the captain had means on board thereof whereby he could have cured a much larger number and could have freighted them home, and he could have sold what fish he did not need in their fresh state to parties in said harbour for at least one dollar and fifty cents per barrel. That said captain with said crew thereafter only secured three hundred barrels of fish and had to return with on y that amount.

"That by said depredations of said inhabitants of the Colony of Newfoundland, your memorialist has suffered great loss and injury, and your memorialist is advised and believes that these parties have been carrying on these depredations for several years, causing great loss and injury to other inhabitants of said Province of Nova Scotia.

"Your memorialist therefore humbly prays that such proceedings may be taken on behalf of the authorities of the Dominion of Canada as will prevent a recurrence of these depredations upon and injuries to the inhabitants of said Dominion of Canada, and that such relief may be accorded your memorialist as the nature and circumstances of the case may warrant.

"And as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray, &c."

In this matter the lives of those on board were threatened and their property was wrested from them by force. The document I have just read sets forth the grievance. This Mr. Purcell has been engaged in the prosecution of fisheries for forty years, and does a large part of his business in the county of Richmond, which I have the honor to represent. It may be doubted by some whether there is a necessity for the services of the Government steamer *La Canadienne*, under the able direction of Commander Wakeham. I am able personally to testify to her value, in rendering protection to the fishermen, their vessels, and wrecks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Straits of Belle Isle and the shores of Labrador. There are a number of other important papers in connection with this case, and I trust the Government of the Dominion will see to the protection of its subjects, and prevent such outrages being perpetrated on our fishermen. The loss in connection with this affair is estimated at \$10,000, and I may add that such transactions as this tend to destroy and prevent Inter-provincial Trade. I should be inclined to recommend the following course in this matter: that satisfaction be first obtained and explanation given afterwards. The Americans are very sensitive on matters such as these, and are very jealous and vigilant in the protection of their citizens. To declare yourself an American, it is well known, is to ensure your protection, and from the very first, from the declaration of Independence, the consuls and the Navy of the United States took good care to protect and preserve their subjects wherever found, and they do so to this day. They usually act without consulting Washington, and are

generally sustained in the steps they take. I trust this memorialist will not present his claim in vain, and that steps will be taken between this and next meeting of Parliament to give him redress.

Mr. BOWELL. As to the information asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the accounts are not in such a state as to be able to give it in detail. There are some eleven or twelve clerks and employés of the Department who have been doing portions of the extra work and have been paid at the rate of \$2 per every five hours' service performed under the supervision of one of the clerks of the Department. A portion of this amount is for printing circulars and clerical labor. As to Mr. Ogden, he has been employed in Nova Scotia adjusting certain accounts and investigating claims that had been made, the correctness of which the Department had some doubts. The same work is being performed in New Brunswick by Mr. Harrington, who is an employé of the Department. The services of all these officers have also been utilized in connection with the distribution of the fishery bounty, and in procuring the fish and other articles that have been sent to the exhibition in London. This statement also refers to adjusting accounts and procuring exhibits for the exhibition. Mr. Rogers and Mr. Johnston, of Nova Scotia, have been employed; the former has expended \$950, and the latter \$700. In Quebec Mr. Wakeham is employed, and in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Duval. Mr. Ogden up to the present time has expended \$490; Mr. Honeyman, for Nova Scotia, has expended \$200; Mr. Gregory, Quebec, \$1,500; Mr. Andrews, British Columbia, \$1,100. Professor Macoun was also employed in procuring fish food for the exhibition.

Mr. BLAKE. I see there are fourteen clerks in the Department employed for extra services in connection with this matter. It was a new matter entirely, and I hardly understand the ground upon which the hon. gentleman says it was important in the public interest they should be employed for that extra work. I do not mean to say that if the Department is overworked, or when extra pressure comes upon it, that it may not be necessary to employ extra services; but if that be so, it seems to me there has been a needless and unwarrantable violation of the Civil Service Act, which prescribes that clerks in a Department shall not be employed for extra services in that particular Department. This work could very well have been attended to by other persons employed for that purpose. The sums may not be important, but the principle is, and I am sorry that at a period when we are regulating our Civil Service Act, and adopting the most virtuous resolutions, the hon. gentleman should propose to violate one of the most wholesome clauses of this Act in this manner.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not so understand the Civil Service Act. That Act provides that clerks employed at a regular salary shall not be paid for extra work, unless the sum be voted distinctly by Parliament. It is well known that for a number of years past that the practice of employing clerks and paying them large sums in addition to their salary was the reason for introducing that clause into the Civil Service Act. In almost every Department there were very large sums paid to clerks in violation of the law as it then existed. Since the present Act has been passed, when it has been necessary to employ any extra service, it has not been paid to him out of the contingencies of the Department, but a special vote has been placed in the Estimates to cover it, in order that Parliament might know in every instance where a clerk had been employed, the services he had performed and the amount that was to be paid to him, which was not the case under the old law. If a clerk now receiving a salary is worked over hours he cannot be paid under the law as I have indicated, but it has to be brought before Parliament. I do not therefore consider this is a violation of the Civil Service Act, for the reason that Parliament knows every dollar that is

Mr. PAINT.

paid to an extra clerk. I cannot understand that it was the intention of Parliament to prevent the services of a clerk being utilised when he was required in any special work in that Department; but it did make this provision, that if he is so employed, his salary is not to be supplemented out of any vote granted by Parliament for other purposes, hence the necessity for coming down to Parliament in every instance with a specific sum to cover these particular items. In this case I am informed by those upon whom the responsibility rest in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that they found it both easier and better to adopt this system, and to utilize clerks who had had experience in the Department, and that it would cost much less to employ them in this manner, than to bring in other clerks into the Department. Had new clerks been brought into the Department, they would have had to undergo a certain education, and be taught either by the Deputy Head or the chief clerks, at a loss of time to these latter officers. I am also informed that had the Department brought into the offices this number of clerks to perform this work, there would not have been rooms in which to place them.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I agree with what has been said by the leader of the Opposition, that this expenditure is entirely uncalled for, and if money is to be wasted and salaries paid for extra services, there are plenty of works in connection with the fisheries of Nova Scotia, where it could be spent with better advantage. When the hon. Finance Minister made his Budget Speech last year, he stated that it was the intention of the Government to provide \$150,000 for the purpose of paying bounties to fishermen. Nearly seven months elapsed before any steps were taken, and it was not until 7th November, 1882, that the hon. gentleman made any statement in connection with this matter. It was not until 4th December that it was heard from again, and not until 18th December were any steps taken to collect information as to the proper persons to receive the bounty. A circular was issued on that date, addressed to the Collectors of Customs in Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada. These returns could not be obtained until January or February, and it was scarcely a matter of surprise that extra clerks were necessary, at that late date, to examine claims and prepare cheques. If the Department had given their attention to the matter two or three months earlier this expenditure would have been unnecessary. With respect to the appointment of Mr. Ogden: I understand he has been appointed for the purpose of making enquiries into disputed claims in connection with the fisheries of Nova Scotia. There are, however, a sufficient number of officers to look after those fisheries and to represent the Department, without extra men being appointed. There is Mr. Johnson, the head of the Department of Nova Scotia; Mr. Rogers, Inspector of Fisheries; and deputies and inspectors of fish in almost every county. I think in one county, that of Guysborough, there are no less than twenty-five inspectors and deputy-inspectors representing the Department.

Mr. BOWELL. Some of these men receive only \$30 a year.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). They are appointed to perform certain duties and there are plenty of others willing to take their places. Then there are the Collectors of Customs. These collectors were instructed to examine into the claims. The acting Minister has stated that Mr. Ogden was appointed to collect fish for the London exhibition; but Dr. Honeyman, a most valuable officer, and one who has been connected with exhibitions since 1862, was also engaged in that work, and could do it most successfully, and to far better advantage. This vote for extra clerks is entirely due to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine having neglected to perform their duty

in not taking earlier steps in respect to the payment of the fishery bounties.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman would have the country and the House believe that all the clerks in the Department and the fishery wardens had nothing else to do except to distribute this amount of \$150,000. I may say in this connection that 16,000 cheques have been issued in connection with these bounties. If the clerks in the Department had nothing else to do they should not be there. The presumption is that officers in the Department have their regular duties to perform, and that their whole time is occupied. Hence, it was necessary, in order to perform this extra labor, to make a thorough investigation into those claims, that others outside of the Department should do the work, and that those in the Department who were engaged on it should be paid extra. In Halifax, the Department attempted to utilize the Collector of Customs, but he found it utterly impossible to perform his own duties and attend to the verification of these accounts and the payment of a very large number of cheques. When this was represented to the Department the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked some other officer to do the work, either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Ogden. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) could not be serious when he spoke of employing fishery wardens, for he was well aware that nineteen-twentieths of them were selected merely to protect the fish in streams, and to see that the close seasons were observed. Even if some of them were qualified for the work connected with the bounties, they would have required extra pay. When the hon. gentleman attacks the Marine and Fisheries Department, he gives the very best evidence that the Department was not to blame, if any blame attached to anyone. He tells the House that the first reference made by the Department was on the 9th of the month, and that, on the 18th of the same month, the circulars were issued. It might be possible, if the hon. gentleman presided over the Department—

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said the 7th of November.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood the 9th of November; well, from the 9th to the 18th—

Mr. ROBERTSON. The 18th of December.

Mr. BOWELL. Admitting that it was the 18th of December, that is about a month; and during that month—

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is six weeks.

Mr. BOWELL. And during that month or six weeks the whole scheme had to be considered, and they were as busy as they could be in preparing the necessary documents upon which claims could be made, and to lay down a principle and basis upon which to act. The Department certainly was not remiss in its duty, in adopting a system of this kind for the distribution of \$150,000 among so many. It is not yet all distributed, but about 16,000 cheques have been sent out already. A number have had to be rejected, and a number of claims have had to be investigated. There has been no unnecessary delay in carrying out the intentions of Parliament in appropriating this money. I can readily understand—and so can my hon. friend—that in the future, in the distribution of this money, having once established the system, neither large expense, nor trouble, nor delay will take place; he will also bear in mind that all the expenses attending the distribution of this money are extra and are not taken out of the \$150,000, which was given by Parliament for distribution among the fishermen. For the attending expenses, Parliament has been asked to grant extra votes in order that the full amount of money go to the fishermen.

Mr. DALY. It appears to me that the hon. member for Shelburne merely desired to criticise the action of the Department, and that this was the sole object of his remarks

this evening. If I were inclined to criticise the Department it would be in exactly the opposite direction to that which the hon. member for Shelburne has taken. It seems to me that any just criticism would be founded upon a want in that Department in not having employed a sufficient number of persons to distribute this award at one time, and in not having gone outside their own Department and retained the services of others, as they would in that way have distributed the award much more quickly and in a more speedy manner than has been the case under the present arrangement. I think that the Department has been rather inclined to overtax the already fully taxed officers with labors which they were unexpectedly called upon to perform. I can only say that in the county I have the honor to represent, we have but two inspectors of fisheries. This county extends for 100 miles on one side and for over 35 miles on the other side of the capital; and to distribute along the whole length of the shore of this county, to the owners of the numerous boats, who claimed the share in this bounty to which they were entitled, simply through either the agent at Halifax, Mr. Johnson, a very capable but greatly overworked employé of the Government, and of the inspectors of the two sections of the county, either east or west, or by means of these inspectors alone, would be a work of endless trouble and would not result, I am sure, satisfactorily. I believe that if any error has been made by the Department at all, it is in not having employed others and in not having gone outside to obtain the services of others to a greater extent than they have already done. I believe that the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne are directed more at the employment of a former political opponent who had the honor of a seat in this House, than they were actuated by any motive of benefiting the service, which he now pretends to support. I believe that this bounty granted to the fishermen, is a policy to which this Government can lay claim to the credit of having inaugurated, and it is to this Government and to this Parliament to whom the fishermen of Nova Scotia, in spite of all the observations that now come from the other side of the House, will give, and will continue to give, that credit for years to come.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). In the circular issued by the Department to the Collectors of Customs in Nova Scotia, they were instructed to circulate forms which were to be filled up and sworn to before a Justice of the Peace; and they were to see that those forms were correctly prepared, and to certify to them. This was the duty which devolved upon the Collectors of Customs from the instructions issued by the Department. The remarks of the member for Halifax, and of the acting Minister of Fisheries, would lead us to suppose that the officials in Nova Scotia had to examine into the claims, draw the cheques, and pay the money; but as I understand it, all this was done at Ottawa. What was done in Nova Scotia was to circulate the forms which were to be filled up, which were to be certified to by the Collectors of Customs, and this duty of certification took very little time indeed. I believe that so far as the Department is concerned, it did its work faithfully and well, considering the time that it had at its disposal for this purpose. Many returns never reached Ottawa until the middle of last January, and a large number of claims had to be examined by officers here, and the cheques had then to be drawn. I find no fault in the Department here; but I say that the work undertaken by the Ministers of Fisheries and Finance, should have been begun months before they reported on this matter, or brought it first to the attention of the Privy Council. If this had been done in time, then it would have been easy enough to have the claims examined, the cheques drawn, and the money paid long before this. The member for Halifax would lead us to believe that these cheques were drawn by some officer who must

travel all round the coast to pay the cheques to the owners of the boats and to the men who fished in them. I do not so understand it at all; the Departmental cheques are payable to order of the men entitled to them; and they are forwarded to the office from whom the claims have come; and this does not entail any expense. His insinuation that the remarks I addressed to the House had for their object the slurring of a past political opponent is entirely uncalled for. I had no such intention. I do not approve of the appointment of Mr. Ogden to such a position; but I think it a most fortunate thing for a person in Nova Scotia, or in any part of the Dominion, especially a Conservative, to be defeated; for if defeated they are far better treated than those who meet with success and win seats in the House. I repeat that if the Department had issued instructions to collect this information before November or December, and had undertaken this work earlier in the season, this information might have been in the possession of the Government long ago, and there would not have been any necessity for employing so many extra clerks, while the fishermen would have been paid long before they will now be paid.

**Mr. BOWELL.** Will the hon. gentleman explain to the House how the statistics could have been obtained before the fishing season closed, and while half of the fishermen were out at sea.

**Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).** Then you did not wait until the information was returned, because you issued instructions, and finding that there was a considerable amount of money on hand, the bounty to the fishermen was increased, and you ascertained this only three or four weeks ago. The fact is that if the Department had asked the number of vessels employed, the tonnage of vessels, and the number of boats and their tonnage, they might have had this information in the month of October. I looked through the returns for my own county, and I found that there was not a vessel reported but might have been reported in October; and I only hope that in future the Department will take steps to collect the information earlier in the season in order that the men may be paid before the season is closed.

#### On Resolution 314,

Customs—To provide for amount required to complete service in the Province of Manitoba ..... \$25,000.00

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** As I understand, this \$20,000 additional is for this year's service in Manitoba. I see the vote in the original Estimates was \$19,000, which would make altogether the Estimates for 1882-83, \$44,900, while the Minister is only asking for, 1883-84, \$40,000. I suppose there will be a Supplementary Estimate for this year.

**Mr. BOWELL.** I hope not.

**Mr. PATERSON (Brant).** Will there be less expended in 1883-84 than in 1882-83?

**Mr. BOWELL.** I hope so, from the fact that the service there has been systematized to a certain extent. As I explained when the item was before the House, we anticipate that a large amount of goods which are now passing through the United States, and which have to be bonded at Sarnia or Windsor, and the bond cancelled when these goods reach the boundaries of Manitoba at Emerson or Winnipeg, thus entailing a large amount of labor on the extra men whom we have attached to the staff, will go to Manitoba by way of Thunder Bay, and instead of the bonds being broken and the goods examined at Winnipeg, they will go westward to the sub-ports which we propose to open. We hope that there will be a less rush of business in Winnipeg than there has been, and that hence a less number of men will be required. The hon. gentleman will readily understand this expectation when I point out the fact that every car of goods, no matter whether it be dutiable or free,

**Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).**

or whether it is immigrants' effects which passes through the United States, has to be bonded when it enters that territory, and the bond has to be cancelled when it reaches our borders at Winnipeg or Emerson. All the work attending that collection of revenue is imposed on these officers, less the amount of money received and the making of the calculations; but we hope they will be relieved of a large proportion of that work when immigrants and goods passing through, either from Montreal or Ontario, will go by Thunder Bay, and that there will be nothing for the Customs officers to do. I trust that this year, unless an unforeseen circumstance should arise, the expenditure in connection with the collection of revenue in Manitoba, will be somewhat lighter than during the past year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:55 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 16th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced, and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 131) to encourage the manufacture of pig iron in Canada from Canadian ore.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution declaring that it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the granting of shop, saloon, hotel, vessel and wholesale licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors in the several Provinces of the Dominion, said: The House, when a Committee was specially struck on this subject, adopted, in effect, the principle of this resolution. It is, however, not necessary *pro forma* to move this resolution in order to meet the principle that all matters affecting trade should commence in Committee. A Bill has been reported, I believe, by the Committee, and on this resolution being adopted, the Bill which the Committee were authorized to introduce will be presented and printed, and pressed on the consideration of the House.

**Mr. BLAKE.** The House, in obedience to the suggestion of the paragraph of the Speech from the Throne on this subject, referred the matter to a Select Committee, giving them power to report by Bill or otherwise. I was surprised when I saw the notice on the paper which the hon. gentleman has just moved, as I understood that the matter having been referred to the Committee, it was by that channel alone that the Bill could come before us. I think the hon. gentleman's notice was irregular, as I think this motion is irregular. It seems to me the function of the Committee being to report by Bill or otherwise, it was the duty of the Committee to have reported a resolution, if a resolution is the proper mode to initiate the legislation. We have neither a report, nor a resolution upon which to found a Bill containing provisions similar to those which were suggested. It seems to me that on the point of Order, we have to carry out the proceedings which we have initiated in this matter in accordance with the third paragraph of the Speech from the



Throne, upon which the Select Committee was appointed. It is only upon their report that we can act, not upon any motion, such as the hon. gentleman is now making. It strikes me, therefore, the true course would be to await the report of the Select Committee, and upon that to move whatever resolution might be necessary to initiate the legislation which they suggest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House certainly struck a Committee for the purpose of examining and reporting on this subject, with instructions to report by Bill or otherwise—no matter whether they reported by Bill or by resolution. The House has not concurred in that report; and will not be asked to concur in it. The report will be laid before the House as a means of information to the House. They might report a resolution which did not meet the views of the Government, and the Government, therefore, take the responsibility of moving this general resolution as a matter affecting trade and commerce; it will commence in Committee, and certainly there can be no point of Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me that by adopting this resolution and going into Committee, it is open to introduce a Bill, either a Bill that has been reported by the Committee, or some similar Bill. I think the motion is in order.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I presume the hon. gentleman will give us some explanation of what the general provisions of this proposed measure will be. I suppose the real object of this is that the important matters concerning trade should be sifted and go through more stages than ordinary matters. That is the object of the rule; but if it is to be pure form, if the Speaker is to be moved out of the Chair, and you, Mr. Chairman, to be moved into the Chair, and the Committee is to report back again, and we are to have no more light until the Bill is introduced, then I would like to know of what use, for what object, this proceeding is taken. It seems to me there is substance as well as form, and that there ought to be more frequent stages, and earlier information than upon ordinary Bills. I would invite the hon. gentleman, therefore, to give us some explanation, particularly as he has told us that the House is not to be asked to concur in the report of the Select Committee, as the Government, upon their own responsibility, is now taking this initiative. We are now entirely at sea. We have had some information from the newspapers as to what the Committee has done, and the character of their Bill, but we have none at all as to the proposition the Government is about to submit to us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would simply say that this resolution is practically a matter of form. The expediency of dealing with the subject was approved in the Address from the Throne, and the formation of the Committee, and the submission of this subject to the Committee, showed that the House thought we should have legislation in the matter. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a mere matter of form, in order to satisfy the letter as well as the spirit of the Rule of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman declines to give us any information as to the nature of the legislation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will discuss that when the Bill is brought in.

Resolution reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 132) respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the issue of licenses therefor.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this Bill in print?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; it is printed in English and French.

Bill read the first time.

#### PATENT ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. POPE, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 122) to amend the Patent Act of 1872, said: The object of the present Bill is to remove difficulties in the working of the existing law. One main difficulty was that by the Patent Laws of the United States, any patent taken out expires at the earliest date at which the patent could expire, which had been taken out in any other country. We have always acted on the principle that our patents were for fifteen years. They are first issued for five years, and a fee of \$20 imposed, and the time is afterwards extended for ten years more, and a further fee of \$20 is collected. This arrangement was made in the interest of the patentee, so as to make it easy for him to procure a patent. It has been decided by the United States Courts that a patent taken out in the United States, after a patent had been taken out here, would expire at the end of five years, under our law. This amendment is intended to remove, as far as we can remove, this difficulty. We declare by this Bill that:

“The term limited for the duration of every patent of invention issued by the Patent Office shall be fifteen years; but at the time of the application therefor it shall be at the option of the applicant to pay the full fee required for the term of fifteen years, or the partial fee required for the term of five years, or the partial fee required for the term of ten years.”

It further states:

“Every patent heretofore issued by the Patent Office in respect of which the fee required for the whole or for any unexpired portion of the term of fifteen years, has been duly paid according to the provisions of the now existing law in that behalf, has been and shall be deemed to have been issued for the term of fifteen years, subject, in case a partial fee only has been paid, to cease on the same conditions on which patents hereafter issued are to cease under the operation of this section.”

The object of this Bill is, therefore, to give effect to what we have always contended was the principle on which we have issued patents, and to make the law clear. We hope that when this measure is adopted our patents will be accepted in the United States as being issued for fifteen years. The difficulty experienced is greater on account of the fact that when parties apply for patents in the United States and Canada, ours are issued two, three or four months before those of the United States, and that being the case the decision of the American Courts provided that the patents shall expire in the United States at the shortest time for which they were issued in any other country.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 126) to make further provision respecting the regulation and collection of tolls on Government timber slides and other works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber, lumber and saw-logs.—(Mr. Costigan.)

#### SUPERANNUATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the superannuation of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the Bill.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As I stated when the resolutions were brought down, this Bill is mainly a consolidation

of the Acts relating to superannuation. The amendments made by the Bill have been rendered necessary by the provision of the Civil Service Act of 1882, by which that Act was applied to a limited number of officials. There are only one or two new sections in the Bill, among them are the following:—

"All officers, clerks and employes in or under the several Departments of the Executive Government who are paid a yearly salary, and to whom 'The Canada Civil Service Act, 1882,' applies, and who in case they were or are appointed after the coming into force of that Act were or are appointed in conformity with its provisions.

"All such officers, clerks and employes of the second or outside division of the Civil Service, to whom 'The Canada Civil Service Act, 1882,' does not apply, and who are employed in an established capacity, and paid a yearly salary as the Governor in Council may, from time to time, designate."

Under the Act of 1882, so far as the outside service was concerned, it limited the officials to whom the Act should apply to the officers of the Customs, Excise and Post Office Departments; and it was, therefore, necessary to amend the Act in order to place the service generally under its operation. There is one provision to which the hon. leader of the Opposition took exception, and at the time I was inclined to agree with him that the objection was a sound one. I refer to the section reserving to parties their rights when a repealing Act is introduced. Such a clause is usually inserted; but as it may possibly turn out that a party superannuated was not legally superannuated, after consultation with the Minister of Justice I have decided not to press that clause if the hon. gentleman thinks it objectionable.

Mr. McMULLEN. When this Bill was introduced, the hon. gentleman promised to give us some information with regard to the operations of the Act, so far as the finances of the country are concerned. The Civil Service Board set out that the country was saving money by the Act, and the hon. gentleman undertook to give us some information on this point.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is exceedingly difficult to give definite or reliable information on this point. The hon. leader of the Opposition took some exception to the calculations made in the report of the Civil Service, and I may say that when I first read these calculations I was somewhat inclined to think that they were exaggerated. But in looking into the matter carefully, I am of opinion that though their calculations may not turn out entirely correct, they will be so to a great extent. Take the port of St. John, for example: There were three persons superannuated there within the last three or four years. Their average salary was \$1,000 each. The average superannuation, perhaps, amounts to \$1,500. Only one person was appointed to fill the position of the assistant statistical clerk, who had a salary of \$1,000, and they were superannuated at an average of about \$500 a year. The result was, that while there appears to be an increased charge made on the revenues of the country of \$1,500 there was really a saving of \$1,100 to the Treasury by that operation, because the salaries which were saved amounted to \$3,000, less \$400 paid to a junior clerk. It may be said that those men would not have been retained but for the Civil Service Act; but I appeal to the House to say whether three aged men who were not capable of doing work should be turned out on the world without a dollar. The result would have been that they would have been retained in office, and other persons would have been employed to do their work. Therefore, in that particular case, while there appears to be an addition of some \$1,500 to the Civil Service fund, there is an absolute saving of \$1,100. The hon. leader of the Opposition says the calculation is based on the supposition that the men shall live forever. I do not quite see that that is the result of the calculation, but it is exceedingly difficult to make an estimate of this kind, because you have to estimate how long they are likely to continue to draw from this sum. It has been sug-

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

gested that in future, when a person is superannuated, it should be stated on the face of the paper whether the office is to be filled up or not, and in that way it might be ascertained exactly what was saved and what was lost by the change. The statements of payments made to the Superannuation Fund by the Civil Service, and of the amounts paid to them, do not give a correct idea of what the country loses and the Treasury pays under the operation of the Civil Service Act. To make a definite calculation of the matter is exceeding difficult, in fact it is impossible. While I doubt very much the correctness of the statement made by the Civil Service Commissioners, I must say, after looking more closely into it, there is more ground for the calculations they made than I had supposed on giving it a cursory examination.

Mr. McMULLEN. This Superannuation Act is a matter that I think deserves the serious consideration of the House. It has now been in existence in this country for about twelve years. I have looked carefully into the operations of the Act, and I find that last year there were on the list of persons who had been superannuated 394 names, and this year the number had increased to 406. The sum paid out last year on account of superannuation was \$160,319.95, and the amount to be paid out during the current year, according to the return brought down to the House on the 23rd of February, is \$189,978.98, an increase of \$29,658.03. This is more than double the increase that has taken place during any year since the inception of this Act, and I hold that it is the duty of this House to seriously consider whether it is wise, in the interest of the country, to continue this system in force, or whether it would not be better to abolish it entirely, and adopt something else that would be fairer to the country and juster to the Civil Service. I have looked carefully into the list, and I find that fifteen of the number served an average of six years and six months, and in the fixing of their retiring allowance they have had added to their time eight years and nine months.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under the Superannuation Act they cannot be superannuated unless they have served ten years.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are some who have served only three years, and those fifteen only served an average of six and one-half years each.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That cannot be.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have gone carefully over the list and any hon. gentleman who goes over it will find that my calculation is correct. In the fixing of their retiring allowance they have also had eight and one-third years added to their time of service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. members may challenge the statement I make; but until they examine the list, and are prepared to say that my statement is wrong, they had better, in the meantime, accept it. The total amount contributed to the fund by the fifteen I have referred to, is \$2,944.01, during the time they were in the service of the Government; and the sum they draw annually from the fund is \$6,209.54. During the entire time those fifteen men were in the service of the country, they did not contribute sufficient to pay one-half year's allowance of the amount they draw. I contend, therefore, that it is unjust that those who are placed on the superannuation list should be permitted to draw a sum not proportionate to the number of years they have served, but largely in excess of it, by the addition of a number of years. There are some cases in which ten years have been added. The total number of years that have been added to the service of the superannuated servants now on the retired list, is 413. The average sum drawn annually by each person on the superannuation

list at present is \$468; but owing to the number of years that have been added to the service of these men, the country is now paying annually \$8,494.00 more than it should be required to pay under the terms of the Act. The average annual increase of payment on account of this fund since its inception, has been \$12,141.41. The entire sum paid out since the introduction of the Act, is \$1,108,539.40; and the entire sum contributed by the Civil Service has been \$526,876.62, leaving \$581,662.78 as an absolute loss to this country, by the operation of this system during twelve years. The next point I desire to call the attention of the House to is the average salary paid. Of course, it is said that these people, having been in the service of the country so long, and receiving only a moderate salary, should be provided with something in the shape of a retiring allowance in the event of their becoming incapacitated from discharging the duties devolving upon them. There are in the Department of Justice, fifteen, with an average salary of \$1,431; in the Department of the Secretary of State, there are forty-one, with an average salary of \$1,028; in the Department of the Interior eighty-eight, being five of an increase this year, with an average salary of \$1,172; in the Department of Indian Affairs, thirty-two, with an average of \$978; in the Auditor-General's Department, eighteen, with an average of \$1,066; in the Finance Department, forty-six, with an average of \$1,262; in the Inland Revenue Department, twenty-eight, with an average of \$1,275; in the Customs Department, twenty-nine, an increase of three this year, with an average of \$1,136; in the Post Office Department, 161, an increase of thirty-nine this year, with an average, of \$876; in the Department of Agriculture, forty-two, an increase of nine this year, with an average of \$1,205; in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, thirty, an increase of five, with an average of \$1,166; in the Department of Public Works, thirty-two, an increase of ten, with an average of \$1,294; in the Department of Railways and Canals, twenty-seven, an increase of one, with an average of \$1,601. The average salary of the entire staff is \$1,191, and the total increase this year, 118. My reason for giving the average salaries in the several Departments is this: Of course, the reason why the superannuation system is kept in force is, as I have already said, that it is thought desirable, on the part of the Government, that some retiring allowance should be made for those people after they have labored for a considerable time in the service of the country. My reason for making an average of the salaries is to show that those gentlemen receive in return for their services, annually, salaries as large, if not in excess, of those usually paid to bank clerks, clerks in wholesale houses, school teachers, or any other class. I do not think there is any other class better paid than the Civil Service. Under these circumstances, I think it would be only right that those people should be required to provide for themselves out of the very liberal allowance they get, in place of their being made a charge on the country. From what I have gathered from the operation of the Act, the Civil Service rather take the position of being heirs or sons of an estate than servants. It appears that, once a man becomes a servant of the country, he has a right to expect—in fact, the Government admit he is entitled to be supported by the State for the balance of his life. Should anything happen to him he has to be provided for. I think this is a very wrong principle. We have a right to expect when a man is hired to discharge any duty in connection with the Department in which he is employed, that he should be engaged on the distinct understanding that so long as he efficiently and faithfully discharges his duty he can reasonably expect to hold the position, but that when he fails to do that he must expect to be dismissed. That is the rule in the case of banks, and all other cases, and I think it is wrong that the public should be led to suppose that because a man is placed

on the list of the Civil Service he must count on being provided for during the balance of his life, as if he were an heir or a son. I find in this list there are sixty-one Deputy-Heads of Departments and assistant clerks that get an average of \$2,640.00. My reason for putting the question I did, in the first place, with regard to the report of the Civil Service, was to find out on what grounds the hon. Minister would attempt to show that the operations of this Act were advantageous to the country, and that the report was correct. I took the opportunity myself to examine into the working of the Act. I took two or three cases as an illustration. In the first place, if you take the case of John Wilson of the Inland Revenue Department, you will find he was superannuated the 1st March, 1872, when he was drawing \$900 per year, and he was granted a retiring allowance of \$193.72. He lived eight years and four months during which time he drew a total of \$1,656. Had he remained that time in the service he would have drawn \$7,500, thus leaving a difference between the two of \$5,844. In his case the office was closed and no one appointed to take his place, and the Civil Service report declared that the country made \$5,844 by superannuating him when he was not wanted and from an office that was not refilled. If a business man were to adopt this system, and in the event of his failing, bring before his creditors a report stating that by the removal of certain clerks whom he had hired, and who had nothing to do, he not only saved say \$400 a year—but that he had made a clear profit during that year of \$400—I fancy such a statement would be laughed at. On the 1st of March, 1872, E. D. Scott, when he was getting \$1,400 a year, was superannuated on an allowance of \$380.80. He lived nine years and four months, in which time he drew a total of \$3,551.13. Had he remained in office all the time, he would have drawn \$13,066. Deduct from that the amount he drew as retiring allowance, and you have a balance of \$9,511.87. That is another case in which the Civil Service report cited as a case in which the country made \$9,511.87 by removing this man, and not putting another in his place. I do not think any gentleman who carefully examines the basis on which those calculations were made, would risk his reputation for intelligence and accuracy and careful calculation, by saying that they are based on a proper, equitable, fair, and just calculation. I was surprised to find the names I did of the gentlemen attached to that report of the Civil Service. In the next place, I find that all those in the Civil Service drawing a salary of \$1,000 a year have to pay 2 per cent. of that salary towards the fund. Now, I hold it would be more in the interest of the Civil Service of this country if that 2 per cent. was set aside at interest and that the sum should remain at their credit, to be drawn out when they left the service. I think it would be more just to the service than the system now in force. From my examination of those on the retired list, I have come to the conclusion—which I think will be concurred in by every member of this House—that a great many have been taken into the service who never ought to have been admitted, and that, in order to get rid of inefficient servants, they have been superannuated; and the result is that the faithful and efficient servants who have discharged their duties well for a number of years, are called upon to pay a certain sum annually out of their salary in order to provide for those who never ought to have been admitted to the service. I believe great injustice is thus done to the efficient servants; and that if the question of the continuation of this system were submitted to a vote of the service to-morrow, they would reject it and prefer some system of insurance. I do not mean, for a moment, to say that those who are now in the employ of the country and have contributed toward the fund, should not be permitted, if they choose, to reap any advantages they may be entitled to draw from the fund at some future time when they may become unable to discharge their duties. I am

willing that justice should be done to them; but I think that in place of perpetuating such a system as this, seeing the operations of the Act, seeing how much money has been paid out for the last twelve years at the expense of this country, and seeing the manner in which the Act has worked since its inception to the present time, it would be very much better to abolish it altogether and to introduce a more equitable system whereby those who are disposed to contribute to a fund out of which they may be permitted to draw when they retire from the service, should be able to draw in proportion to the amount they had contributed, and that the honest and efficient clerk, the man who, for a great many years, had faithfully discharged his duty, should not be compelled to pay for the drones and those that are inefficient. Under the present system their family is robbed by the amount they should have coming to them on account of the annual deduction made from their salary. I admit that in England there may be some reasonable grounds for the continuation of this system. In that country the Civil Service officers have not the same opportunity of investing their money to advantage as they have in this country. I hold that if the Civil Service of this country were made to understand that they would have to provide for themselves they would be much more economical in their habits than they are now. I contend this system rather leads them to recklessness than to economy. If there was no law under which they expected the country to provide for them they would lay aside more money annually. There are plenty of opportunities for good investments, such as real estate or bank stocks. Now, I would draw the attention of the House to the manner in which these 406 men are distributed over the Departments. There are fifteen now employed in the office of the hon. Minister of Justice, and his percentage of those who are on the retired list would be ten, who are drawing the sum of \$4,680 annually. There are twenty-seven in the office of the hon. Minister of Militia, and his percentage of those who are on the retired list would be eighteen, and they are drawing \$8,424 annually. There are forty-one in the office of the hon. Secretary of State, and his percentage of the 406 who are on the retired list would be twenty-seven, who are drawing the gross sum of \$12,636 annually. There are eighty-eight in the office of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and his percentage on the retired list would be fifty-four, who are drawing annually \$25,272.00. There are thirty-two in the Department of Indian Affairs, the percentage would be twenty-one, and they are drawing \$9,828. There are eighteen in the office of the Auditor General, his percentage on the retired list would be twelve, and they are drawing \$5,716. There are forty-six in the office of the hon. Minister of Finance, his percentage would be thirty, and they are drawing \$14,040. There are twenty-eight in the office of the Minister of Inland Revenue; his percentage on the retired list would be eighteen, and these are drawing \$8,424. There are twenty-nine in the office of the hon. Minister of Customs, his percentage on the retired list would be eighteen, and they are drawing \$8,424. There are 161 in the Post Office Department, the percentage on the retired list would be 107, and they are drawing \$50,076. There are forty-two in the office of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, his percentage on the retired list would be twenty-eight, and they are drawing \$13,104. Those gentlemen who are drawing those sums are strutting round doing nothing, and living at the country's expense of course. There are thirty in the office of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, his percentage would be twenty, and they are drawing annually \$9,360. There are thirty-two in the office of the hon. Minister of Public Works, his percentage on the retired list would be twenty-one, and they are drawing \$10,206. There are twenty-seven in the office of the hon. Minister of Railways, and his percentage on the retired list is eighteen, and they are drawing

Mr. McMULLEN.

annually \$8,424. There are 406 altogether on the retired list, and to these the yearly sum of \$189,978.98 has got to be paid. Now, I think this question deserves the serious consideration of this House, and it is time that something should be done. Not only in the interest of the country, but in the interest of the faithful and efficient servants, some system should be adopted, if any system of retiring allowances is necessary, whereby the country would not be called upon to lose the enormous sum we are now losing annually and to provide that the faithful servants should not be so unjustly treated as they are by the provisions of this Act.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. member followed up his proposition with a resolution it would be to repeal the Act; he does not believe in the Act, that is quite clear. I doubt very much whether Parliament is prepared to accept his proposal and repeal the Act. In 1871, or earlier, when this law was enacted, twice the amount was required to be paid by the members of the Civil Service, as compared with that exacted from them to-day. I recollect perfectly the great interest taken by a prominent member on the other side of the House, Mr. Joly, who took up the question, brought it under the consideration of the House, and produced such an influence and effect on hon. members that the amount paid by Civil servants was reduced one-half. Two remedies are suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) if the Act were repealed. One is, that a certain percentage of the salary of each member should be placed in the Treasury bearing interest, and be paid to him on his retirement from the Service. When this Act was passed we found a great many aged men in the service who were utterly unfit to discharge their duties, and the Governor came down to the House and asked, in the interest of the service more than to benefit the men themselves, that they should have power to superannuate officers and give them something on which to live. Suppose the propositions of the hon. member were adopted, that is that the Civil servants should pay 2 or 4 per cent. of their salaries into the Treasury and receive the interest thereon, and obtain the amount with interest, upon their retirement, it would not have reached the cases of men who, at that time, should be superannuated, having been twenty-five or thirty-five years in the service, and who took the benefit of the Act at once. Then the hon. gentleman suggested that the lives of the Civil servants should be insured, in order that their families should receive an amount on their decease. That scheme is somewhat popular in the Civil Service, namely: That instead of getting a retiring allowance, there should be a certain life insurance. But this again did not meet the case. The object of Parliament was to provide for those men who were not efficient servants, in order that there might be efficient men secured. You would not reach these cases by a system of life insurance, for, while the family would obtain the benefit in the event of the father's death, he would be turned out of the service without a shilling. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has devoted a good deal of time to the preparation of the statement which he has submitted to the House. Some of them, no doubt, are correct; but he must be mistaken, notwithstanding the emphatic manner in which he reasserted it after some doubt had been expressed on this side of the House, in his statement that 15 per cent. were superannuated on an average service of six and a-half years; that they paid \$2,900 and received \$6,000. That must be a mistake, because the Act strictly provides that an officer shall not be superannuated until he has served ten years, except for causes stated in this Bill, which in this particular is a repetition of the old Act, as follows:—

"If any person to whom this Act applies, is constrained from any infirmity of mind or body to quit the Civil Service before the period at which a superannuation allowance might be granted him, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for

each year of his service; and if any such person is so constrained to quit the service before such period, by reason of severe bodily injury received without his own fault in the discharge of his public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding three months' pay for every two years service, or a superannuation allowance not exceeding one-fifth of his average salary during the then last three years.'

The hon. gentleman has somewhat reflected on the service. His principle objection is that drones contribute equally with active men. But each man contributes according to his salary. When the hon. gentleman, in reflecting on the Civil Service expenditure, says that Civil Service servants seem to be considered as the sons and heirs of the Government, I do not hesitate to say that in the public interest Civil servants should be fairly remunerated for the work they perform for their country; and I will say more, if I had a dozen sons, even with the large salaries of which the hon. member complains, I would never advise one of them to enter the service. I would prefer that they should go into shops, stores and banks, where they were not so well paid, according to the hon. gentleman, but where they would have a chance to rise. Here an officer at \$600 or \$700 a year with a family, has nothing left at the end of the year, except, perhaps, debts; he is in a hopeless position, and is able to obtain only a bare living. Whereas, a man entering trade and commerce, though he might meet with mishaps, might ultimately make something, which an honest Civil servant can never do. I hold it would be a great mistake to go back to the position occupied before 1871, and neither this Government nor any other Government would vote for a return to the position under which officers were removed, after giving faithful service for twenty or thirty years, without receiving a shilling. It does not appear that we are repaid the whole sum, but there is a very considerable saving effected, which compensates for the amount paid under the Civil Service Act, and there are other advantages to the public service which flow from a continuation of this policy of providing something for a man who has spent his life in the service, and who has not been able to lay by anything for himself or his family.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I quite agree that it is very desirable, in the interest of the country, that the Civil Service should be made as efficient as possible, and it cannot be made efficient unless the officials are reasonably well paid; but I remember cases when men contributed under the superannuation arrangement, a certain sum from their income every year, which they could ill afford, and, because they died during the time of their service, their families did not obtain a return of any part of the money paid in. I understand there is a proposal to establish a life insurance system, but that would never meet the case, because if it were established it would be an additional amount which the Civil servant would have to pay. If an officer dies within one year of the time when he would be entitled to superannuation, his family receive nothing. That is not a fair or reasonable thing; and I would like to hear from the hon. Minister if any arrangement could be made by which that very grave injustice could be remedied.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If this Bill is objectionable from a financial stand point, it would be still more objectionable if the suggestions of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) were adopted. I think the members of the Civil Service are perfectly satisfied to take their chance in this matter, because if we were to pay back to the family the money which every officer had paid in, it would involve a very considerable amount; and that was one of the grounds urged by Mr. Joly for reducing the amount paid by the Civil servants namely, that their contributions would not necessarily come back to them.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposal of the Administration, in the first instance, was, that this fund should be self-sustaining, and they were of the opinion that the contributions,

which originally were nearly double what they are at present, would produce that result. It is very clear from the figures, that if the original proposal would not have produced any such result, still less the diminished proposal—a proposal as my hon. friend from Muskoka will observe, was for an insurance against particular risks, and for insurance against the risk of their becoming disabled and infirm while in the service, and the insurance money is paid as insurance money against that particular risk. But it is not adequate insurance money for this purpose, because the country has to pay four times as much as the whole of the Civil servants pay, in order to carry out the obligations imposed on them, even for that limited risk; and if, in addition, the country was to undertake to pay under any events, under any circumstances, of course, the financial results of the measure would be still more onerous, as the hon. Minister of Finance pointed out, than they now are. I obtained a return from the hon. Minister of Finance a while ago. It was only a partial answer to a return which I had applied for, and the whole figures of which it was impossible to bring down, but it was numerical, and I may say it showed that since the Civil Service Act was passed the numbers are not very unequally divided between those superannuated or retired upon a gratuity under the Civil Service Act and those who died while in the service. There is a slight majority—I cannot remember the exact figures, but I think the number was 11,000 or 12,000 altogether, and there was a majority of seventy-five or thereabouts of those who got some benefit from the Civil Service Act practically, and of those who died while in the service—and therefore the hon. gentleman's observation that there is a very large proportion—and I think rather an increasing proportion than otherwise—as far as it has worked into its normal condition, although perhaps there has been too short a time yet to toll about it—of those who contributed to it and never got any practical benefit from it. Against this particular risk, another risk, which comes to us all sooner or later, happens to them, and they die in the service. I am not objecting to the second reading of the Bill because it is a Consolidation Bill; and I presume that nobody, however much opposed to this system in the beginning, and, however much convinced as I am that it requires modification in the future, would propose that Civil servants who had entered office or retained office for ten or eleven years under its operation, and who had changed their condition in life with this inducement existing, should be deprived of what may be called fairly by that much abused name sometimes—a vested right. I do not think that it would be fair or reasonable to persons in that position, even if the policy of the country should change upon this subject, to say to them: "Gentlemen, you have been ten or twelve years in the service, you have paid your subscriptions to the fund, and you entered and continued in the service under the idea of having the benefits of this provision; but we have changed that policy now and will cut you off, and return you your money." I think that any change that takes place in the policy of the country with reference to the persons who have been for any reasonable, any appreciable time in the service, must be a charge, optional as far as they are concerned, and not be compulsory upon them to their disadvantage. It is an old observation, as old as the time in which Burke introduced his great economical reform, that it is the duty of those who propose economical reforms in the State, to remember that the State is perpetual, while the lives of its servants are, after all, but of brief duration. We should not propose to do an injustice to the individual in attempting to make a public benefit. That principle was carried, in my opinion, in the particular instance to which I refer, in consideration for pensioners, a great deal further than we would be disposed to carry it, but the general principle to the extent to which I have indicated seems to me quite sound. I think that this Bill contains details of

an objectionable character, to which I called the hon. Minister's attention a while ago, and to which I will take the liberty of calling the attention of the Committee, when we go into Committee; and I think that when we go out of Committee, and it is proposed to read the Bill the third time, then will be the proper time to propose in future, and with reference to existing Civil servants, who may avail themselves of it, perhaps with reference to those who have very recently come into the service, and under any circumstances, certainly with reference to those who have yet to come into the service, some modification of a policy which was experimental at the start, and the expectations connected with which have not, I think, been answered. Speaking generally, the observations of the hon. Minister I concur in. I have always said that the condition on which we are to expect efficient service is the giving of a fair reward to those who are placed in office. I believe that a fair reward to those placed in office ought to co-exist with a determination on the part of the Administration to exact a performance of their duties from these persons; and I believe that a liberal, cheerful spirit in the performance of duty, is best to be obtained by affording that fair play which the hon. Minister advocates, and which I am always prepared to support. I agree further with the proposition of the hon. Minister, that some proposition of some kind or other in this relation is of practical consequence to the State in regard to these servants. It is an unfortunate thing that it should be so, because one of the most important things in the making up of people's characters is that they should learn for themselves that part of prudence which consists in economy, in, whatever your income may be, confining your expenditure within the margin of that income, and in saving something for a rainy day for yourself, and still more for those near and dear to you, dependent upon you; and anything which recognizes the proposition that there is to be a State aid for the period of infirmity, and that there is to be a compulsory saving, is a thing which, to that extent, takes away from the nerve, fibre and stamina of the character of those in whose favor, so to speak, such a provision was made. No doubt experience has demonstrated that, where the State is master, those feelings of compassion which we all entertain in reference to persons who may not be saving money—and who find themselves incapable of longer discharging their duty, are very strong—they are so strong as to prevail over the stern discharge of the duty to the State, which is involved, in seeing that a man is retired the moment he ceases to be able to efficiently discharge the duties to which he has been appointed. In private life, persons at any rate who have not accumulated vast means, and who are employés of others, are obliged with deep regret, but still obliged, no longer to continue the services of those who have become incapable of serving them, because they cannot afford to keep them for nothing and make them pensioners; and they are obliged to revert to the principles to which I alluded a while ago—to pay them the worth of their services they from time to time receive from them, and that it is their duty out of the moneys they have received to have accumulated what might be necessary for the period of ill-health or old age. But the State does not do so, and the Administrators of the State do not do so; and there is this additional point which is not without force: That the Administrators of the State, when they continue an officer in the service after he is unfit for, or less fit for it, are not paying out their own money. They are not themselves suffering any inconvenience—the State suffers. Somebody else is appointed; some other provision is made to do the work that has been done less efficiently; and after all it is not the individual who is called upon to make the decision that suffers personally, but the State at large. Now, these are considerations which have resulted in this way. As a matter of fact, the State does not, through its Ministers, turn

Mr. BLAKE.

people out of doors if they have not saved money, and are not able to support themselves when they have become inefficient; and you ought to put the Ministers of the State in a position in which those feelings of compassion to which I have referred shall not over-bear the sense of duty to the State, so that they will be able to say: "Now we can discharge our duty." Well, that is all very well; but once again, in all other walks of life, if those persons were professional men, or bankers, or clerks, or merchants, they would have been called upon—out of the reward for their labors received day after day, month after month, year after year—themselves to make that fund. My hon. friend has given some figures which show that taking it by the large, taking it all around—with some exceptions, I dare say—the fund is there. But it is not so applied. Now the question is whether the true mode of dealing with these cases now—not as the hon. gentleman said in 1871, when he wanted to relieve the service of a number of persons then old and infirm, and then presently to take the benefit of the Act—is to provide that in future as you are going to put in none but excellent men who have passed admirable examinations, young and vigorous men—physically and mentally fit for the service, you should provide something of the kind which my hon. friend has described—a compulsory saving graduated according to their emolument, which shall go to the credit of these gentlemen with interest accumulating, and which shall take the shape of a fund, so that when the time arrives when a particular individual leaves the service, whether by voluntary retirement from infirmity, or because he has left the world, this fund shall be available for himself or his family. This would be the adoption of a compulsory saving on the part of the service for that voluntarily which individuals are obliged to make at the risk of being driven to the wall and exposed to poverty in their old age, or when they become infirm. The making of that saving would result in the hon. Minister being able to say to a Civil servant when the time arrived when the efficiency of the service required his retirement, where is that sum which could be converted into an annuity and paid to his family afterwards because it is composed of his own savings with interest during the time he has been in service. I take occasion to make these remarks because I think that even on the second reading of this Bill when it is proposed to re-enact, not a system of superannuation, but this system of superannuation which I think has proved in many cases expensive, faulty, and defective, we should express our views upon the subject.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister himself pointed out that when the system was first introduced, it was not introduced as being the mature expression of what was thought most advisable for all time to come, but was introduced as an experiment for the time being. The hon. Minister's words when the Bill was introduced in about 1870 or 1871 were that it had been found that there were a number of old men in the service of the Government who were inefficient on account of their age, and finding himself unable to dismiss them with compensation this plan was adopted to enable him to get rid of them. If that statement was correct, as I have no doubt it was, it shows that the whole principle of the scheme of superannuation, as well as the details, are quite open to our consideration, for there is nothing in it which may be considered as having been settled by the wisdom of previous Parliaments, or settled by precedents. As the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out, things have changed very much. There is now a Civil Service Act providing that no man who is too old to expect a moderately long term of useful service shall enter the Department; that no man who is not in sound health shall enter the service. There is no reason why a different arrangement should not be made with regard to those who now enter the service under the Act, for we do not propose at all to interfere with those who are already

in the service. Of course, the great cause of the excessive superannuations in the past has been that men have been allowed to enter the service when they were too old to have a reasonable expectation of devoting any considerable time to the service, and they thus come on the country before they should have done, thereby involving an excess of expenditure, particularly because a large number of these men were appointed to the higher positions in the service. This has been remedied to a great extent by the present Act, though I think, perhaps, that the age for entrance might have been put at a lower point. The hon. Minister has said that if he had twelve sons he would rather put them in banks, or in commerce, or in other occupations where they could hope to rise, than in the Civil Service. There is no doubt that, as at present constituted, the Civil Service does not offer a very tempting career, simply because a man is by no means as sure of rising by any amount of honest work, or by persistent attention to his duties, as he would be in commerce. This is not a necessary concomitant of a Civil Service, but it is of any Civil Service such as ours which is managed as ours is, as it always has been, by political influence. So long as a man's promotion depends so much upon the amount of politics at his back rather than his qualification, so long will it be no object for active and capable young men entering the Civil Service. We have been told by one of the most efficient deputy-heads of the service—the deputy-head of the Post Office Department—that it was impossible to attract to the service fairly good men, or even as good a class of young men as the junior clerks in banks, not because the salaries were not high enough, for they are nearly double, but because there was no prospect of promotion. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has realized the fact that the great objection to the service and the thing which makes it practically an unprofitable service for active and energetic young men to enter, is, that there is no certain promotion as a reward of merit; but though he has provided that promotion shall not take place without a certain amount of competency, he does not provide that promotion shall take place in consequence of that efficiency. When he has taken that step the service will become as attractive to capable and enterprising young men as the service of banking, insurance, or other companies—in fact more so than the service of any private corporation. Men who are employed in these corporations, though they may not have the chance of becoming enormously wealthy, they have a chance of attaining to the highest position in the service of such companies; they have not only a chance but a certainty of promotion if they remain in the service of those banks or other companies, and persist in the faithful discharge of their duties. He knows that merit will be appreciated, and that promotion will not come as a result of the amount of backing he has, or of the result of some election which may occur, but that it will depend entirely upon the zeal and ability with which he discharges his duties. While we are on this subject of the salaries of the Civil Service in comparison with those paid in banks, &c., I may say that it has been pointed out that the salaries of the Civil Service are larger than those paid by such companies, especially for the lower grades. I do not believe, under present conditions, that a Civil servant can save as much money as the ordinary bank clerk or clerk in a wholesale house, receiving the same salary, for the reason that he is expected to spend more, and to take a higher position in society. He is even encouraged to do so by his superiors, for we find that when Rideau Hall festivities approach, which naturally call for a little outlay on the part of those who attend them, the Government are prepared to advance sometimes a month's salary to their employes to enable them to make preparations for these festivities. I say, therefore, that they are not only obliged, but encouraged to indulge in what would be called extravagance in another walk in life, where they receive the same salary, and on this

account they cannot be expected to save as much as they would under other circumstances. I think, therefore, that there is good ground for imposing compulsory saving upon them. The only question is whether to this compulsory saving, a bonus should be added by the Government. I am myself inclined to the opinion, though I do not lay it down authoritatively, that there is some ground for giving a bonus of a certain amount in addition to what they are compelled to save. What the amount should be is another question. I think the present contribution by the Government to the superannuation fund is excessive. I think it has been clearly shown that men, by simple persistence in the service without any particular zeal in the performance of their duties, and by political influence, succeeded in rising from one grade of the service to another, and in becoming entitled to a sum altogether out of proportion to the amount of work they have done for the country. I think the bonus should bear a fairer proportion to the amount of their compulsory saving than it does at present; and I do not know but that it might very fairly be combined with a system of Government life insurance. The Government, in addition to collecting a certain compulsory saving from their employes, might receive besides, as much as they are willing to contribute for the purpose of insuring them. This may not be much of a boon to the service; but we know that the insurance companies make a profit, and, therefore, a man's representatives do not get as much from them when he dies as they would if the fund were managed for nothing. I do not think it would be at all out of place for the Government to conduct gratuitously such an insurance fund, so as to let the Civil servants insure their lives either in a sum payable at death or in an endowment payable at a specified age, or upon a man's leaving the service. This would be a real boon to the service, as it would enable them to obtain a larger premium in proportion to what they paid than they could possibly obtain from any existing company. But I do not think the evil of the superannuation system consists exclusively in the excessive amount paid to those who are *bona fide* disabled for the service. The great abuse consists in what is too frequent under all Governments, viz.: The superannuation of men who are still able to perform their duties, merely to get rid of them, and get their places for some friend of the Government. This will continue to be the case as long as the service is regulated on political considerations; and it is in these cases, in which the Government continue to pay a man capable of work for work he is not doing, and to pay another man for doing the same work, that the abuse of the system stands out most prominently. Another abuse consists in placing men in the service too late in life, who have soon to be superannuated. The reason of the great accumulation of this fund is that it is impossible, under present conditions, to weed out inefficient men while they are still young in the service, and the drones continue to receive as much pay as those who work until they are got rid of, and the Government have to pay for their inefficiency in the shape of superannuation allowances. If political influence were done away with, and if a man's entrance into the service and position in it depended entirely upon his personal merit, there would be no difficulty about superannuation allowances, and about getting rid of inefficient men who had been for a certain length of time in the service.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the hon. Minister of Finance, while generally admitting the correctness of the figures of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to state that in no case was any one participating in the superannuation fund who had not been in the service ten years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I said that he certainly could not find those fifteen cases averaging six and a-half years.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said more than that. He said the law prevented them from participating in the fund unless they had served ten years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did; I read the provision.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will furnish the names to the House on Concurrence.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. The first clause seems to be of awkward construction.

"1. The Civil Service for the purpose of this Act shall include and consist of—

"(1.) All officers, clerks and employés in or under the several Departments of the Executive Government, who are paid a yearly salary, and to whom 'The Canada Civil Service Act, 1862,' applies, and who in case they were or are appointed after the coming into force of that Act were or are appointed in conformity with its provisions."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the phraseology used in the present Act.

Mr. BLAKE. My impression is that if a junior Civil Service clerk were called upon to draw up a clause and gave such a construction as this, he would not pass the examination. With reference to the second sub-section, I renew the objection before made. This is substantially the same as the provision in the original Act. We were then dealing with an experiment, and the Government were not in a position to bring down propositions which should fully state who should be entitled to the benefits of the Civil Service Act, and consequently that was left to their discretion. Inconveniences have occurred through classes being considered within the Act by one Government and not by another. At this time, however, after twelve years of experience, the Government ought to be able to designate what classes should receive the benefit of the superannuation allowance, and the question should no longer be left unsettled.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not prepared to agree with the hon. member in the view he takes, as new circumstances arise with new Departments and new employés. Take the railways, for instance; it may be prudent to take the leading employés, the manager and certain permanent officials on railways within the Act, and to include others, such as conductors, who, though occupying responsible positions, cannot be considered permanent employés. The hon. gentleman may say we should designate those; but there are circumstances when it is considered there should be some elasticity, and since there is no difficulty in this case, we see no reason why we should, by Act of Parliament, prevent the Government having the power to exercise that elasticity. Therefore, as long as Parliament has confidence in the Government, and if it has not, if it thinks the Government have acted unwisely in any instance, there is the constitutional mode of remedy. It was considered desirable there should be some elasticity, and that the Government should not be tied down to certain employés named specifically in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. This designation has admittedly to be made either by Act of Parliament or Order in Council; and if it is difficult to make by Act of Parliament how is it going to be made by Order in Council. Is it possible that after twelve years of experience we have not yet reaped any fruit of certainty. Rules have been laid down I presume; certain classes of the outside service have been considered; it is in the discretion of the Government whether they will be put in or kept out. The hon. gentleman says there is a constitutional mode of remedying any evil. That observation is all very fine, but it amounts to nothing. He knows that those who support him will support him over a

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

much steeper question still than the question of whether he has wisely or imprudently superannuated civil servants. He knows that prudence in all cases—I am speaking of all Governments—such prudence as has been exemplified in the conduct of constitutional and representative Government, calls for Parliament to do what they can, leaving to the Executive as little as it can, instead of, as this Government proposes, leaving the area of Executive authority as wide as possible, and obstructing the authority of Parliament as much as possible.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I just leave it where the hon. Minister left it five years ago.

Mr. BLAKE. No; we did not make this law. The hon. gentleman is now proposing to re-establish the law, to re-enact every one of those clauses. He is proposing to do that after four years of experience as to the working of the Superannuation Act. But I am dealing with this case as I always do with reference to questions between Executive and Parliament, entirely irrespective of the question of how it will affect a particular Government. We are to give no more to one Government than to another, to the Government in which we have the greatest confidence than to that in which we have no confidence at all. A majority is bound to consider what are the limits properly to be assigned to the Executive power, because the majority may become the minority, and they may find good cause for complaint. Here you find in one sub-section, Parliament designating the officers by a general enumeration who are to come within it; in the other sub-section is mentioned a very large number of officers who will admittedly come within it, although there are a large number who, I presume, will stay without. All is to be left at loose ends, so far as Parliament is concerned; for the hon. gentleman says that elasticity should be the rule, that there is some difficulty in designation, and the Governor ought to leave it in their power to deprive the whole outside service of the benefit of the Superannuation Act if it pleases to draw the line between those who are to be excluded and those who are to be included. Now, I do not agree at all in this view. I think it is a mistake. I admit it is of a piece with the general line of action of this Administration which was duly proposed to Parliament from time to time to surrender its functions and to hand them over to the Executive. The hon. gentleman knows that he may look with perfect confidence upon his friends sustaining him, even though he may commit great errors, even improper acts, with reference to the superannuation of particular individuals. His friends would say then: "The mischief is done, we cannot revoke it, why should we cry over spilt milk? Shall we join in a vote of censure on our friends when it will do no good? We may privately remonstrate with them, but we will not join in a vote of censure." The true security is to prevent the wrong being done, to prevent a repetition of the wrong by punishing those who have committed it. But we know from very long experience that this security is an illusory one, so far as this Government is concerned.

Mr. CASEY. The reading of this clause is vague in another respect. Amongst those who are employed in an established capacity and paid a yearly salary are many who are occupied but a small portion of the year. We heard the other day of a great many fishery wardens in the Maritime Provinces who are paid \$300 or \$400 a year, and who are occupied but a portion of the time; and as this clause leaves it open to the Governor in Council to declare that those who are employed in an established capacity and are paid a yearly salary, may come under the provisions of this Act, officers like these might be held to be included.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This gives authority to the Governor in Council to deal with these very men.



On sub-section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. There may be some persons who are contributing to the superannuation fund in error. We have had such cases before, where contributions had been made for a considerable time; but you are making an absolute provision that all those who contribute to the fund shall be entitled to superannuation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It provides that persons who now contribute shall come under the operation of the first and second clauses.

On section 2,

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest that instead of paying an annuity to officers superannuated, Parliament should pay them a lump sum based on their length of service. The cost to the country under the present system depends on the number of years the officer lives after he has left the service. The amount given could be invested by the officer as he pleased; at all events, I do not think the country should be bound down to pay him so much a year, no matter how long he might live.

On section 3,

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest to the hon. Minister whether it would not be proper, in regard to the use of the ten years' clause, to pass an Order in Council in the case of all persons who enter the service over thirty years of age declaring whether or not they were to be treated as eligible under this clause. If you declare that the person who has been appointed, was appointed as being possessed of particular attainments and qualifications you will then know when you come to deal with the matter of superannuation whether he comes within the clause or not. At present, if you were considering the question of superannuation, an officer might say that he was appointed when more than thirty years of age, and that he had special qualifications, although he was only too glad to come into the service at the time of this appointment. My proposal is that in all cases in which a person is employed as possessing special professional or other qualifications or attainments, that fact should be expressly stated in the Order in Council on his appointment; if not, that it should be conclusive that his appointment did not come under this clause.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will take this suggestion into consideration.

Bill reported.

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

### After Recess.

#### SUPPLY.

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

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the condition of public business this Session, and contrast it with former Sessions, and to invite the attention of the House to the situation in which we stand with reference to several measures which were proposed in the Speech from the Throne. The Sessions for the last nine years have averaged about eighty-one days.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Might I ask the hon. member to postpone his remarks in the absence of the leader of the Government, whom I would like to have here while he is making his comments.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the House be in Committee of Supply again?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will not complete the Estimates to-night.

Mr. BLAKE. I was anxious to make my observations to-night; but as the hon. gentleman says we will not conclude the Estimates at this sitting I will postpone them.

(In the Committee.)

327. Governor General Secretary's Office—To pay to C. J. Jones, difference of salary between \$1,450 and \$1,800 from 1st February to 30th June, 1883, as provided by the Civil Service Act..... \$145.83

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Civil Service Act provides that in the event of a senior officer being absent from sickness, or on leave, the officer below him who discharges his duties temporarily is entitled to be paid at the rate paid the senior officer. In the present case the vacancy occurred, not by leave of absence or sickness, but by the death of the senior, for which no provision is made in the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a temporary allowance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

328. Department of the Secretary of State—To provide for the salary of one chief clerk in Correspondence branch \$2,000, and for the statutory increase to the salary of one clerk (omitted in main Estimates) \$50..... \$2,050.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to explain that when Mr. Grant Powell was promoted to the Under-Secretaryship of State we omitted in the main estimates to provide for the salary of the chief clerk who took his place. This chief clerk will receive \$2,000 instead of \$2,400 which was paid to Mr. Powell.

329. Department of Finance—Additional allowance to the Clerk of Contingencies..... \$200.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is \$200 additional to Mr. Ross, the Clerk of Contingencies. He was in the Secretary of State's Department at the time the stationary was re-organized, and he took charge of that office at the request of the head of the Department. He left the Department of the Secretary of State rather reluctantly, because he was hoping for an advantage which, as it turns out, he would have received had he remained there, as he was the senior of the gentleman who has since been appointed deputy head.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this a permanent increase?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

330. Department of Railways and Canals—To provide for the salaries of four third class clerks..... \$2,800.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These are two persons who have been employed at \$2 a day for a number of years, and they are now to be put on the permanent list.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not fully understand how this is. The reason, I presume, for the division of the Department of Public Works into two separate Departments was the view that the Canadian Pacific Railway was about to be constructed as a public work—at all events, that was the main reason. Now that that work is being constructed by a private corporation, it is obvious that the work of the Department of Railways and Canals must be less instead of more, than if the whole responsibility of that construction continued to be in that office. Why at this day and under these circumstances more permanent officers are proposed to be added to the Department of Railways and Canals I cannot very well see.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There have been a number of persons temporarily employed, some of them for several years, and it is proposed to place two of these persons on the permanent list, by which their salaries will be rather decreased than increased. What the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the division of the Department is quite true, but it will be some time before these works are

finished, and there will be no great relief to the work of the Department until they are finally finished. Besides, a great deal of the work connected with the management of the Intercolonial Railway is being done at headquarters in the Department which was formerly performed outside.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose the Committee will readily accept the statement that there has been a saving by adding these gentlemen to the permanent list as meaning that this would be the ultimate result to the public Treasury. These men may have been employed temporarily at a higher rate than the minimum salary of a junior clerk, but putting them on the permanent list involves considerations of permanency, promotions, increases, and so on. Will the hon. gentleman say how long they have been temporarily employed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Over two years, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is since the reorganization, and since the Canadian Pacific Railway contract that they came in?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to state at this moment. It is more probably three years.

Mr. BLAKE. Since the reorganization, at any rate. Of course, the work is very rapidly diminishing, because we have the Thunder Bay section practically out of the way now, and only the Columbia part remains for the Government to deal with, and what I observe is that the reorganization of the Railway Department was based upon the supposition that the whole work of the Pacific Railway was to devolve upon the Government. But immediately after the contract was let, and the Company assumed the responsibility of locating and constructing these portions of the line, which they have been engaged upon since, there was an immediate diminution of the strain on the Railway Department, and, therefore, it was the reason that I was surprised to learn that it was proposed to grant permanent increases at this time, or to appoint any new permanent officers. When you make a man a third class clerk against his will, you will probably have to keep him against your will when the time comes for the Department to be diminished in the scope of its operations, and we hope in the scope of its expenses.

335. To pay to the widow of the late Judge Fisher, for extra services rendered by him to the Government under Commission from 1870 to 1881..... \$2,400.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this extraordinary item?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Before the Union, we passed a law in New Brunswick establishing a Court of Divorce, and one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province acted as the Judge of that Court. After the Union that Court, being a Provincial Court both in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, continued to exist, and Judge Fisher was appointed the Judge of the Court in New Brunswick, and Judge Ritchie in Nova Scotia. Judge Ritchie was also a Judge in equity, for which he received a salary of \$5,000 a year, while Judge Fisher received \$4,000. Judge Fisher frequently made application to the Government for the same salary as Judge Ritchie received, and almost his last communication addressed to the Government previous to his death was the renewal of that application. As the Government had decided that at Judge Ritchie's death his successor should only receive \$4,000, they did not see their way to give Judge Fisher the increase he asked for. So the matter has remained since, and at the solicitation of his widow, who pointed out the justice of the Government paying something for the services rendered by her husband in this Court, an enquiry was made as to the number of cases brought before Judge Fisher to be adjudicated upon during the time he held this Commission. The number was found to be thirty-two,  
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and it is proposed to pay his widow \$75 for each case, making \$2,400.

Mr. BLAKE. This is one of the most extraordinary propositions, I think, ever submitted to Parliament. This gentleman accepted the office of Judge and the office of Judge of the Divorce Court. These offices were not forced upon him, and he was not reluctant to accept them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This was after he was appointed Judge.

Mr. BLAKE. No; according to my memory, it was at the same time that he was appointed that there was a vacancy in the Divorce Court. When was Judge Fulton appointed a Judge?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think in 1870.

Mr. BLAKE. And this settlement is for the time extending from 1870 to 1881, so that his Commission was for the same time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not sure that it was.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it was, and if the hon. gentleman is not acquainted with the facts, I think he should familiarize himself with them before he comes down with this vote. My recollection is that these appointments were contemporaneous; but whether contemporaneous or not, there was no compulsion on Judge Fisher to accept the offices. He accepted them; I do not know that he ever had an additional salary as Judge of the Divorce Court. Parliament never provided an additional salary, and never was asked for it. As often happens with public officers, after he was appointed he thought he was under paid, and he made a special claim of this Divorce Court business. The hon. gentleman's Government repudiated the claim. Another Government came in; he renewed his application, and during the whole time of that Government it was refused on the ground that there was no justification for coming to Parliament for a special salary. That Government went out and the old Government came back again, and remained from 1879 to 1881, during which time, I suppose, Judge Fisher continued his application; and now, after the expiration of all these years, the hon. gentleman comes down with a proposal to pay the Judge \$75 a case for the cases tried. That there were thirty-two cases which actually came to a hearing in New Brunswick, in the course of those eleven years surprises me. There may have been that number of cases entered in court, but that there was that number tried I doubt extremely; and to make the proposal that a Judge is to be paid so much a head for the cases he tries—\$75 a head during eleven years—is certainly utterly unprecedented. He was simply discharging his judicial duties, and there is no justification at all for taking out of the Treasury now the sum of \$2,400. If he had a right to be paid the Government have no right to make the money a present to the widow, for it belongs to his estate and may be the property of his creditors. We make allowance to widows of deceased public servants; but that is a present given out of our liberality, and stands in an altogether different position from that which the hon. gentleman says is a debt. I believe the trumping up and paying of old demands on the public purse which have been repudiated by so many Governments is utterly unexampled in the history of the country.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The claim of Judge Fisher was for \$1,000 a year. As to the payment to the widow the Government have no particular desire to pay the money to her, and will have no objection to paying it to the executors, for it will go to her benefit and that of her children. The claim was made a year after for \$1,000 a year.

Mr. BLAKE. And repudiated.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; because the Government did not feel paying it as it was not known what the

extent of the labor would be. At that time the Government felt satisfied the labor he performed was not worth \$1,000 a year, but at the time of his death when the claim came in another shape for services rendered in cases he had to deal with, the Government felt they were justified in asking Parliament to contribute the amount. The hon. gentleman says it is exceptional to allow \$75 for cases of this kind. Was there not some provision in the Election Law giving Judges allowances for election cases?

Mr. BLAKE. There was, but it was thought so unseemly and improper that it was struck out.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At all events there was such a provision, and no doubt in the legislation of the present Session there may be duties imposed on Judges for which they ought to be paid. The Government thought that in equity this sum should be allowed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman now says it was because Judge Fisher asked too much. What is the relation that was supposed to exist between the Judge and the Government? He says the Government ought to have paid something, but too much was asked, and therefore they gave him nothing at all. And that continued during ten or twelve years of his judicial life. What correspondence was there on the subject? What was the attitude of the Government? Did the Government say: "We ought to pay you something, but as you ask too much, we will pay you nothing." This is degrading to the character of the bench, and does not accurately represent what the relations of the Administration were to the Judge in this regard. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that thirty-two divorce cases were actually tried during this term? I doubt it very much.

Mr. PICKARD. The late Judge Fisher was appointed in 1868. If he had done any work extra entitling him to pay beyond the \$1,000 that the other four Judges in New Brunswick received, I certainly think it is only paying for delay of justice in now settling the claim. I had the honor every year, until his death, of presenting a letter from him to the right hon. leader of the Government, asking for some compensation for work done as a Judge of the Divorce Court. His letters to me I never could read. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman could read those sent to him, but the late Judge always told me what he was going to write about.

Mr. BLAKE. I can corroborate the hon. gentleman's statement. I never saw any handwriting so difficult to read as that of the late Judge.

Mr. PICKARD. I presented a letter from him to the Government of which the hon. member for Durham was a member, because I received them every year.

Mr. BLAKE. But my hon. friend did not get much satisfaction from either of us. Will the hon. Minister of Finance give us a list of those thirty-two cases, and the years they were tried in, or if they were tried? Some proceedings take place in some cases which go no further than the presenting of a petition.

331. Department of Interior—To provide for the salary of the Surveyor-General..... \$3,200.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Lindsay Russell is performing the duties of Surveyor-General and of Deputy Minister of Interior; but it has been found absolutely necessary that he should be to a considerable extent removed from the work of the office in order to devote himself to the survey. He still holds his position of Surveyor-General, but we must have another person in the Department. A great portion of the working season Mr. Russell must be in the North-West. Men are continually going up there for the purpose of expediting the survey. There are a great many difficulties arising in regard to the accuracy of the survey,

or improper proceedings on the part of the surveyors, and Mr. Russell will have to examine into them. He will be charged with doing more field work than office work.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand there is to be a Deputy Minister of Interior, a separate officer, and a Surveyor-General?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; this arrangement will probably go into operation about the 1st of July.

336. For a gratuity of one year's salary to J. Dillon, guard at Kingston Penitentiary, as compensation for loss of sight whilst performing his duties.. \$550.00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In reference to this case I will read the report of the hon. Minister of Justice:

"The undersigned has the honor to report that Mr. Jeremiah Dillon, guard in the Kingston Penitentiary, whose health and sight have been failing for a long period, has now become almost totally blind. Warden Creighton reports, that Dillon is without means of any consequence, with an aged mother wholly and two sisters partially depending upon him, and that in his present condition he is not able to help himself. He also states, that this officer has been most faithful in the discharge of his various duties.

"Dillon was appointed guard on the 1st January, 1871.

"His salary is \$450, with an additional \$100 for performing the duties of assistant school teacher.

"The Inspector of Penitentiaries reports, that 'this man has always proved himself a thoroughly competent, faithful, and respectable officer, in fact exceptionally so; he also recommends that a small annuity be allowed Dillon during his life, or failing that, two year's salary as a gratuity.

"On his retirement which it is intended should take place on the 30th June next, he will be entitled to a gratuity equal to one month's salary for each year of service up to ten, and a half month's salary for each additional year.

"In view of the unfortunate nature of the case, the undersigned recommends that an amount equal to one year of his salary, namely \$550, be put in the Supplementary Estimates for 1883-84 for Mr. Dillon, as a special recognition of his services, and the unfortunate circumstances under which he is retired, this to be in addition to any gratuity which may be allowed to him."

Mr. BLAKE. This vote is rather misleading. The statement in the vote is that it is for compensation for loss of sight while performing his duties. I had supposed some accident had happened in the discharge of his duties by which he had lost his sight, but it appears that is not the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. While performing his duties, but not from any accident.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not appear to be in any way in consequence of the discharge of his duties, or from any accident which occurred to him in the discharge of his duties. This is just the same thing as if some ordinary disease had beset him, or as if a stroke of paralysis had rendered him incapable. Up to a few years ago there was no provision for these persons disabled under these circumstances; but in my time we established a provision for the retirement of men under these circumstances which would have covered the case of this unfortunate man. But because by reason of advancing infirmity he has lost his eye sight, it is proposed he shall have a year's salary besides the usual gratuity. We cannot give to him and refuse to another. If you establish this precedent all those who become infirm in the service of the penitentiary will be asking for a similar gratuity, and you will have to award it practically to all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this man had been in the Civil Service he would have a superannuation allowance, but instead of that we give him a year's pay. I did not intend to trouble the House further in the matter, but I shall read the warden's report on the case:

"I regret to be obliged to report that Guard Jeremiah Dillon, whose sight had been failing for a long period, has now become almost totally blind, and I fear there is no hope that Dillon will ever again recover his health. His case is a very sad one, and I hope that in considering it the following facts will be given exceptionally favorable consideration.

"Dillon is without means of any consequence—with an aged mother wholly, and two sisters partially, depending upon him. He has been a kind son and brother, sober, clever, well educated, faithful and most industrious in the discharge of his duties.

"You will remember that Dillon had charge of the dry room. There all the prison clothing was dried in winter and on wet days in summer. And until we got a centrifugal wringer, which wrings the water out of the clothes more thoroughly before they are taken to the dry room the atmosphere was invariably very moist and almost always offensive. The steam dyeing closets recently introduced are a great improvement, but they came too late for poor Dillon's benefit. Dillon's duty was arduous, but he was so correct and methodical, keeping the convicts bedding, shirts, socks, &c, in good order, that there was little room for complaint. And I felt much relieved to know that I had an officer in that department who could not be humbugged by the convicts, and who had a place for everything and everything in its place. But I have no doubt that doing duty in the dry room so constantly had an injurious effect upon Dillon's eyes, as well as upon his general health.

"Jeremiah Dillon was appointed guard at this Penitentiary on 1st January, 1871, and in addition was appointed assistant school-teacher on 26th September, 1873. Making his salary from that date about \$550 per annum, out of this he has saved a little, which he has invested in two little houses. In one of these he lives, and the rent from the other is a very small and precarious pittance.

"In his present condition Dillon is not able to take care of himself, hence his case is most pitiable. I have not yet struck his name from the guards' pay list, and I propose continuing him on it till 30th June, if not otherwise ordered.

"Dillon is most anxious that the Government would allow him a small annuity during his life, or failing that, two years' salary as a gratuity. The annuity, however, would be most acceptable.

"With this brief statement I leave the matter in the hands of the Department, hoping that Dillon's case will receive most favorable consideration. It may be fairly made exceptional, as such another case may not occur again in twenty-five years.

338. House of Commons—To meet amount required to pay L. J. Piteau, indemnification for loss of appointment as Assistant French Translator, 1878 ..... \$383.53

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. Minister explain this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The case is this: Mr. Piteau was a sessional translator previous to 1878. He claims three months salary and travelling expenses on account of having been relieved from his position as permanent French translator, to which he was appointed on 2nd December, 1878. He had been officially informed of his appointment by Mr. Anglin, as Speaker, after the Elections of 1878, and his appointment was to begin on 1st December, at a salary of \$1,400. He accordingly reported himself to the Clerk of the House, Mr. Patrick, and was informed that the appointment could not be recognized. Mr. Piteau was not permitted to enter on his official duties. He had been for several years previously employed as a sessional translator, and discharged his duties satisfactorily. Now he demands three months salary, \$350, and \$33.60 as travelling expenses to and from his home at Somerset, Megantic, Province of Quebec. This gentleman having been so informed by Mr. Anglin, thought the appointment would be maintained, and did not take any other employment.

Mr. BLAKE. Who took his position?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. Minister inform me whether it is intended to apply the same rule to Mr. Brossoit, who was also appointed by Mr. Anglin as a permanent French translator, and who never was permitted to perform his duties?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of that gentleman I know nothing. This case was brought before us, and is the only one.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the date of Mr. Piteau's claim?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. His claim came before us during the last five or six months.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I supposed so.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no reason whatever why, if this rule should apply to Mr. Piteau's case, it should not  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

apply to that of Mr. Brossoit. Two vacancies occurred in the French translators' office: one was that of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), who retired to contest Ottawa, and the other was that of Mr. David, who also resigned to be a candidate in the Elections of 1878. One was elected and the other had not that good fortune. Mr. Anglin, thinking he would be Speaker, and acting in that capacity, appointed two gentlemen to fill the vacancy, namely, Mr. Piteau and Mr. Brossoit. Neither of those gentlemen was allowed to perform their duties, and their places were given to some other parties, whose names I do not now remember. Since that time Mr. Piteau—I cannot speak positively, but I am under the impression—remonstrated time and again at his dismissal. His claim has not been recognized until this year, and of late Mr. Piteau has changed his politics, and last year worked for the hon. member for Megantic. Whether this has had any effect on the case I do not know.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed by my hon. colleagues and hon. members round me that the claim was made before that period. The case came before me during the last six months. As regards the politics of Mr. Piteau, all I know is that the last time I knew anything about him he was working hard against me, and, therefore, I cannot be supposed to be partial; but I thought this was a case in which the gentleman was entitled to indemnification. Mr. Brossoit's case, we are bound to consider when it comes before us, and we will have then to decide whether he is entitled to indemnification or not.

Mr. LAURIER. He is still an unrepentant sinner; but there is more joy over the repentance of one sinner than over dozens who have never politically sinned. Mr. Piteau's claim had been several years before the Government, and he always considered he had been harshly treated. The Minister says this was only during the last four or five months brought to his consideration—I suppose that he means favorable consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so. I think, however, that the word "favorable" might be omitted by the hon. gentleman. When I stated that it had not come under my notice, of course, I meant exactly what I said. I was not aware of the claim until there was question of the Order in Council.

340. Immigration,—Victoria, B.C., Agent, &c..... \$1,500.00

Mr. POPE. This is a new agency, and the item explains itself. We are trying to induce emigration from the Old Country to British Columbia, and we succeeded slightly last year in doing so. We hope to be able to do more, and we are offering inducements in this relation.

Mr. BLAKE. Hitherto there has been no organized arrangement in this relation?

Mr. POPE. No; none at all.

341. Quarantine—Sydney, N.S.—Inspecting Physician, &c..... \$1,400.00

Mr. POPE. This is also a new item. Sydney is a very important shipping place, and, perhaps, as many ships call there as at any other port in Nova Scotia, from what I hear. We found it necessary to give this very small sum to provide for an officer to look after this place.

Mr. BLAKE. It is true, of course, that this is a very important port of call, and no doubt there has also been a considerable increase in its traffic, and in the number of ships coaling there. Has there been no organization of any kind up to this time? And will the hon. gentleman state, not the number of vessels that came there simply to coal, but the number which took in or discharged cargoes during the year?

Mr. POPE. I cannot do so.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). I can tell the hon. gentleman that at the port of Sydney last season 300 Atlantic steamers loaded with bunker coal; and during the past calendar year about 500,000 tons of shipping called, while at its out-ports the ships which entered and cleared could not have been less than 250,000 tons, making 750,000 tons in all for the ports in the county of Cape Breton alone. I may say that very frequently small-pox is brought to this port in vessels, and this gives us a great deal of trouble. For the last several years we have been endeavoring to get the Government to build a quarantine hospital, and at last they have consented to do so. I am glad to say that the contract has been awarded, and that the building is being erected. This matter cost the Government, some three or four years ago, I think, a considerable sum. Several vessels came to this port five years ago, and two in particular, the owners of which, from St. John, N.B., were obliged to build a temporary hospital for their men. This cost the owners of the vessels a good deal, and I think that the Government made good a portion of the expense to which these owners were put. Hereafter, however, nothing of this kind will have to be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any information with reference to what I was very sorry to see in a paper to-day—a very serious outbreak of small-pox at St. Boniface?

Mr. POPE. No; I have not.

Mr. BLAKE. The newspapers say it is very serious

Mr. POPE. I do not think that this is possible from recent information which I have received. Formerly at Sydney we had temporary provision for these cases; the Custom House officers could quarantine vessels and send the men to some other port, where provision for patients existed.

Mr. ROYAL. As to the report in the papers with reference to small-pox in some part of Manitoba, I am enabled to state, from a private letter received from that locality, that this disease has existed in some localities on Red River during last winter; one or two families of half-breeds only had it two or three weeks ago; and this small affair has been greatly exaggerated. I am able to state that no such thing as this disease has broken out in that locality; besides, the municipal authorities of St. Boniface, some two or three weeks ago, provided hospital accommodation to meet any such emergency that might arise.

Mr. DODD. As to the port of Sydney, it is peculiarly situated, inasmuch as it is a port of divergence for vessels coming across the Atlantic to southern or western ports, in the St. Lawrence or in the States. An immense amount of shipping called there last year. In addition to some 200 odd steamships, which called at our port, we had in the aggregate an amount of shipping beyond that which visited the port of Montreal, the largest shipping port of Canada. It is necessary, of course, that precautions should be taken against the spread of small-pox, which is frequently brought there by vessels; and consequently this is a very proper vote for a proper purpose.

342. Militia ..... \$180,500.00

Mr. CARON. The first item is for the purchase of building and property situated on the east side of the canal basin required for military store purposes at Ottawa, \$8,000. I may say that the military stores were kept in a building on the opposite side of the canal, but it was quite insufficient for keeping these stores, which are of great value. The building we are about to purchase for the sum of \$8,000 is one upon a lot owned by the Government, for which there is a rental due of \$3,000. The Government gets this building for \$3,000, and this arrearage of rent. This building cost Dufresne & McGarity \$20,000, and it is sufficient to contain all the military stores we will require for years to

come, so that I think it will be admitted that we purchased a very valuable property at a reasonable price. Besides the military stores we intend to have the offices of the Brigade Major, the District Adjutant and others removed to this building, so as to give more room in the Department, which is overcrowded so far as the officers required for working the different branches are concerned.

Mr. VAIL. Where is the building?

Mr. CARON. It is on the east end of the Sappers Bridge—a stone building connected with the street by a wooden way. I may say that these stores require a great deal of care so far as preventing damp, which interferes with their value. The present building is of stone but it is not lined, but the new building is lined with wood, and there is a heating apparatus which will not only save a considerable expenditure, but will keep the stores in the best of order. I may say that the matter of the rental was referred to the Department of Justice, and it was considered that in giving up this rental and paying \$8,000 we were securing a building which was a decided acquisition at that price.

Mr. BLAKE. There seems to be an error in the mode in which the vote is proposed to be taken. It is evident that the \$3,000 of public debt due, I presume, on Ordnance Lands is a portion of the price of this property, so the price is really \$11,000 instead of \$8,000 as stated in the Estimates. The proper course would be to take a vote for \$11,000, and then \$3,000 of arrears in rent would go to the credit of the Ordnance Lands account, instead of disappearing altogether as it will by this mode of taking the vote. The vote mentions property as well as building: what property goes with the building?

Mr. CARON. The Ordnance Lands not being under the control of my Department the \$3,000 on that account cannot appear in my estimates at all, as I have to submit to Parliament in my estimates only what I am called upon to pay in the purchase of that property, which is \$8,000. As to the other point we have, of course, to be as careful as possible in framing these estimates; and there may be some outside properties, as for example the sidewalk to the street, which, though included in the purchase price, cannot be designated as part of the building.

Mr. BLAKE. It is true the hon. gentleman will have nothing to do with the \$3,000 except paying it, but the \$3,000 is part of the price.

Mr. CARON. I do not pay it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman should pay it, else the Ordnance Lands will lose it. It is part of the consideration, and certainly Messrs. Dufresne & McGarity are not going to pay it. It is obvious that unless the hon. gentleman takes a vote for \$11,000 of which \$3,000 is a set-off, the \$3,000 will not be credited at all. Either the tenant must pay it, or the Crown must pay it as part of the price of this property, and if the Crown must pay it, it must be paid by another Department. Will the hon. gentleman state whether this great bargain was achieved by arbitration, by valuation, or by private arrangement, or how the price was arrived at?

Mr. CARON. The Department of Militia applied to the Department of Justice to recover this amount of rental, which had not been paid. Through the gentlemen who were acting for the Department of Justice, we learned that the property could be purchased for this sum, which we agreed was really far under its value; and it was a question whether it was better to purchase this property or to make the improvements and repairs which were absolutely necessary for the safety of the Militia stores. Officers both from the Public Works Department and the Militia Department were sent to inspect the old store building and the building we contemplated purchasing, and they all agreed that the purchase would be a saving of money to the

country, and a very valuable addition to the property of the Department. Under these circumstances, and especially as the stores, which were valuable, were in danger of being completely spoiled within a few months in the old building, we decided to make the purchase.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there any inspection, or any report from the officers as to the value of this building?

Mr. CARON. There is a written report which gives all the details, and which was submitted to Council before any action was taken. That report I shall be very glad to submit to Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the property in the hands of the tenants?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And how long had the arrears of rent been accumulating?

Mr. CARON. The property was leased by the Government to the firm of Dufresne & McGarity, who got into financial difficulties seven or eight years ago. Upon a lease obtained for a number of years they put up this valuable building, which was not only a warehouse, but their place of business, and was most elaborately fitted up. When Dufresne & McGarity got into difficulties the lease was taken by another firm, whose name I forget; but they never paid up the rent. I saw that those arrears stood against us in the books, and I submitted a statement to the Minister of Justice and asked him to proceed to recover this money, and ultimately the matter was settled in the way I have mentioned. The report which I will bring down gives all the details. With regard to the vote of \$20,000 for the purchase of ammunition, hon. gentlemen will understand that the stores have been allowed to run down considerably, and we have had to draw on the reserve of ammunition for the purpose of accommodating the annual artillery practice. The stores got so low that it became necessary for the Department to ask Parliament to vote this amount for replenishing them and enabling us to meet the requirements of the service.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose for some time the hon. gentleman has been drawing on the reserve ammunition stock until it has got this low.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman must go beyond the period of time when I took charge of the Department. The hon. gentleman who preceded me in this office will agree with me that the stores have been allowed to run down below what they should have been allowed to run at any period. To meet annual requirements and gradually reform the reserve this sum was required—\$5,000—for the annual requirements, and the remainder of the \$20,000 for the reserve.

Mr. BLAKE. It will take three years at \$20,000 each year to bring the reserve to the proper point, or \$60,000?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to know the hon. gentleman calculates we will have no war inside of four years, but will have that time to make up our reserve in case of emergency.

Mr. CARON. The next item is \$150,000 for artillery battery and cavalry and infantry schools. The policy of the Government is to establish three schools of infantry to be composed of 100 men each. It is also the policy of the Government to establish a battery similar to "A" and "B" Batteries, to be called "C" Battery. This will be stationed in British Columbia. After consulting those who could advise me from a military point, I concluded that the British Columbia force should be an artillery force, and the intention is to place the commandant of "C" Battery also in command of the military district, substituting the commandant of "C" Battery for the Deputy

Mr. CARON,

Adjutant-General who formerly had the military command of this military district. By so doing we will have an artillery officer perfectly *au fait* with this branch, and who, moreover, will save us the pay we would otherwise have to give to the Deputy Adjutant-General. My intention is to combine the position of the commandant of "C" Battery with the position of Deputy Adjutant-General. By combining both we can save one of these offices, and have a unit so far as the military side of the question is concerned—one officer who will command not only the permanent force but also the military organization. The hon. gentleman would, no doubt, like to know the details of the expenditure we are going to make. As I stated on a former occasion, the whole expenditure will amount to \$203,900. This covers the three military schools, "C" Battery and a troop of cavalry. One half of that troop will be added to the establishment of "A" Battery in Quebec, and the other half to "B" Battery in Kingston. The object of thus dividing the troop is, that by adding sixteen horses to "A" and "B" Batteries each, it will be possible to organize a good permanent school of cavalry which will be a training school for the field officers and for the cavalry of this country. The captain of the Infantry School is to get \$1,460; two lieutenants, \$1,460 combined. These together with the sergeants, corporals, and ninety-two men, will make up \$16,200. The men's pay will be 40 cts. per head. That comprises the permanent establishment. To that we must add rations for 100 men, \$500; uniforms, boots, kits, &c., \$3,500; barracks, furniture, transport, fuel, light and contingencies, \$7,533, making \$37,000 for everything in each infantry school. The total amount for each school will be \$44,300. The troop of cavalry, as I stated, is to be divided; the cost will reach \$22,800. To establish these troops of cavalry we will have to add to that \$3,900 for the purpose of purchasing horses required for the troop; but this item will not be required another year.

Mr. BLAKE. Except the remounts.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman would be surprised to learn how these cavalry and artillery horses live. The hon. gentleman will understand that under my system I intend to prevent war. The hon. gentleman must see that I am taking every possible precaution to avoid a war, and to save the expenditure we would have to incur in case of war.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not given us the details of the \$22,800.

Mr. CARON. I have not got the details of expenditure for rations, horses, blankets, saddles, &c., but if the hon. gentleman requires, I will bring it down. I should have to go back to the old items in the Estimates to find exactly the items which have already been submitted to Parliament in detail, when I had to discuss the items for "A" and "B" Batteries. The items are exactly similar, except that in "A" and "B" Batteries each is composed of 150 men, whereas "C" Battery will only have one hundred. In discussing the Bill I gave the hon. gentleman the different items composing the expenditure. I was asked how I could explain that "C" Battery was going to cost so much less than "A" and "B" Batteries, and the reason I gave for the smaller estimate was that instead of having 150 men we had 100.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimated gross expenditure of "A" and "B" Batteries?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will see in the Estimates there is an amount for pay and equipment, "A" and "B" Batteries, \$125,700, from which has to be deducted \$2,500 on account of the transfer of an item to another Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Where are the three new schools to be stationed?

Mr. CARON. The intention is to establish an infantry school in the Province of Quebec—I expect, without stating it, as a matter of certainty, on St. Helen's Island, near Montreal, or at St. Johns. Another school will be in the Maritime Provinces, probably at St. John, N.B. The third will be in Ontario, probably and almost certainly at Toronto. The hon. gentleman knows that at Toronto we have a valuable military property, which, from the information I have received from the officers of the Department, could, with a very little expenditure on repairs, be made perfectly convenient for the force we require to have there. The intention is to make use of all the military property we possess in the way of barracks, so as to reduce the expenditure on buildings. The Cavalry School will be located in British Columbia and the whole district will be turned into an artillery corps.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman formed any idea of what the additional expense for buildings will be?

Mr. CARON. As far as Montreal, St. John, N.B., and Toronto are concerned, I believe the repairs for this year will be covered by the Estimates submitted to Parliament for public works for military purposes. In British Columbia we have no such property, and it is impossible for me—and that is the reason why I do not ask for the vote—at present to know exactly what will be required. I am trying to ascertain whether we will be able to obtain the accommodation required without building; but if it becomes a question of erecting a building, for the purpose of accommodating a force of 100 men, we will not go into the expenditure which the Imperial Government lavished on military works and buildings in Canada, as hon. members will perfectly understand. As far as British Columbia is concerned, I have not made an estimate, and have not asked for a vote, because, from the information I am able to collect, we will have to rent accommodation at first, and have plans prepared for a permanent building, an estimate of which will be submitted to Parliament. In regard to St. John, New Brunswick, I may say—

Mr. VAIL. I think all the military buildings at St. John were burnt during the great fire. There are some at Fredericton.

Mr. CARON. I speak of St. John, New Brunswick; but as the hon. gentleman belongs to the Maritime Provinces he is, of course, a much better authority as to the military buildings there than I am.

Mr. BLAKE. If it is determined to locate the school at St. John, and the military buildings have been burned, as my hon. friend mentions, a new building will be required. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has finally fixed at St. John or has considered the case of Fredericton.

Mr. CARON. I have not definitely fixed the places.

Mr. BLAKE. For British Columbia an amount will be required for buildings, and I suppose the House will be asked for a vote before any large expenditure is incurred. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman considered, in making the estimate which is based upon the cost of "A" and "B" Batteries, the increased cost of living in British Columbia. My hon. friend who comes from that Province says that it is rather a dear country to live in, and I observe that extra votes are given occasionally in consequence of the increased expense of living in British Columbia over the happier land in which it is our good fortune to reside. Does the hon. gentleman expect to maintain this battery as cheaply as in the east?

Mr. CARON. I believe that this over-expenditure will diminish as soon as the railway is built, and the natural means of communication are improved. I must admit, however, that this is a difficulty, and one which I have to examine into, as Head of the Department. From all I can

ascertain, I believe that a permanent force can be kept up there, for the most part, as cheaply as here. The pay of the men will be the same, but I cannot at present say what the allowances will be. I think, however, I can keep up "C" Battery within my estimate.

Mr. BLAKE. Will there be any additional expenditure with reference to attaching portions of the troop of cavalry to "A" and "B" Batteries, touching accommodation?

Mr. CARON. No.

244. Public Buildings—Nova Scotia..... \$11,600.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As to the first, the lot will cost about \$1,000, and other expenses, the survey, &c., will be about \$200. For the works at Yarmouth, \$15,000 will not be sufficient for the entire expenditure, but this will suffice for this year. We will likely require \$7,000 more. Room is to be provided in the Marine Hospital at Picton for sixteen or twenty beds; and to raise the rear wall of the building to the same height as the front. We had a vote for the site at North Sydney, and the lot will be purchased before the 1st of July; \$15,000 will be required during the year to proceed with the building, which, in all, will cost \$20,000. The building at Baddeck will cost between \$15,000 and \$16,000. The lot at Arichat will not be an extensive one; and the sites at North Sydney, Baddeck and Yarmouth have not yet been purchased.

245. Public Buildings—Prince Edward Island..... \$5,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a vote of \$5,000 for a Custom House and Post Office at Montague, and I think we will be able to erect an armory besides. The cost will be about \$12,000.

Mr. DAVIES. There is an armory at Georgetown in the same county and about ten miles distant. I would ask if this vote included the purchase of land and where the site is to be, whether on the north or south side of the river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote includes the land. I cannot give any information as to the site, as it has not been selected. Before purchasing we generally send a confidential officer of the Department to look at the different sites and to make a report showing prices and other particulars along with the plan, and upon this report I make my report to Council.

Mr. KEEFLER. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the amount of revenue collected at this port?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot state.

Mr. DAVIES. I may state that most of the buildings in this place are of wood, and that the appliances for extinguishing fire are very slight, and the rate of insurance accordingly very high. I would strongly recommend the hon. gentleman to make the building either of brick or of stone.

Mr. BOWELL. I will now take the liberty of reading the memorandum with which I have been furnished from the Department relative to the Charlottetown Marine Hospital:

"At Charlottetown for a number of years a private dwelling was leased for the purposes of a Marine Hospital, and Dr. Taylor as medical attendant received a salary of \$300, the whole cost of the institution being about \$9 per week per patient. In 1880, it was decided to erect a Hospital at an estimated cost of \$5,800 including land, and plans were prepared, and necessary steps being taken when a petition signed by the Mayor of Charlottetown, members of Parliament, and leading men of that city, was received setting forth that an institution known as the Charlottetown Hospital under the management of the Sisters of Charity, proposed to take charge of all sick seamen on conditions that the Government would bear the following expenditure: 1st. The purchase of certain ground adjoining the Hospital, and the erection of suitable buildings; 2nd. The allowance of a weekly sum for maintenance of sick seamen; and recommending it to favorable consideration. The Minister gave the matter due consideration, and being informed on enquiry that all denominations contributed to the

support of this Hospital, and that it was open to all classes, he recommended to Council, and an Order issued on 23rd September last, authorizing the entering into an agreement with the Hospital authorities at rates not exceeding \$5 per week for each patient, and an annual allowance of \$400, to provide medical attendance and medicine.

"An arrangement has accordingly been made on the terms stated, it being a condition that the Hospital shall be open to the inspection of Officers of this Department, friends of patients, and Clergymen of all denominations, and that the agreement may terminate at any time on six months' notice.

"As Dr. Taylor's services were not required under the new arrangement, he was advised on the 21st September last to that effect."

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring down on Concurrence any representations which may have been made by Dr. Taylor as to the inconvenience that would result from this transfer of the sailors to the General Hospital?

346. Public Buildings—New Brunswick..... \$19,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is \$10,000 for a Post Office, Custom House, &c., at Bathurst. The total cost of the building will be \$20,000, exclusive, I believe, of the site. The next is \$9,000, for the Portland Post Office. This amount will cover what is required for this building.

347. Public Buildings—Quebec.....\$100,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is the Hull Post Office and Inland Revenue Office, \$4,790, which, I think, will complete that building. The next is Lévis Immigrant Buildings, \$15,000, which is required to complete building which will be erected this summer. Montreal Immigrant Buildings, \$15,000. The Minister of Agriculture has asked for such a building, as there is no suitable building in Montreal for that purpose. The next item is Montreal Custom House, \$3,000, for some improvements, and to repair a portion of the building which was damaged by fire. Improvements consist of heating apparatus, furnaces, and other items. The next item is Montreal Inland Revenue Building, \$11,260, which will be the last amount required for that building. This amount is made up of a number of small items varying from \$140 to \$2,600, the latter being for flagging the sidewalk.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is that the old Custom House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The next item is \$45,000 for the Montreal Examining Warehouse. As I explained the other evening, the largest portion of this vote is for the construction of iron joists in the place of the wooden ones, which have become rotten, and for the construction of a stone shed for the storage of bar iron, &c. The next item is \$7,000 for the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. This is to cover the extra expense of having stone quarried for completing the building.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the case that a portion of the stone is being quarried by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it is impossible to have it all done by convict labor. The convicts will have plenty to do in the yard, dressing the stone, and so on.

348. Public Buildings—Ontario..... \$131,200.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is \$6,000, the amount required this year for a Post Office at Orangeville. The next item is \$50,000 for a building in connection with the Toronto Examining Warehouse, which is represented by the proper authorities as being absolutely necessary. The whole building, when completed, will cost \$160,000, the intention being to complete it in three years. For this purpose we intend to ask for \$50,000 more next year, and the balance the year after. The next item, \$3,100, being the balance to complete the Belleville Post Office and Custom House. The next item is \$15,000 for a Post Office, Custom House, and Inland Revenue Office at Peterboro'. The land will, I think,

Mr. BOWELL,

be furnished by the locality, and the building, when completed, will cost \$20,000. A vote of \$20,000 is asked for the Berlin Post Office and Custom House. This amount is required for the year, and I think we shall require \$6,000 or \$7,000 more; the total cost will be \$27,500. The next item is \$17,000 to complete the work on the St. Catharines Post Office. The next item of \$8,000 for the Toronto Drill Shed is to provide additional accommodation for armories, &c., on the north side of the present shed. The next item of \$1,000 is to provide for alterations in the House of Commons Post Office that are required to give more accommodation in the way of boxes and better accommodation for the officers. The London Custom House, addition for Weights and Measures and Gas Inspection Office, \$5,000. This amount is required to pay for some legal expenses connected with the purchase of the lot there and also for some improvements in the building, and probably for the purchase of a small piece of land in rear of the building in order to isolate it further.

Mr. BLAKE. How much will the total of the Orangeville Post Office be, and how much for the site?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know the exact amount. It may cost \$18,000 or \$20,000 without the site?

Mr. BLAKE. The sum for drill sheds seems large.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We may be obliged to build separately, and therefore I made the amount \$8,000 in order not to be out of funds should that be the case.

349. Public Buildings—Manitoba..... \$70,000.00

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the expenses the Dominion is incurring on account of the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces generally is rather high. I know the expense is regulated by Statute, but this item is for buildings and stables. I do not know whether the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba desires, like the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, to have an extensive piggery. I think the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor might be directed to some more noble occupation, for though there is nothing degrading in raising pigs it is rather expensive for the Government to allow such a large sum for that object. I have here a list showing the different salaries paid to Governors in the States. I take some twelve States, the average of whose population is about those of Ontario and Quebec: from Indiana whose population is 1,187,000, to Alabama whose population is 1,262,000, the other States averaging about the population of Ontario and Quebec. The Governor of Georgia receives only \$3,000 a year; the Governor of Iowa, \$3,000; the Governor of Kentucky, \$5,000; the Governor of Massachusetts, \$5,000; the Governor of Michigan, which is rather a large State, \$1,000; the Governor of North Carolina, \$3,000; the Governor of Tennessee, \$4,000; the Governor of Texas, \$4,000; the Governor of the Territories, \$2,000; the Governor of Wisconsin, \$5,000. This statement shows that for a country like ours which is far from being so rich as the United States, we are paying too high salaries to our Lieutenant-Governors. If we take the State of Pennsylvania, which is the largest State in the Union as to population and wealth, we see that the Governor there received the largest amount, \$10,000. These Governors do not receive a vice-regal mansion. It is only the President who receives a large mansion. It is true that this year we may have a surplus to dispose of, but however large it may be that surplus comes from the pockets of the people, and if the people were to pay them in the same ratio as they do in the United States the whole Dominion would rejoice at it. Though this country is becoming prosperous, to a certain extent, the extravagant expenditure by those at the head of the Government is not an example that can do any good to the different Provinces. Under these circumstances I think that some suggestions of this kind ought to be well received by this House and carried into effect hereafter.



Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Chairman: In the name of the Province of Quebec, I offer my most sincere thanks to the hon. member from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain). There is a proverb that one should wash his dirty linen at home. I ignore whether it is in virtue of this proverb that the hon. member should have brought before this House the name of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec with reference to the Manitoba stables. If the hon. member has any remarks to make in reference to the item now asked from this House, let him make them; but to come before this House, which makes no appropriations for items of this kind for the Province of Quebec, pour out his bile against a man whom he does not like, seize this occasion to insult in the person of the Lieutenant-Governor the entire Province of Quebec, the least we can do, even if we do it ironically, is to offer him our sincere thanks. I feel assured that every time the hon. member delivers speeches of this character he will diminish his chances of attaining the goal he aspires to.

Mr. VALIN (Translation). Mr. Chairman: I thought that the hon. member from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) would, at least, have spoken to us about the Manitoba stables, for this is the subject under consideration. But since he has deemed it proper to attack the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, he ought to have informed us how it was that the ex-Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, who is one of his friends, went into commercial operations in horses, animals, lands, and other matters. I would like to know what is the difference between one who goes into the pork business, which is an agreeable thing to eat, and one who goes into the horse business. I do not see why the hon. gentleman wants to draw us into a discussion of Quebec matters when Manitoba questions are the ones under consideration. The hon. member from Montmagny (Mr. Landry) is quite right in what he said, and I do not see why the hon. member from L'Islet attacked persons here who are not subjects for our consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to interpose in the discussion between our friends from the Province of Quebec, but I cannot allow the very extraordinary position which the hon. member for L'Islet has taken in relation to this matter to pass without a single word. I am astonished that any hon. gentleman in this House, should refer to the fact of the Lieutenant-Governor engaging in agricultural pursuits as degrading to his office or the position he holds. I hold, Sir, that the cultivation of the soil and anything that relates to it, is as honorable an occupation and as honorable a calling as that which the hon. gentleman himself follows; and, I believe, that the hon. gentleman will find little sympathy in this House, or little sympathy out of it, for attacking the Lieutenant-Governor because he uses the leisure which his office affords—I care not whether it is Mr. Cauchon the ex-Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, or my friend Mr. Robitaille, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. I say that neither of these gentlemen can use their leisure, or use any means at their disposal, in a manner more advantageous to the country, than in promoting and encouraging agriculture and agricultural pursuits in any respect whatever. There is no branch of agriculture to which these gentlemen can devote any portion of their leisure time more profitably to the interests of Canada, than in the improvement of stock, whether of horses, horned cattle, or pigs. The loss to the people of Canada, the loss to the agricultural interests of this country, by having poor and inferior breeds of cattle, is something enormous, and I am astonished that when a gentleman occupying the high position of Lieutenant-Governor, has turned his attention to a matter so beneficial to the country, any hon. gentleman in this House should endeavor to represent that action as degrading to his office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I see nothing degrading in raising pigs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is nothing in this item about pigs. The hon. gentleman will please confine his attention to the item.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was speaking about the Lieutenant-Governor's stables, and I desired to know the object for which these stables are built. Are they for horses, or hens, or cocks, or pigs? That is the question before the Committee. I do not see anything degrading in raising pigs.

Mr. VALIN. This is not a vote for pigs, but for stables.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If my hon. friend will keep quiet for a moment perhaps we may be able to find out from the Government the purpose of building these stables; and if the purpose of building these stables is to raise pigs, we ought to know it. There is nothing degrading in raising pigs. But I do not think it is the duty of this Government to build stables for that purpose. This House would like to know whether the Lieutenant-Governor intends to raise pigs. That is information that I have a right to ask for and which the Government may properly give.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The next item is the Dominion Land Office, Winnipeg, \$10,000. This item has been asked by the Department of Interior because the present building is too small for the service, and the intention is to build an extension. The next item is the Winnipeg Powder Magazine, \$5,000. This is to construct a new brick powder magazine, 40 x 20, for Military District No. 10, and estimated by the chief architect to cost \$4,800, with \$200 for contingencies.

350. Public Buildings—North-West Territories.....\$29,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We asked for \$12,000 to construct an immigrant station west of Qu'Appelle. The site has not yet been selected, but we will have to build a shed for the immigrants west of Qu'Appelle, during the next season. Then, new Public Buildings at Regina, the capital of the North-West Territories, additional amount required, \$7,000. The amount of \$20,000 that was voted is considered too small for the buildings that are required there for the use of the Government of the Territories. There is also an amount placed for a new immigrant station at Qu'Appelle, to take the place of that destroyed the other day by fire.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a remark that appeared in the papers yesterday and to-day, to the effect that the destruction of the immigrant sheds at Qu'Appelle was due to its close proximity to the station. Is it intended to re-erect the destroyed building on precisely the same site formerly occupied, or would it not be prudent to endeavor to some extent to isolate the building? I see from the newspapers that this fire destroyed a large quantity of settlers' effects, the loss of which, at this juncture in their lives, appears to be almost incalculable in its effect; and I think it would be prudent and wise to adopt all precautions available, in order to protect settlers in their endeavors to open up our country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to place the new building at such a spot as will isolate it as far as possible; but the hon. gentleman knows that immigrant sheds should not be far from the railway depot.

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest, seeing that such buildings are always of an inflammable nature, that their contents should be insured for a reasonable amount, so that in case of fire the settlers may be recouped part of their loss.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government are their own insurers. It is very unfortunate that an accident of this kind should have occurred at Qu'Appelle, but such a one may not occur again for ten or twenty years. The idea is not to keep immigrants long in the sheds; quite the con-

trary. I do not see how we could carry out the hon. gentleman's proposal.

Mr. ORTON. In regard to the immigrant sheds, I would ask whether it is the intention of the Government to erect an immigrant shed at Regina. This unfortunate fire at Qu'Appelle is a very sad affair for the people of that town. I do not desire to make any assertion against the erection of an immigrant shed at that point; but I mean to say that Regina having been selected by the Government as the capital of the North-West Territory, and people having been induced to buy property on the distinct understanding that the Government intended to erect all public buildings there, that fact has led many people to invest capital there and to go there in order to help to build it up, and such people feel they have been somewhat deceived by the Government. I certainly think the capital of the territory is the right place to erect an immigrant shed. It is about the same distance, or perhaps a little further from Brandon, where there is an immigrant shed, as Brandon is from Winnipeg; and I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the importance of having an immigrant shed erected at Regina. It is proposed that a branch railway shall be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway to that point, and I think that the Government should provide some accommodation for immigrants there. Many people have been led to believe that there is division even in the Cabinet, with respect to the selection of Regina as the seat of Government in the territory. When they find that the public buildings are not all being erected there, as was promised by those who had lots to sell on behalf of the Government, I certainly think it does not look very well that there is no provision made for immigrants going to Regina.

Mr. HESSON. I would remind the Committee that I have had the honor of presenting a very large petition from the inhabitants of Regina upon this subject, the erection of an immigrant shed there. It is of the utmost importance, especially to strangers going there, that there should be some accommodation, however temporary it may be, for their accommodation during a few days. It is natural to suppose that at the place which has been selected as the capital of a new Province, they will at least find shelter from the inclemency of the weather, and when they come to find there is no accommodation for immigrants they will feel very much disappointed. I have no desire to say that the position is not well chosen, but with regard to buildings of a permanent and substantial character, it might be worthy of consideration whether it would not be advisable to divide the expenditure between these two places, and give the accommodation at Regina which the member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) very fairly stated the people going there had been led to expect. The erection of a temporary structure at Regina is deserving of consideration; and I may say that the petition I presented to the House is signed by the most respectable residents of Regina—men of capital and means, who were induced to go there on the representation that it would be the capital of the new Province, and they have a right to expect that something will be done. I trust that some action will be taken in the matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is for an immigration station west of Qu'Appelle, and as Regina is west of Qu'Appelle, the Government, of course, will have to consider the remarks of the hon. gentlemen on this head. The Government are of opinion that there should be an immigration shed at Qu'Appelle, as it is 40 or 50 miles from Regina, and many immigrants are going to this point, as is shown from the quantity of settlers' baggage destroyed during the recent fire.

251. Public Buildings—British Columbia..... \$12,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to say that the British Columbia Penitentiary is too small; civilization is  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

penetrating more and more into this beautiful Province, and therefore we have to extend the penitentiary. The question was whether we should build a wing or erect a building on the plateau, because the present structure is on a slope. There is some difficulty about drainage, and this matter will be well looked into, and I have no doubt that the architects will remedy the drainage.

264. Railways—Intercolonial.....\$158,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The first item is for a shunting and station yard at Point Lévis. I may say that the time has arrived for a decision as to the station yard at Point Lévis as well in connection with the Intercolonial as the Grand Trunk Railway, and after full consideration the Chief Engineer is of opinion that in the interests of the Intercolonial traffic, the shunting and station grounds should be in close proximity to the Grand Trunk yard, and that the connection of the Intercolonial tracks with those of the Grand Trunk should be made in such a way as to approach on the south side of the Grand Trunk Railway where should be the new passenger station, in order that the passenger traffic may be exchanged with despatch and to the convenience of the travelling public, while the way station should be placed at the south ferry. When the vote was previously under consideration on the question of the St. Clair Branch, I stated that we expected to run this by the lower ferry, where would be the way station cross at that point, and then run up to the Point Lévis Grand Trunk Railway station. The cost of the shunting shed at the centre of the Grand Trunk Railway yard will be \$33,000, the way station on site at Smith's wharf will cost \$12,000, and the way station building, \$25,000, making \$47,500, whereas the same accommodation at the lower station would have cost us \$125,000.

Mr. LANDRY. Will the shunting and station yard be between the ferry and the Grand Trunk station?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The shunting yard will be in the proximity of the present Grand Trunk Railway station at Point Lévis.

Mr. LANDRY. Is it the intention of the Government to have a station at Point Lévis?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; a branch is to be built at the Rivière du Loup, over the two miles between the railway and the town, to furnish wood and water at that point; and we expect to increase greatly the facilities for sea-side excursions, and those who go to this town during the summer season. The estimate of the entire cost of this Rivière du Loup Branch is \$25,000, covering everything connected with the purchase of the roadway and construction, and such station accommodation as is required. The Dalhousie Branch will pass over the six miles between Campbellton and Dalhousie. It was originally intended to locate the Intercolonial at Dalhousie; but it was decided that the distance could be shortened by having the road take its present course past Campbellton in a direct line, leaving Dalhousie some six miles off the track. The desirability of having this branch constructed will be obvious, when I state that navigation has opened much earlier in the spring and has been continued much later in the fall at Dalhousie than it has been at Campbellton, so that the postal communication by steam with the surrounding country will be much improved by this arrangement.

Mr. LANDRY. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the following resolutions which were passed at a recent meeting of the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec:—

"Moved by Mr. N. Turcotte, seconded by Mr. P. Vallière.—That this meeting hopes that the Government may grant to the city of Quebec the same advantages which have been accorded to other towns in the Dominion, namely, that a freight agent for the Intercolonial Railway be placed at Quebec as well as at Lévis, and it is obvious that the mercantile community of the former city suffer great inconvenience in being

compelled to cross to Lévis on matters of even the least importance concerning freight traffic on the said road.—Carried.”

Actually there is only one agent of the road in the city of Quebec, and he lives near the St. Louis station, a long way from the terminus where the ferry lands. In that part of the city we have not even a blackboard to tell us whether the trains are late or not, and if we want to get information as to the trains we have to send a person across to Lévis to get it. Under these circumstances I hope the Government will do justice to Quebec by giving us an agent and the freight accommodation we asked for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My attention was called to this matter before, and I brought it to the notice of the Chief Engineer and Manager of the road, stating that I was anxious that every possible facility should be given to Quebec city, and all possible information furnished. Since that time my attention has been drawn to the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade of Quebec, and I have directed an officer to make a report to me on the subject. The matter is now engaging the attention of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this include the accommodation of Rivière du Loup?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; this covers everything, both Rivière du Loup and Dalhousie.

Mr. BLAKE. Will there be stations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, at both points.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the trains be run on the short branches to connect with the main trains of the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All travellers desiring to go down will be carried directly, either to one point or the other.

365. Canals.....\$96,000.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The first item of \$14,000, St. Peter's Canal, is for the purpose of providing for the protection of vessels which, in passing through the canals, are liable to be driven against the sides by the winds. I will read from a memorandum I have here:

“Complaints have been made as to the necessity which exists for the protection of vessels passing through this canal, which are liable to be driven against the sides of the canal by the influence of certain winds. The Engineer in charge recommends that the north entrance be protected on the east side by a pier 330 feet in length, its top to be six feet above the level of the lake; estimated cost, \$11,000. Also, to place timbers vertically against the rock sides to carry horizontal fenders, \$3,000. Total, \$14,000.”

The next item is \$80,000 for the Williamsburg Canal—towards enlargement of the upper entrance, Galops Canal:

“On a report dated 23rd April, 1883, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting that complaints have been made in respect of the condition of the works at the entrance of the Galops Canal, it being urged that in consequence of the carrying away by ice of much of the head pier, loaded vessels coming downwards are unable to enter at the head and have been for some time past compelled to run the rapids to Iroquois at the foot of the canal, and if bound for the intermediately situated Village of Edwardsburgh, to work their way back *via* the canal; and that from reports in his Department it appears for the past year the depth of water at the entrance to be considerably below that of even other canals on the St. Lawrence, which were themselves inadequate, and that a remedy for this condition of things was urgently called for in the case of these canals.

“The Minister represents that the Chief Engineer has, under date the 21st inst., reported that instead of attempting to repair the old pier at the upper entrance of the canal, it would be better to proceed with works applicable to a new entrance at this point, this being part of the general scheme of canal enlargement, and he suggests that the extension of these works up-stream would have the effect of increasing the depth of water in the canal.

“The probable cost of forming new entrance he sets down at about \$260,000, of which amount the sum of \$60,000 could, he states, be advantageously expended during the ensuing year.”

It was found that to remedy this difficulty at all, would involve a large expenditure unless the work was dealt with in this mode; and otherwise it would have been useful in carrying out the ultimate system of the enlargement of the

canals. Then there is \$2,000 to remove a shoal above the locks of the Culbute Canal.

“Attention has been drawn by steamboat owners to the necessity for the removal of certain shoals in the Ottawa River which at low water interfere materially with the passage of vessels using the Culbute Lock. The matter has been reported upon by Mr. Perry, and finally submitted to the Chief Engineer of Canals, who has reported that the clearing out of these shoals is of great importance to navigation, and advises that the work be proceeded with. Estimated cost for the shoal above the lock, \$2,000.”

With regard to the last item, Miscellaneous Works, I may state that about \$3,500 of that sum is for the preparation of the large way which has been prepared during the past season and the remainder is for a number of other smaller items.

390. To compensate Mr. Thomas Munro for performing the duties of Superintendent of the Welland Canal for one and a-half months in 1879 \$180.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will be remembered that at one time Mr. Bodwell, the Superintendent of the Welland Canal, was suspended, and an investigation was held by the Department. During that period Mr. Munro, who is a Division Engineer on the canal, was charged with the additional duties of Superintendent. He made an application for \$362, which would have been the salary of the Superintendent during the time Mr. Munro performed the duties. What I have recommended is that he should be paid one-half of that amount.

Mr. BLAKE. When did Mr. Munro apply?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He has continuously applied, and from time to time the subject has been postponed.

353. Miscellaneous—Fort Dufferin, St. John, N.B..... \$3,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the construction of some works to protect the fort at a point where it is exposed to being washed away by the sea.

354. Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia ..... \$29,850.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are a number of small items, mostly for repairs. The vote of \$4,600, for Yarmouth, is for the construction of 160 feet of cribwork for the protection of the western end of the harbor. The next item is \$2,000, of which \$1,000 is a revote, for works at Parker's Cove, in the county of Annapolis. In the previous vote of \$1,000 there was a condition attached, that the locality should provide a similar amount, but it has been represented to me by the late member, Mr. Longley, as well as by the present hon. member for the county, that the people are too poor to do so, and, under the circumstances, we ask for sufficient to do the whole work. The next item of \$3,000, for Grand Narrows, in the county of Cape Breton, is for the extension of the existing wharf 124 feet in length, and the addition of a wing 60 feet long. The next is Oyster Pond in the county of Gloucester, \$2,000, for the extension of the pier works constructed in 1876. The next is White Point in Queen's county. The chief explained that urgent repairs were needed as much damage had been caused in the beginning of March, 1883. The next item is to provide for the construction of a wharf, 129 feet long and 20 feet wide extending to 12 feet of water at Militia Point in the county of Inverness. The next item is Cataragui Gut, Cape Breton, \$1,500, for opening a passage with three feet of water at neap-tide to allow fishermen to pass their boats through and give them a place where they can lie in safety. The next item is McNair's Cove in the county of Antigonishe, \$5,000. This is for restoring the inner side of the breakwater and making it useful as a place of shipment.

Mr. VAIL. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has overlooked some particulars. A grant or two for some piers in Digby county, are urgently required, and I may mention

that a petition was sent from the inhabitants of Sandy Cove, accompanied by a subscription list asking for a grant. An engineer was sent some years ago to examine that place, and the inhabitants expected a very large and important pier would have been built, but the engineer reported that a large amount would be required, and the Government consequently did not proceed with the work. The inhabitants have since concluded that a small work costing a reasonable sum would be a great advantage to them, because they are now obliged to turn their attention to fishing; whereas heretofore they had larger vessels and were engaged in a different calling. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will see his way clear to making a small grant towards that work this year. There are also one or two important works at Church Point and Comeanville, which could be repaired at a small expenditure, and would be of great advantage to the people. I hope the hon. Minister will consider these suggestions and bring down grants for those works this Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As to the first work mentioned by my hon. friend, I was not able to comply with his request, as the engineer reported it would entail too much expense; but after what the hon. gentleman has said, I may be in a position to examine the work again, but cannot make any promise. The hon. gentleman called my attention to the two other points, outside the House as well as in it, and I told him I would most likely have an examination made in order to put myself *au fait* with the position of affairs.

Mr. FORBES. A petition was sent in from Hunter's Point to which I never got an answer. The public works there were erected by the Local Government, and the people were trying to get a small grant from the Dominion Government to assist in completing them. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Government to send an engineer down this season to report on that work, though I think it was reported on some years ago. I would like to ask the hon. Minister when I may expect to receive the report of the engineers and the surveys that were made for the breakwater on the western side of the bay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As to the return, I have a list of the returns that have not yet been brought down from my Department, and have sent to my deputy pressing him to send the returns as soon as possible. I cannot do more than that. As to the other work mentioned by the hon. gentleman, I must ask a little patience on the part of hon. members. The Government have done all they could this year with what they considered the most pressing work. The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, remain in this House for several years more, and will be in a position to call my attention to this work again, should I forget it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to bring to the hon. Minister's notice the small sum allowed to King's county for the piers and breakwaters on the north shore of that county. These have been built by the people themselves, aided by the Provincial Government from time to time, and are indispensable to their trade. Under the fiscal policy so happily inaugurated and successfully carried out by this Government, these people have depended almost entirely upon Canadian flour. They import that in their vessels from Portland, Boston, and New York, in bond, and bring it down to the shore, and if these piers and breakwaters give way from force of the storms, it leaves them entirely unprotected, and unable to carry on their business. I have presented to the Minister of Public Works eight or nine petitions from the people along the shore, asking for grants to these respective piers and breakwaters, and stating that if relief was not afforded, they would probably go out during the present year. I think the sum of \$1,500 will be found to be entirely inadequate to accomplish what the people desire.

Mr. VAIL.

There are other piers and breakwaters in a dilapidated state, and I would ask the hon. Minister, during Recess, to look after them. A stitch in time saves nine, and perhaps \$300 or \$400 here and there, will save thousands of dollars to the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember all these piers that are mentioned by the hon. gentleman, but if they have not been put on the list, it is because we could not do so this year. Of course there is always a certain latitude left to the Head of a Department in case of emergency, and if any very pressing necessity arises, I might be in a position to come to the relief of the locality, but I cannot do that for many piers.

355. Harbors and Rivers—Prince Edward Island.....\$7,250.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item is to build the work at South River, already begun, deepening and extending the present channel so as to provide a straight channel fifty feet in width and eight feet deep at low water. The total cost is \$8,250, of which a portion has already been expended. The next item is \$4,000 for Malpeque.

Mr. DAVIES. We took last year a vote of \$3,000 for the breakwater at Malpeque, and I would like to know from the hon. Minister if anything has been done yet with that money. The breakwater is washing away at the end and it is of no use as it is now. The tide is undermining it and washing the work away, and unless something is soon done all will be lost that has already been expended there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to expend this amount. The colleague of the hon. gentleman called my attention to the fact a short time ago and asked for another vote of \$2,000. I will consider the matter and see whether there are means of making it \$5,000.

Mr. DAVIES. The local members have called my attention to the same vote of last year, and they said that \$3,000 would not complete it, but that it would require a vote of \$5,000. I hope the hon. Minister will see his way clear to do that much for us.

356. Harbors and Rivers—New Brunswick.....\$26,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The second item is \$4,000 for Mispick breakwater. It is also called Port Simons and is in St. John county. It is proposed to construct a breakwater 200 feet long and 25 feet wide. The total cost will be \$8,600, of which we only ask \$4,000 this year. The next item is for the construction of a wharf at Robby's Point in the county of Westmoreland, which is estimated at \$1,500. The item of \$4,000 is to construct a ballast wharf at Hope-well Cape, in Albert county, the total cost of which is estimated at \$9,000. \$2,000 is to complete breakwater as originally contemplated at Grande Anse. \$4,000 is to rebuild a portion of the work of Shippegan, which when completed will cost \$12,000. \$3,000 is asked towards the construction of a wharf at Buctouche.

357. Harbors and Rivers—Quebec .....\$46,900.00

Mr. DESJARDINS. Perhaps this is the proper time to enquire of the Government whether they have been able to consider, this Session, the representations made to them on several occasions, relating to the urgency of deepening the channel between Montreal and Quebec. I do not see as yet any resolution on the paper, or any amount in the Estimates to show that the Government have taken action. The question is a most important one, affecting the interests of the trade and navigation of the St. Lawrence. I hope the Government have come to some conclusion; and we are anxious in our district, at least, to know if immediate action will be taken on this matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give a positive answer this evening to the hon. gentleman;

but if he will kindly renew his question to-morrow, I think I will be able to let the House know the course which the Government intends to take on that subject.

Mr. BLAKE. Are all these items for new work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. \$1,500 for piers at Lake Megantic is to continue the work. \$3,000 for wharf at bridge across River Richelieu on road between Lacolle and Clarenceville is for a new work. \$6,000 is to protect the lighthouse at St. Jean d'Orleans. The lighthouse was placed on a pier that belongs to the locality, and on which there is a large indebtedness to the Local Government; and, of course, they call on us to pay our share for the pier. That money will not be paid except on a discharge from the Local Government of all liability on that ground.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Am I to understand that this vote is for works to protect the lighthouse, or merely to pay the money to the Local Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the works themselves. \$4,500 is to complete improvements at Pointe aux Orignaux, Rivière Ouelle, which were begun two or three years ago.

Mr. LANDRY. Does this \$5,000 include the amount to build the lighthouse at Isle aux Grues?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. It belongs to the Minister of Marine.

Mr. BLAKE. How does the hon. gentleman take a vote to protect the lighthouse at St. Jean d'Orleans?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was built by the Department of Public Works. An Order in Council was passed some years ago directing that such works costing \$10,000 should be built by the Public Works Department, while small lighthouses, costing \$1,000 or \$500 or so, are built by the other Department.

258. Harbors and Rivers—Ontario.....\$65,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was estimated in the first instance that the work at Morpeth would cost \$20,000, but we think that we will do it with probably \$10,000, so that this will have to be supplemented next year. The locality is very much exposed, the pier will be extended to 12 feet of water, and a bend to give shelter will be provided. The future will decide whether a further extension shall be made.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not intended to go on to deep water and to protect the wharf at the end of it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as the money is voted, we will see how far the money will go. If this be not enough, we will trust to Parliament to give us more next year. It was originally proposed to build a new wharf with 12 feet of water at low water; total length about 470 ft. and at a total cost of \$20,000. With this \$10,000 we will probably build 200 feet with a return wharf, but do not wish to be bound down to this, as the plan may be changed. For the L'Original repairs, the local authorities furnish \$1,000, and we, \$3,000. The Kingsville work was begun last year. This amount will not complete it; we will probably need \$5,000 more to do so. The total cost will be between \$32,000 and \$33,000; \$5,000 were voted, and we have still of it, I think, \$4,500, which, with this, will make \$31,000, while there will be something for contingencies, &c. At Belleville the channel will be deepened, 1,875 feet long by 100 feet wide—14 feet at low water. A landing pier will be provided at Southampton, where there is an accumulation of sand or silt, and we want to extend the wharf to get to the current formed by the opening between the two piers on the one side and Chantry Island on the other. Dredging will be done at Meaford. The work at Little Nation River was begun two years ago, and is to be continued.

Mr. BLAKE. Will this vote complete the work at Owen Sound, and what depth of water will it give?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The sum asked is to complete the dredging of the channel in this harbor to fourteen feet. When we began these works the locality agreed to furnish, I think, \$13,000 or \$14,000, and we the balance. We have found the undertaking a little more difficult than we had foreseen, but this amount will complete the work.

Mr. BRYSON. Is the dredging of the portion of the Ottawa River at the Narrows to be continued this season? No doubt the hon. gentleman is aware that the dredge is within a few miles of the Culbute locks, and I see that the Government has asked for \$2,000 to remove the boulders above these locks. I desire to ask if it is the intention of the Government to continue the removal of these obstructions, on the same principle which was observed last season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not now in a position to answer that question positively. This request came very late. Of course I intend to investigate the matter, but I know enough of it, from the information which I have received from other quarters, to see that it was necessary to ask for a small vote for this purpose.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to Morpeth Harbor, I am glad that justice has at last been done the locality, and that the arrangement originally understood between them and the Government is being carried out at least in part. The \$4,000 which the locality subscribed was subscribed, I believe, on the understanding that the original plan or something like it should be carried out, and I hope the hon. Minister will be able to carry out that understanding. I hardly think that for the amount he named he will be able to get deep water at that point of the coast, but I have every confidence that when the works are begun and the plans are made, he will do what is required to make the expenditure useful.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am glad to hear the word "confidence" come from the hon. gentleman's mouth—it certainly shows that he is improving. Of course I can make no promises, and I am asking the vote simply because the locality is satisfied with this arrangement.

Mr. CASEY. The word "confidence" was not a slip on my part, because I have every confidence in the hon. gentleman's business capacity and his faculty for managing the Department in a business-like way—we can all say that, whatever we may think with regard to his policy.

359. Prince Arthur's Landing—Harbor Improvements \$50,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hon. gentlemen know that at Prince Arthur's Landing there is not sufficient, and it is becoming a very important harbor. We intend contributing a share of the improvement of that harbor, but the locality is also contributing \$25,000. We expect that the vote will also be supplemented by the railway company, which is largely interested in having the harbor sheltered. We will, of course, enter into communication with the railway company and the authorities of the locality as to their respective contributions.

Mr. BLAKE. In the old times we used to hear comparisons made between another port and Prince Arthur's Landing, from which I was disposed to believe that Prince Arthur's Landing was one of the most admirable, safest, and most land-locked harbor to be found anywhere. Now it seems a considerable expenditure is required to make it safe. I would like to ask if there is any arrangement as yet with the railway company, and whether there is an approximate estimate of what the whole cost will be of the works required to make it what it should be in this regard?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That depends altogether on the extent of the shelter to be afforded. It will vary from \$150,000 to over \$200,000—perhaps \$250,000. But the intention is not, for the present at all events, to go to an extreme estimate. If the company, as no doubt they will, furnishes a reasonable amount, this \$50,000 from Parliament, and \$25,000 from the locality will certainly be sufficient to build a breakwater which will shelter a portion of the harbor. With regard to the hon. gentleman's reminiscences perhaps this harbor was better sheltered than the other, though it may not be as good as we might desire.

Mr. BLAKE. If it is better sheltered than the other port I am much mistaken. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all the public money he proposes to expend is \$50,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For the present at all events. Of course if these improvements are to be extended very much—if they are to cost from \$200,000 to \$250,000 we may have to supplement this vote by a smaller one, but my idea is that this vote will be sufficient for the present.

Mr. BLAKE. The improvements will be in the nature of a breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to Prince Arthur's Landing, it is now the terminus of the railway, and a very large traffic is likely to go through there this summer, so that it is highly necessary that something should be done to provide accommodation for shipping. Prince Arthur's Landing is decidedly a well-sheltered harbor. It is in a bay which is completely land-locked—a bay, however, which is of somewhat large dimensions—and, of course, a little surge rising may sometimes occasion inconvenience. A sure proof that it is a good harbor is the fact that although for the last ten years a large amount of shipping has gone there—last year it was 190,000 tons or something approaching that amount—early in the spring and late in the fall there has not been one single accident. A breakwater is required for the reason I have stated, but within a year past the people of the Landing have laid out themselves about \$100,000 in building wharves. They are very commodious, one of them being 1,100 feet long, by 100 feet wide, and others of lesser dimensions. They are very strong vertically, but are too slightly built for the lateral pressure of the ice shoving upon them, and therefore a breakwater is required, which, if built, will protect all this property, and they will be perfectly good as wharves. A great deal used to be said in old times about the Kaministiquia River, which is far from the Landing. I believe some \$60,000 or \$80,000 was expended on that river in dredging, extending over a period of some five or six years, during which dredging was carried on continuously in the summer season. The results of that dredging have been nearly obliterated by a cause which may occur any year, but which has never been taken into consideration. It is, that that river is at times subject to ice-gorges, which form a jam, and dams the water back, heaving up banks and greatly altering the soundings in the soft, alluvial bottom. In order that the House may better understand what occurs, I shall read a description from a local paper, of what took place on the 29th of April, 1881:—

“Fort William submerged—An ice gorge on the Kaministiquia—Schooner *Richardson* high and dry—Davidson's boom and dock demolished—Steam dredge under water—Hudson Bay Co.'s dock a total wreck—Tug *Lizzie* leaking badly—Two scows carried out into the lake and lost—The range lights out of range—Hundreds of cords of wood washed away—Ice piled six feet high on the road.

“On Monday last persons arriving from Fort William reported an inundation of the fields belonging to the Hudson Bay Co., caused by the rapid rise in the Kaministiquia, which had swelled to an enormous extent, overrunning its banks to a considerable depth. From those who witnessed the rushing of the water we learn that for about a mile along the road leading from the Hudson Bay Co.'s Fort to Prince Arthur's Landing, the water was of such a depth as to admit of boats being

Mr. BLAKE.

rowed from the Fort buildings to within a short distance of a second river bridge; the road being considerably higher than the surrounding land, it was estimated that the water at one time must have risen to a height of nearly four feet above the banks of the river.

“Quite early in the afternoon the ice began moving towards the entry, and without much warning the water rose very rapidly, soon submerging the banks and allowing but little time for escape; in fact, the people living there had barely time to secure boats before the water was three or four feet in depth, and extending on both sides for about a mile beyond the banks. Women and children were seen on the tops of houses, and one (supposed to be Mrs. Stevenson, wife of the manager of Davidson's Mill), with her child, were distinctly seen across the river, on top of a lumber pile.

“The fields on both sides of the road gave every indication of the rushing of many waters; on the north side especially was this the case, and for a long distance the ice covered the entire surface. Arrived at Fort William the scene was grand beyond description, it was of that mournful grandeur that surrounds old ruins. The road at this point was rendered impassable by immense cakes of ice, which were piled one upon another in some places to a height of six feet. The ice seemed to have a special liking for the road bed, as it was there found in greater quantity than at other points. As far as the eye could reach along the river banks, these miniature icebergs were the only objects discernible. One that was measured was found to be over three feet in thickness, and about eight feet in length.

“Finding Mr. Richards, who is in charge of the Hudson Bay Co.'s store and property at this fort, we learned that the water commenced to recede about half-past ten o'clock at night, and that by twelve o'clock it confined itself to the river bed, so that they anticipated no further danger, although a strict watch was kept all night long. On this reserve is an old stone building used in former times for storing fur, to this Mr. Richards removed his family in a row boat. Mr. Morrison, who has charge of the lighthouse, also brought his family to the same place by means of a boat.

“During the winter the schooner *Richardson*, the steam dredge, the tugs *Lizzie* and *M. I. Mills*, two scows belonging to the dredge, and a number of small boats have been harbored at this point, and all have been more or less demoralized. The schooner *Richardson* brought up late last fall, a load of nitro-glycerine, &c., for the use of the Hamilton Powder Co., and being too late after unloading to return to the Sault Canal before the time announced for closing, she was moored below the dock, near the mouth of the river. It was very fortunate for the owner that she was so moored, as there is no reason to doubt that she would otherwise have been a complete wreck. As it now is, she has been lifted high and dry on the bank, and is only supported on one side by the jammed ice. The steam dredge was completely under water, and her shovel carried away and deposited inland. The tug *Lizzie* was also shoved upon to the dock, but by prompt attention given her by Mr. Richards, Captain Coxetter and others, she was safely launched into her usual position, though found to be leaking badly. Men placed at the pumps found the water in the hold gaining upon them and eventually she had to be beached and allowed to fill. The tug *M. I. Mills* is on the opposite side of the river, and has the appearance of trying to crawl up the bank, as she is a rotten, old hulk it does not matter much whether she has sustained any damage or not.

“One of the scows in attendance on the dredge was taken away by the flood, and cannot be seen; it is supposed that she was carried down and drawn under the ice in the lake, or sunk in the river channel. Another scow, belonging to Davidson's Mill, has suffered a similar experience.

“The plank walk leading to the outer range is a thing of the past, and the force of the water landed the range light into a swamp, carrying it completely off its underpinning, and of course in its present position, is of no use.

“The oil house, another large building in the same vicinity, is also moved from its foundation. The light-keeper's residence formerly occupied by Captain J. W. Plummer was flooded to a depth of about three feet, and trunks, furniture, and other articles were floating around inside. The bedding, bedsteads, carpets, &c., were rendered almost worthless by the deposit of mud and sand that the water left upon them.

“The Hudson Bay Company will be heavy losers, the fences were entirely destroyed along the west side of their land, and their docks are a total wreck. The latter had lately been repaired at considerable expense, but the deluge has wrenched large timbers and piles asunder.”

I need not read further from this description. I think it is very necessary that the attention of the House should be drawn to this, so that hon. members may know what sort of a harbor the Kaministiquia is—the expenditure of \$60,000 or \$80,000 produced no permanent result.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there any plans or estimates or surveys of this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is an estimate and there must be a report in the Department. During 1880 surveys were made by an officer of the Department, and the information then obtained is now used by the Chief Engineer in proposing the construction of a breakwater. I stated the extreme cost would be \$250,000, but I see it is \$240,000.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it the intention of the Government to bring down Supplementary Estimates for the maintenance of piers on the Island which, by a decision of the Supreme Court, are declared to belong to the Dominion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Local Government have been in communication with the Dominion Government on this matter. The First Minister of Prince Edward Island was here, and I informed him an officer or two would visit the Island to examine each pier in order to ascertain exactly whether these were Dominion or local works. We will have a report by the 1st or 15th July. I told the First Minister he could, if he wished, send an officer to accompany ours. When the report is received, I will examine the whole question with the Chief Engineer and report the result to Council in order that the Government may decide whether any and which should be Dominion works.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman does not propose any grant this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; but any small repairs will be made out of the general vote.

363. Public Works—Miscellaneous—Monument to Joseph Brant..... \$5,000.00

Mr. HICKEY. It has been said this is an age of economists and calculators, but I am pleased, and I am sure the House is pleased, to see that the spirit of chivalry is not altogether absent from our midst and destroyed by our activity of life, but that this spirit shows signs of being more prominent and stronger in the future. Monuments erected in honor of the illustrious dead, add to the national glory of the country in which they are erected, and we have not so many heroes in our past, or fields of victory in our country, that we can afford to neglect those that add lustre to our history. I think that the battle of Chrysler's Farm is of sufficient importance in our history to demand the attention of the Government. A few hundred dollars expended in raising a monument to commemorate that victory, and to show to future generations that we, at heart, honored the valor of our sires, would be a fitting action on our part, and I hope, in another year, an estimate will be brought down to erect a monument to our worthy sires who fought and bled in this battle, and gained a victory which, the best historians say, maintained this country in its British connection.

364. Telegraph line from a point opposite New Westminster to Lader's Landing, B.C..... \$1,500.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Private individuals wanted to build this branch line from our own line, but we thought it was better not to allow private individuals to interfere with the lines of the Government. The people will furnish the poles, and we have an old cable perfectly fitted for this branch line. We have also some wire, so that we will only require \$1,500 to build the line.

334. Privy Council contingencies—To make payment to officers of this Department who are engaged after hours..... \$1,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The officers of the Privy Council are often obliged to work late at night, after having worked all day. Instead of increasing their salaries permanently, we thought it was better to ask for a gratuity of \$1,000.

Mr. BLAKE. It has always been understood that when the Council sat late, and the business required despatch, the officers should remain after hours, as is done in other Departments. There has been no proposition up to this time that there should be extra remuneration for that service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We think that these officers are not sufficiently remunerated. The work of the Privy Council has increased very largely, and these officers are overworked. We thought it better to give them this small

remuneration than to increase their salaries, for if we increase their salaries it will be a permanent thing.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman suppose this vote is going to disappear from the Estimates? We are going to have this every year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so.

368. Additional amount required for purchase of life-boats, stations and life-preservers, maintenance of crews and rewards for saving life. \$3,000.00

Mr. BOWELL. This is an additional vote that is asked for in order to put into operation the life-boat service on different stations along the coast. The subject was fully discussed a few nights ago, and from the expression of opinion in the House, it was deemed advisable to ask for a larger sum.

Mr. PLATT. Will the hon. Minister inform the Committee whether buildings are to be constructed this season to cover the life-boats?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of; the system is not yet perfected.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of what will be the cost of the life-boat it is intended to purchase? The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) made some suggestions the other day that seemed worthy of consideration.

Mr. BOWELL. I think they were, and they will be taken into consideration by the Department.

370. Indians—New Brunswick..... \$618.12

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). There was a deputation of Indians here from New Brunswick the other day, and I presume this is the result of their visit.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a sum of \$393.12, which is an increase to be paid to medical officers of from 26 cts. to 50 cts. per head of the population. The second item of \$100 is to provide for the salary of a missionary at Big Cove, county of Kent. This is to be paid to the Rev. John Edward Barnett, parish priest of Richibucto, who has already been attending them. The medical grant having been considered inadequate, the Department decided to increase it from 26 cts. to 56 cts. per head of the population.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). A deputation of Indians from New Brunswick recently visited Ottawa in order to submit their grievance. I desire to enquire what those grievances are, and whether they have been attended to?

Mr. BOWELL. I remember a deputation of Indians from New Brunswick called upon the First Minister and laid before him what they called their grievances. The matter has been referred to the inspector for investigation, and that investigation is now proceeding.

Mr. BURPEE. What were their grievances?

Mr. BOWELL. They were under the impression that they were not properly treated by the superintendent, against whom they lodged complaints, and the matter is now being investigated by another officer.

386. Collection of Revenues—Excise..... \$4,845.00

Mr. COSTIGAN. The larger portion of this amount is to provide for additional allowances in Manitoba and the North-West and British Columbia, to compensate for increased cost of living as compared with the other Provinces. This amount is to be distributed by arrangement between the different Departments on a general scale. Those having salaries of \$2,000 and upwards are to be allowed 12½ per cent.; salaries \$600 to \$1,000, 20 per cent.; and lower salaries, 40 per cent. This percentage is not given to any officer who, by reason of his appointment in these Provinces, is now receiving a higher salary than he would have received

in the old Provinces of the same rank. In some few cases, officers were appointed at higher salaries owing to being sent there and to the increased cost of living; therefore, these percentages is not given to those officers, but only to those who get the same salaries that are given here.

Mr. BLAKE. A proposal was made some time ago regarding allowances, and some officers in Manitoba, I think, got what were said to be board allowances at a certain rate instead of a percentage. I should suppose it important to have a uniform system, and whichever was preferable should be adopted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We ask for \$3,000 to meet those cases, but these allowances are asked for other Departments to cover what may be termed board allowances, although all are based on this same principle.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the general principle?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It applies to all the Departments out there.

Mr. BOWELL. It was established by the Treasury Board.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like an explanation regarding the Durnford and Bellemare items.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is one of the old claims which I hope will not create a good deal of discussion, when I inform the House as to its nature.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is only fifteen years old.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry that it has remained so long unsettled. These claims have been investigated, and I am quite satisfied that no payment has ever been made of the one-half year's salary to these officers. This was due to the change of Departments just after Confederation. These claims have since been pressed, and before recommending payment to the House, we made enquiries, and our officers have reported that these salaries were never paid to these two men, and that it was only fair that payment should be made.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a most extraordinary statement. The hon. gentleman says it is on account of Confederation

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said it was on account of the changes following Confederation; that is the only way in which I can account for six months' salary remaining unpaid.

Mr. BLAKE. Confederation took place a whole year before this began.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In 1867.

Mr. BLAKE. On the 1st July, 1867; and this half-year is from the 1st of July to the 30th of November, 1868, and these gentlemen were in office before July, 1868.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They were in office before Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. They were paid monthly before that time?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; but by the year.

Mr. BLAKE. Were their salaries not payable monthly?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I find from the 1st of July to the 30th of November, which does not indicate half a year, and I presume they were paid monthly.

Mr. BLAKE. How is it? When were these claims made? Surely their salaries were not cut off without some notice, or without some complaint being made at the time. Did they complain in 1868, '69, '70, '71, '72 or '73? How is it that it was not attended to then? This seems most extraordinary, most incomprehensible. Was there any report from any officer? Is there any evidence to be brought before the House to justify this vote?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understand something about this vote with reference to Mr. Durnford, as the papers  
Mr. COSTIGAN.

were placed in my hands some time ago, before the Minister took possession of his office. Mr. Durnford, as I understand it, was an officer who, subsequent to this period, became stamp distributor, or stamp officer, for the Province of Quebec. Up to the 15th of November, or between July and November, he also acted as Inland Revenue officer, and then these offices became separate. During this period he collected some very large amounts, over \$100,000 of revenue for the Dominion, and at the same time he was acting as stamp distributor for the Province of Quebec. He received no remuneration, and he made a claim for it at the time, but did not persistently press it on this Government, further than to put it in and to write about it several times, because he was of a nervous disposition, and was frightened lest it should interfere with the other office that he held. He died some two or three years ago, and his widow has pressed the claim ever since. The officers of the Department, I am informed by Mr. Miall, made a very close investigation into it, and are satisfied that he never received the salary for that period, and that the statement is perfectly true. He collected for the Dominion a very large amount of revenue, and only received the small salary which he had for performing his provincial duties. That is the story. I got the letters which Mrs. Durnford sent; I asked Mr. Miall about it, and this is the information which he gave me.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if the claim was made at the time, it must have been considered at the time. It cannot be presumed that the Government threw the claim of a public servant on one side, into the waste-paper basket. It must have been considered and disallowed.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was not disallowed.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not accepted, at any rate.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I saw the papers; but there was no disallowance or consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was not then in Parliament.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I saw the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not know how diligently the Administration of that day performed the duties of their offices. I decline, for the credit of that Administration opposite with which I sat all that time, to assume if possible that they wholly neglected a claim of this kind, and having considered it, they must have decided that it was not fit to be paid. I have some remote recollection, gathered as the hon. gentleman spoke—and thought that the question was familiar—of a question of this kind once being raised, the officer having been a Quebec officer; and I think that something was indicated to this officer, that he must choose which service he would take, and he accepted the Quebec instead of the Dominion service.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that something of that kind occurred. Now, the question is, whether this gentleman's main office was not the Quebec office, on what principle is this salary fixed? Was the salary assigned to the office later? or did it belong to the office before they were separated? How does it happen that this discrepancy or difficulty arose in July, 1868? If I rightly recollect the first Government of Canada gave notice to these people that they could not serve the Local Government and them too, and they elected to serve the Local Government. I think, Sir, that we should have the papers before us before being called on to vote this sum of money. I have stated more than once, and I repeat again, that claims fifteen years old, particularly for salaries and allowances, are generally all wrong and without foundation; people press them at the time and they are not granted because they have no foundation. When we are to'd fifteen years afterwards that



they are all right, it is probably because the officers concerned in the matter at that time are dead and gone, or that they know nothing about it, and cannot give the explanations upon which the permanent staff of that time or the political staff decided the other way. When these claims are brought down after a lapse of fifteen years, I think that the least we can expect is that we shall have the papers before us which led the Minister to his present conclusion.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will bring all the papers down on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. In both cases?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And we will have latitude of discussion?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

388. Weights and Measures .....\$1,390.03

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first item is \$500, to provide for necessary increases to certain inspectors and assistants. The next item is a balance of a revote which has lapsed, to pay ex-inspectors sums deducted for superannuation.

Mr. BLAKE. This covers all payments for these officers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1:30 a.m. o'clock) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 17th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Tariff of duties of Customs.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

### STATIONERY FURNISHED TO MEMBERS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), in moving that the seventh report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament, be concurred in, said: If the House will permit me, I will make a brief statement in relation to a matter which has engaged the attention of those hon. members of the Joint Committee who are members of this House. There has been a good deal of complaint made in regard to the stationery supplied to members in the boxes they receive at the commencement of each Session, and the members of the Joint Committee, who are members of this House, through a sub-Committee of their own, examined into this matter and have come to the conclusion, if it be the will of the House, to recommend that in some respects the class of stationery furnished to us be changed, and that it be more in conformity to that furnished to the Senate, though there are some other articles furnished in the Senate boxes which will not be furnished to us. I may say that the ordinary folio post, the ordinary letter paper, will be abandoned altogether, and instead of it, we shall have note-paper of a somewhat better quality—paper that we can write upon and turn over, without danger of its breaking; and in one or two other respects we think the change will be advantageous. I ought to say, perhaps, that

it would involve some slight additional cost—not very much; but the Committee who considered the matter this morning, came to the conclusion that it would be better to go to that slight additional cost and have paper that is really suitable for use. The small boxes which we have now cost, I believe, \$1.65 each; the boxes which the Senate have now, and which it is proposed to have here, will cost not more than \$2. This is a matter that could not be referred to the Joint Committee, because those members of the Committee who are members of the Senate have nothing whatever to do with this matter, it being one of internal arrangement, and we thought this the only way it could be brought to the attention of the House so that an order could be given by you, Mr. Speaker, to the head of the stationery department, and by mentioning it here, if there was no opposition to it, then the list as prepared by the sub-Committee could be furnished. There is also another matter which I desire to mention, and it is in relation to the supply of stationery to members while in Session. We have discovered that the present system is abused, I do not mean to say that it is abused by members, but that it is open to very great abuse; and the proposal that is made is, that each of the pages be furnished with a small pad and pencil, and when he is sent for stationery the member shall take the trouble—as it will take but a moment—to write the order and sign it with his name, so that the head of the stationery department will have some guarantee that the paper that is sent for is, at any rate, intended for a member. It has been discovered that in some cases paper has been obtained in the name of members that really was not for members at all, and it is thought this plan will correct that abuse. I think that, perhaps, we may save as much in connection with the stationery by adopting this plan as the extra cost of the stationery to be supplied to members at the commencement of the Session. The rest of the report refers simply to the printing of certain documents.

Motion agreed to.

### DEEPENING THE CHANNEL BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Yesterday I had the honor of enquiring from the Government, whether it was the intention to take up the question of the deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec this year, and the hon. Minister of Public Works asked me to defer my question until to-day. With the permission of the House, I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister if he is now ready to answer my question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say that the Government have taken into consideration the memorials presented by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, asking to be authorized to continue the deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec to a depth of 27½ feet. This matter having been considered, resolutions will be submitted to this House by which the Government will ask to be authorized to pay from time to time, to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, a sum yearly not exceeding \$900,000, which is the amount that the Harbor Commissioners, through their Chief Engineer, declare this deepening will cost, the interest to be at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum. This is coupled with the condition that before paying that amount to the Commissioners the Governor in Council shall be satisfied that the calculations, statements and estimates of the engineer of the Commissioners are correct; and, therefore, a Commission will be appointed of two officers of the Government, that is to say, Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, and Mr. Perley, Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department, to certify to those calculations, estimates and statements of the engineer of the Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Do I understand that the Harbor Commissioners will be charged 4 per cent. on the amount of money advanced ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The interest will be 4 per cent. on \$900,000.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

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

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the Railway Companies and for the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :

To the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company for 100 miles of their railway from Metapediac on the Intercolonial Railway to Paspebiac, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	\$320,000
To the Caraquet Railway Company for 36 miles of their railway, from a point near Bathurst to Caraquet, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	115,200
To the Gatineau Valley Railway Company for the first 50 mile section of their railway from Hull Station, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	160,000
To the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company for 80 miles of their railway from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	256,000
To the International Railway Company for 49 miles of their railway from Sherbrooke, in the Province of Quebec, to the International boundary line, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	156,800
In connection with the extension of this road through Maine to connect with New Brunswick, at or near Vanceborough or south of that point, the Miramichi Valley Railway Company for 32 miles of their railway, from the Intercolonial Railway at the Miramichi crossing above Wilson's Point, to Moran's, near Demphy Village, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	102,400
To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for the first 50 mile section of their railway, out of St. Jérôme, in the Province of Québec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	160,000
To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for 28 miles of their railway, from Napanee to Tamworth, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	89,600
To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway, from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	80,000
In addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 45th Victoria, chapter 14.	
For a railway from the Intercolonial Railway at Peti-codiac to Havelock Corner, in the Province of New Brunswick, 12 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	38,400
For a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, 110 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	660,000
In addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 45th Vic., chap. 14.	
Total.....	\$2,138,400

The subsidies first mentioned to be granted to the companies hereinbefore named respectively; and the two subsidies last mentioned to be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to complete the said railways, respectively, and all the eleven lines above-mentioned shall be constructed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council; according to descriptions and specifications to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made by each company with the Government, and which the Government shall be empowered to make; and all the said subsidies, respectively, to be payable out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada by instalments, on the completion of each section of not less than ten miles of railway, proportionate to the value of the portion so

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

completed in comparison with the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister.

He said: The district that is proposed to be opened up by this Baie des Chaleurs Railway is one that is well known to those who have paid any attention to the subject, to be very remote from the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and the communication with it to be exceedingly difficult; and we believe the opening up of that section of country will not only facilitate the trade and business of a very large area, but by giving facilities of communication with the Intercolonial will also bring a large volume of traffic to that road, which otherwise would not reach it. This line is proposed to start from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, at or near Metapediac station, and run thence in an easterly direction along the north shore of the Restigouche River and Baie des Chaleurs to Paspebiac, a distance of 100 miles. It is contemplated to extend the line, not only to Paspebiac, but a distance of some eighty miles further, to Gaspé Bassin. The resources of this district are very considerable. It is a very finely timbered country, and the product of the fisheries is very large. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), who has given much attention to the resources of that section of the country, has prepared from the Trade Returns of the Province of Quebec, for 1881, a series of tables which show a very large product from the fisheries in that district. The hon. gentleman has shown that on the south shore of the Province of Quebec there are no less than 30,382 barrels of bait put up annually, 22,498 of salt salmon and herring, 88,151 cwt. of cod, haddock and ling, 530,297 lbs. of fresh salmon, 38,834 gallons of cod and whale oil, and, in the immediate district of Paspebiac, there were 40 vessels, 1,279 fishing boats, and 3,579 fishermen employed. A large portion of the catch is dispatched by sailing craft to the United States and other foreign ports, whereas when the railway is constructed it is believed that the major part of the catch will find its way to Quebec, Montreal and the western parts of Canada and the North-West by rail; and not only so, but supplies from the western portions of the country will come down as return freight. The section of country of which I am speaking has not only valuable forests but an agricultural district, which is very inviting to settlers, and it is believed that the construction of this railway will greatly conduce to the development of its resources. The construction of the road is estimated to cost \$2,590,000, and with an equipment of the value of \$100,000, the total cost will be \$2,690,000. The Province of Quebec, has, I believe, given a subsidy to this line of railway of 10,000 acres of land per mile along the route so far as available in that section of the country. This district is very imperfectly served at present by steam communication, which is provided, of course, only during the season when navigation is open, and when navigation is not open the district is not served at all. When navigation is open communication is maintained by a steamer, which we are obliged to subsidize to the extent of \$12,500 a year. It will be at once seen, therefore, that not only will the service be performed much better, and throughout the entire year, provided the company are able to raise the large additional amount of capital required, but the subsidy of \$320,000 will render unnecessary the old subsidy of \$12,500 a year, which, at 4 per cent., represents a capital of over \$300,000. It will not be necessary to grant the subsidy of \$12,500 a year, which we are now obliged to give, when the road is extended to Gaspé; and so soon as the railway reaches Paspebiac, even supposing steam communication to be maintained between that port and Gaspé, it will be only for a distance of eighty miles and will be performed at a small cost. And I trust that the company will be able to go on, and at no distant day extend the road to Gaspé; and, as I have said before, the country will be developed, it will be opened up for settlement, and these additional facilities will be

given, while a great volume of important traffic in connection with this enormous development of the fisheries of that section of the country will be brought over a considerable portion of the Intercolonial Railway, and be rendered infinitely more valuable than at present, by reason of the rapid despatch with which fresh fish especially will be sent from those districts into the western parts of Canada and the United States. I do not think it necessary to say more to the House, in order to show them that if this important work can be performed for a subsidy of \$320,000, which, of course, will reach over a number of years during construction, we shall have promoted the general interests of the country to a much larger extent than the amount of subsidy which we are called upon to provide for this purpose; and as a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial, we may expect that so far from this subsidy costing us anything, taken in connection with other important advantages in the development of the country to which I have referred, it will be of very great service from every point of view from which it can be looked at. Then it is proposed to provide a subsidy for the Caraquet Railway Company for thirty-six miles of railway from a point near Bathurst to Caraquet in New Brunswick, not exceeding \$3,200 a mile, and in the whole \$115,200. I may say to the House that this is also another branch of the Intercolonial Railway. During the time that the Intercolonial was being located and constructed the House will remember that Mr. Fleming brought forward a project of reaching the sea by constructing this branch of forty miles from the Intercolonial down to Shippigan, and that this project was viewed with very great favor by a large portion of the press, and by a great many people in this country. The Government made a survey of the line, and found that it could be constructed at a comparatively moderate expense, and that there were no serious difficulties in construction; but it has not been proceeded with as a Government work; a company however, is organised for a purpose of constructing a line from the Intercolonial to the harbor of Shippigan, where navigation is reached; and they have also obtained from the Government of New Brunswick a subsidy of \$3,000 a mile for forty-five miles from the Intercolonial to Shippigan. They have applied to this Government for additional aid, and after having given to the subject the most careful consideration, we feel that we would be warranted in asking Parliament to provide \$3,200 a mile for thirty-six miles, which is the shortest distance that will take them from the Intercolonial to tide water where they will be able to reach navigation. This line also runs through a very interesting section of country that is susceptible of great development, and we believe that it will afford, in the same way as the Baie des Chaleurs line, to which I have already turned the attention of the House, means for enabling the fishermen of that portion of New Brunswick to have infinitely greater advantages than they have at present, and increase the value of their catch, because, as is in other instances, they will be able rapidly to send fresh fish at a small cost by rail to the western portion of Canada, and to the various markets of the United States. This line will also so develop that section of the country, and so increase the receipts on the Intercolonial by giving us additional volume of traffic, that we believe it will make an ample return to the Government for the subsidy which the House is invited to give. I have no doubt that if any further information is required with reference to either of these lines, my hon. friends, who represent the line provided for in Quebec, and my hon. friend the hon. member for Gloucester, with relation to the Caraquet Railway, will be able to satisfy the House that this is a wise and judicious appropriation of public money looked at in the light of the commercial results which are to occur in the increased development of the country, and in the increased volume of traffic over the Inter-

colonial, which has cost this country so large a sum of money, and which it is desirable should be rendered as useful as possible to this country by promoting the construction of these subsidiary lines and branches that will throw traffic into it. The next item is the Gatineau Valley Railway Company. For the first fifty mile section, from Hull station, in the Province of Quebec, the subsidy not to exceed \$3,200 a mile, and in the whole \$160,000. Now, I may say that it has been conclusively proved to the Government, what is known to many hon. members of the House—that lying here to the north on the other side of the Ottawa River, is a great country capable of being formed at no distant date into a great Province. There is here, in fact, another Province of Quebec, which yesterday was comparatively unknown, and comparatively unpeopled, but a country that the closest and most careful investigation proves to be of enormous extent, and of great fertility. Now, I need not say to the House, that every member of the House, every hon. gentleman who has given this subject any consideration at all, that it is not only of the most vital importance to Canada that we should attract immigrants from the Old World, but it is of still greater importance to Canada that we should retain our own population within our own country. It is known that, for whatever reason I am unable to say, the great North-West has never presented the attractions to our Lower Canadian friends that it has to the great Province of Ontario and the other Provinces. From some cause, some indisposition to go far from home, or for whatever reason which I am unable to state, we do know it to be a fact, that the greatest reluctance has been shown by the inhabitants of the old Province of Quebec to leave their own Province; and that when they do leave it, they go as short a distance from it as possible, which takes them across the boundary to the south of us, where they become citizens of the United States. If, by developing this great section of country lying on the other side of the Ottawa, this great and fertile country with unlimited resources in the way of forests, to be thus opened up, with magnificent lumber resources, with a soil that is capable of giving a most abundant return to those who cultivate it, with enormous mineral resources, the development of which is calculated to produce great national wealth in that locality—I say, if that be the case, I am satisfied that the House will say: “We are justified in treating these two lines of railway; first, the Gatineau Valley Railway, running 127 miles away to the north from Hull station, with a branch to the Gatineau, and another from St. Jérôme intersecting it away in the interior of the country, on the line which is ultimately intended to be extended to the Mattawan. I say, that from the information we have received as to the character of the country to be opened up, I believe the House will consider these two subsidies of \$160,000 each, or \$3,200 a mile for fifty miles on each of these lines, a wise and judicious appropriation of public money; and the last few years has given the most abundant evidence that there is no section of this country which we could assist in opening and developing, which is more likely to accomplish the great result of keeping within the boundaries of the Province of Quebec, that portion of its population which otherwise, if disinclined to go to our own North-West, might find attractions in the country south of us. I may be permitted to read a few words from a communication addressed to the Government by the Montreal and Western Railway these remarks being as applicable to the country traversed by the Gatineau Railway as that through which the other line is intended to be constructed, the intention being that the two roads shall intersect each other at a distance of about 100 miles to the north. It is stated in relation to that country:

“The tract of country which our railway proposes to traverse can be confidently stated as equal in fertility to the best parts of the Province of Quebec. It is covered as a rule with hardwood, maple, elm, oak,

birch, &c., a sure sign of a rich soil. Already a strong current of colonization has set in through this tract of country; over 10,000 souls have established themselves there since five or six years, and twenty five townships and parishes have been partly settled. But this movement cannot continue without the aid of a railway. The last settlers are now at eighty miles from St. Jérôme, the nearest railway station; they cannot be expected to go any further if they have not railway facilities. Besides, it is necessary to increase the width of the inhabited portions of the Province, in order to ensure in the future and maintain for ever the importance of the route of the River St. Lawrence as the main commercial highway of the Dominion.

"At 100 miles back of the Ottawa River lies an immense territory of unsurpassed fertility, a Province in itself, and from that territory the whole of the traffic created will converge towards the St. Lawrence route and through no other on account of its geographical position. For the populous district of Montreal, containing nearly a half a million of souls, it is the only territory left open for the surplus of its population. I am happy to state that the efforts of Rev. F. Labelle and others have succeeded in directing towards these new and prosperous settlements a great many of our countrymen who would otherwise have gone to the United States."

I may state that the Rev. Father Labelle, a gentleman known to many hon. members of this House as a patriot of the finest type, and as a whole-souled enthusiast, who throws himself into any work in which he may be engaged with such ardor as to inspire confidence in the men with whom he comes in contact, thus leading them on successfully into the most profitable careers—this gentleman has devoted the last few years of his life to peopling this large, fertile, productive section of the country. I am almost afraid to state the number of people he has sent into that country, but I think I may venture to say that he has taken at least 10,000 people within the last three or four years into this previously almost unknown country. These people are making happy and prosperous homes for themselves in what was a desert and wilderness. As he fills one part of the district he goes on to farther outposts; but he has reached a point where, he says, a railway is absolutely necessary for the prosecution of the important and valuable work in which he is engaged. I believe that if these 10,000 people had not gone there they would either have been struggling with poverty in their former homes, or seeking prosperity in another country. I believe there is no member of the House who will not regard such a work as that as of the greatest possible importance to Canada, and that the resources of such a country should be developed as only railway communication can develop it. The amount of assistance proposed is only \$3,200 per mile, but it is believed that this small subsidy, with the subsidies given by the Province of Quebec, will be found sufficient to open up that country, and create out of that untrodden wilderness a region which will compare very well with some of our existing Provinces. The proposition is to give to the Gatineau Valley Railway Company for the first fifty mile section of their railway, from Hull station, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$160,000; and to the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for the first fifty mile section of their railway, out of St. Jérôme, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$160,000. Then, Sir, it is proposed to give to the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, for eighty miles of their railway from Canso to Louisburg, or Sydney, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$256,000. I may say that this is for the purpose of extending the existing railway system of Canada from the Strait of Canso through the Island of Cape Breton to Sydney and Louisburg, two ports which are now connected with a short line of railway—the only railway of any length existing on the Island of Cape Breton. The construction of this eighty miles will extend the great inter-oceanic system of railway communication to which we have been devoting so much time and energy for the last few years, from Port Moody, on the shores of the Pacific, to the easternmost port in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I need not refer to the great volume of shipping which is now pouring into the harbor of Sydney as stated by the senior member for the county of Cape Breton last night, and there is only a comparatively small portion of the year when it is inaccessible to the ocean. The port of Louisburg with which, as I have stated, it is connected by rail, is open at all seasons of the year, and by that port we have the shortest route to Liverpool, as the distance by way of Louisburg is 200 miles shorter than by Halifax, the nearest port to England we now have in Canada. This will make almost an air line of communication—the most direct line of communication—connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal, running by the Grand Trunk system from Montreal to Sherbrooke, there taking the International Railway to the boundaries of the State of Maine, and then striking New Brunswick at the Mattawamkeag, or in that neighborhood, thence on to St. John, thus forming the shortest line of communication which can be obtained between the western portions of Canada and the Atlantic ports. This House has occasionally, and very naturally, been agitated on the question of a winter port for Canada. A good deal of excitement was raised in the country a short time ago, at the danger, as I felt it, and as I believe every good Canadian would feel it, of having the Atlantic terminus of that great Canadian Pacific Railway at Portland or Boston; and, Sir, it was very natural that anxiety should be excited when everybody knew the great advantage the ports of Boston and Portland had over Halifax or any Canadian port, as the terminus of that great trans-continental line of railway, for which we have had to make such great exertions, and have had to provide so largely from the public Treasury. I say that there is no intelligent man in this country, there is no patriotic Canadian, but would deplore the location of the Atlantic terminus of our great inter-oceanic line of railway at Boston or Portland. We have the most friendly feelings towards the great nation to the south of us; but much as we respect that country, we love our own more; and it was apparently a great misfortune that we should be handicapped in our efforts to make Halifax a great Atlantic port, by the shorter distance to the ocean by way of Boston or Portland. But with this line of communication—taking the Grand Trunk to Sherbrooke, taking the International Company's line from Sherbrooke to the boundary of the State of Maine, crossing the State of Maine, and striking New Brunswick at Mattawamkeag, or in that neighborhood, we can reach St. Andrews, a port of the Province of New Brunswick, thus bringing Montreal the great commercial centre of the country, and Liverpool nearer together by a Canadian port; or going on to St. John, we can reach Liverpool by way of that fine port with a shorter line from Montreal than that from Montreal and Portland or Montreal and Boston. When I state that to the House, I think I have given abundant evidence to show the wisdom of the small subsidy proposed for the International Company's line from Sherbrooke to the boundary of the State of Maine—and I may say that it will open up one of the finest districts of country to be opened up in the Province of Quebec, a district that will compare favorably with that of which I have already spoken on the other side of the Ottawa. That company have pushed their line to the boundary of the State of Maine, with the exception of fifteen miles; but a portion of the road is laid with iron rails, which are pretty thoroughly expended, and it is proposed to give that railway a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile to enable them to lay with steel rails the portion of their road already constructed with iron rails, and the portion yet unconstructed, for a distance of forty-nine miles, altogether, thus forming a link of this inter-oceanic communication that will enable us to reach the ocean by the harbors of St. John and St. Andrews, by as direct a line, though not quite so short, as by the port of Boston; and taking into consideration the distance between those

ports and Liverpool, it will enable us, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to have the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of all the railways of Canada—the winter and freight terminus—not at a foreign port to the south of us, but at a port in our own country. The distance from Montreal to Halifax will be shortened by 160 miles by the line I have referred to. Then, a subsidy is provided for an extension of the railway system of Nova Scotia, towards the Island of Cape Breton. A subsidy, composed of fifty miles of completed railway, between Truro and Pictou, was handed over by the late Government to the Government of Nova Scotia, to enable that Government to secure the construction of the line towards the Island of Cape Breton. I hoped, and all of us hoped, when that subsidy was given, that it would accomplish more than it did accomplish; but when the contract came to be made, it was found that the Government were obliged to give an additional subsidy, amounting, I think, to something like \$750,000, to secure the construction of the road from Pictou, or New Glasgow, on to the Strait of Canso. It was hoped that this would carry the line further; but it has not done so, and arrangements have been made by the late and the present Governments of Nova Scotia to acquire that eighty miles of railway, leaving eighty miles to be constructed in the Island of Cape Breton, which everybody knows will be of great importance to this country at no distant day, in forming the most direct and rapid route between this country and the Mother Country; and knowing, as we do, that a great saving of time and distance will be effected for the transfer of mails and passengers by extending this road to the harbor of Louisburg, we believe that Parliament, in carrying out and extending the policy of having the most direct line across this continent from ocean to ocean that it is possible to obtain, and of having the most western portion of our country and the Pacific trade brought as near to the Mother Country and by as rapid and direct line of communication as possible, will be prepared to approve of the small subsidy to the International Company, forming the link on this end of the road, and this subsidy of \$3,200 a mile to secure the construction of that eighty miles, as I trust it will be secured, from Canso to the harbor of Louisburg. I do not think it will be necessary for me to detain the House at this stage of the Session, to speak longer on this question, great and important as it is; but I will say that it would be difficult to overrate the value to Canada of obtaining this great route from ocean to ocean, and it would be difficult to overrate the importance, from every point of view, of opening up the Island of Cape Breton. The Island of Cape Breton is cut off by the Strait of Canso, although there is no ice, and no difficulty of maintaining communication across that strait by means of a boat—and, perhaps, at no distant day, by a bridge or a tunnel, although that is not proposed at present. It is at present cut off by the Strait of Canso from railway communication with the rest of the country, and it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the development of the Island of Cape Breton, of the construction of that eighty miles of railway. Independent of enormous coal fields, independent of the valuable fisheries, it is known that Cape Breton possesses not only a large portion of good soil adapted to cultivation and development, but also mineral resources of various kinds that only await the facilities railroads alone can give in order to cause the Island to spring forward, as I am sure it will, with unwonted rapidity. I will not say more with relation to this particular subject. Then there is the Miramichi Valley Railway Company. This company have projected a line from Fredericton across to the Intercolonial Railway in the Province of New Brunswick, striking the Intercolonial at Miramichi. They have obtained a subsidy of \$3,000 a mile from the New Brunswick Legislature, but I did not feel warranted, under the circumstances, when they applied for a subsidy, in asking

Parliament for a subsidy for that distance; but I believe that the large timber districts that will be opened up and developed by the line, and the opening up of the resources of that section of the country, fully warrants us in asking Parliament to appropriate \$3,200 a mile for a distance not exceeding thirty-two miles, to form a branch of the Intercolonial. I believe that the lumber that will be brought on to the Intercolonial Railway, and from a source of increased traffic for the road will fully warrant us in asking Parliament for this appropriation. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who has given this subject most careful and exhaustive attention, who, as every person knows, is so intensely alive to the development of every section of this country, but more particularly the Province of New Brunswick, and still more particularly the county of Northumberland, will be able to give you more convincing reasons why this small subsidy should be granted. For a branch from Petitcodiac to Havelock Corner, N.B., we ask a subsidy of \$3,200 a mile for twelve miles, or \$38,400. This will open up an important section of country not hitherto opened by railway. In reference to these matters we are only following out the policy entered upon by our predecessors. The House will remember that my hon. predecessor adopted the policy of giving to parties, who would provide the means of constructing branches to the Intercolonial, rails to lay the track. With reference to the Miramichi Valley Railway and this short line to Havelock the same policy is carried out; and I may say that when I was sitting on the other side of the House, that policy, when introduced by my predecessor, had my hearty sanction and co-operation. I believed it was a wise policy, that the Intercolonial having cost the country so much should be made the means of developing the country as fast as possible. No one looked for a return of the money expended in its construction as a national line of communication; but this large sum having been expended, we all felt that every reasonable effort that could be made by giving them comparatively small subsidies to aid in the construction of branches to the Intercolonial was a sound and judicious policy. The Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company applied to the Government for a subsidy in providing rails for the twenty-eight miles of their railway that they graded from Napanee to Tamworth. That road will connect the Bay of Quinté, which it taps at Napanee, and the waters of the lakes and the St. Lawrence, where it taps those waters at Napanee, with the interior line of railway now in course of construction, called the Ontario and Quebec Railway. The Government sent an engineer to report on this road, and having found that not only was it going to be an important factor in the development of that section, but that in addition to the railway facilities it would give, it would open up a most valuable water-power, and give a great stimulus to the manufacturing industries of the country, we believe we would be warranted in asking a small subsidy and applying the same principle as had been applied by the late Government on the branches of the Intercolonial Railway, of furnishing the means of laying the twenty-eight miles of track they had graded with steel rails. Then there is the appropriation for the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, which is substantially the appropriation asked for each year. In submitting to Parliament last year the appropriation for the railway, I made an error of twenty-five miles in the distance. I asked Parliament to give that road an amount that would be necessary to provide \$3,200 a mile from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, and that is all that is asked now. The distance between these points was stated to me correctly by the company, and the error I find was mine. The distance covers twenty-five miles more than that covered by the resolutions of last year, and the \$80,000 is additional to the subsidy provided last year, but the whole subsidy only covers the road between the two points stated. Last year, I explained to the House the importance of that Lake St.

John district. I showed that all the explorations had shown there was a very fertile district lying around Lake St. John which this road would open up, and that this road might be regarded to a large extent as an extension of the Intercolonial up to Lake St. John, because you had only to cross the river at Quebec to enable you to make connection with the Lake St. John Railway, and carry it up to that vast, fertile, wheat-bearing district around Lake St. John which it is most desirable should be opened up. Then, Sir, I come last to the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, 110 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$660,000; and this, as the notice paper shows, is in addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 45 Vic, chap. 14, the subsidy taken last year. Those hon. gentlemen who were here a year ago will remember that on that occasion I stated that this was really implementing a pledge given by the leader of the late Government when he became leader of the Government. It will be remembered that that hon. gentleman, before going to the country, issued, as he was bound to do, a manifesto, stating what the policy of the Government, was and how they proposed to deal with the great question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in their manifesto he stated that a part of the policy of the Government was to subsidize lines of railway connecting with the Quebec and Ontario systems. Hon. members will remember that when that hon. gentleman, at a later stage in the Session of 1874, brought down his Canadian Pacific Railway policy for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when he spoke of the subsidies that he proposed to grant to these lines of railway to connect the Canadian Pacific at Callander with the Ontario and Quebec systems of railway, I interrupted the hon. gentleman, and asked him, as will be seen by reference to the report of his speech at the time: "Do you men to subsidize one line or two lines? Is it to be a line to connect with the Quebec system?"—for he was explaining that, and the hon. gentleman's answer was: "Two lines." Now, this subsidy provides for the Gravenhurst and Callander section, 110 miles of railway, and is intended to fulfil the pledge that hon. gentleman made previous to the Elections, and in Parliament after the Elections, that not only was there to be a direct line of railway communication by the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway, but there was also to be a line of communication from Callander to connect with the Ontario system of railways. If the hon. gentleman had not said that, if he had made no reference to the subject, I do not believe there is a gentleman on either side of this House who will say that not only is it fair and just to make this provision to connect with the Ontario system, as the Canada Central subsidy, which was given by the late Government, enabled us to connect the Quebec system with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that, apart altogether from any question of pledges, apart altogether from any question of even-handed justice, I do not believe there is a gentleman on either side of this House who will not say that, looking at this great question in the light of the importance of the development of the North-West, it is essential, to the completion of our system, that we should have the most direct, the most rapid, and the most independent line of communication between the great Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander, and the great commercial centres at Toronto, Hamilton, and all those towns on the lakes. Looking, Sir, to the importance of the advantage in competition in prices in the development of that great North-West country where for many long years to come you will have a great agricultural population making enormous demands upon the manufacturing industries of these old Provinces, where, for many long years to come, from the very nature of the country and the manufacturing advantages that are enjoyed in these old Provinces, an immense trade will grow up. I say it is of the most vital consequence, in my judgment, to the develop-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ment of the great North-West, that you should have the great commercial centres in Ontario and Quebec connected with the North-West by the most rapid, easy and cheap line of communication you can obtain. I may be told that we had an offer to construct this line of railway by the Grand Trunk Railway Company practically for a subsidy of \$6,000 a mile last year. Sir, I frankly admit that this is the case. I believe that to-day the subsidy voted by this Parliament last year would enable the Grand Trunk Railway Company to connect their system of railway with Callander; but after looking at this question in all its bearings, after looking at it in the light of the great importance to the country of having the connecting link between the commercial centres of Ontario and the North-West at the Callander Junction, we came to the conclusion that we would come here and ask for that which would be necessary to secure the construction of this line of railway as an independent line of communication, that we would ask for this additional subsidy, satisfied that Parliament, in its wisdom, would feel that it was infinitely better that we should, by this increased appropriation of \$660,000 more, secure that as an independent link and line of communication between the railway system of Ontario and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the reason of placing this subsidy in the resolutions that will, I say it advisedly, secure the immediate construction of this important link of railway communication, completing and implementing the promise that was held out to Ontario, that the Ontario lines of railway should be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway as the Quebec lines of railway were. This subsidy will not only secure that, but it will secure it in a way that will enable us to maintain it for the Government. We shall not give a dollar of that subsidy except on terms and conditions that will secure one of two things. I may be told that it is impossible to secure that by a line of railway, that any property held by any great corporation shall not be altered in its character and lose its independence; I may be told that, and I have no answer to give, except to say that the history of the past shows that it is all but impossible to prevent those things taking place; but I say this: We will secure one of two things—that either this line of railway shall be maintained for all time to come as independent of the two great railway systems of this country, the Canadian Pacific Railway on the one hand, and the Grand Trunk Railway system on the other, or we will take care to secure that, before a single dollar of this money is obtained by any company, such security shall be given; that when it ceases to be an independent line of communication, the company who obtains the subsidy and expends it in constructing the road, the moment that occurs this subsidy shall be chargeable, and that we shall have the first lien upon this road, and that we shall have, in addition to that, an additional lien upon the best security that can be given upon the road of any company with which it becomes incorporated or connected; so that if at any time it loses its independence, the Government will be in a position to return back to the Treasury of the country the money that has thus been appropriated, the two sums of \$660,000 each, the amount voted last year and the amount voted this year. I submit these resolutions to the House with every confidence that they will be regarded by the House as they are regarded by the Government, as justified in the best interests of the country, as calculated to develop the various sections of this country at a smaller cost and greater advantage to the country than any similar expenditure of public money would develop them; and that one and all of these subsidies will be found to make the most valuable return to the Treasury by the development of trade and the increase of commerce—I say to a greater extent than any other appropriation of public money to the same amount that could be provided in any other way.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman brought down, towards the end of last Session, a set of resolutions granting aid to various railways, I stated that it was his duty to have preceded that submission to the House by laying on the Table at much earlier dates papers and materials which might enable us, by a study of them, to form some judgment as to the merits of his proposals. The hon. gentleman said that the custom was, when papers were of public interest, to move for them; but we could not be aware that those papers were wanted, that they existed, that they would be called for with reference to any deliberate judgment of ours to be asked this Session until the hon. gentleman's proposals were on the Table, and, therefore, the answer of the hon. gentleman was wholly unsatisfactory at that time. I reiterated the demand that, as a rule, founded upon the practice of Parliament, and founded also upon common sense, and common reason, proposals of this kind should be preceded by the submission of the papers upon which the judgment of the Government was founded. These resolutions of the hon. gentleman was printed for the first time, as well as I remember, in the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, and I at once placed upon the notice paper a motion—which I knew could not be reached for the Government have appropriated all the days, but which I placed there to give an indication, at the earliest moment, of a renewal of my plan—a motion for all papers and correspondence with reference to grants to all these railways. The hon. gentleman, to-day, has made his statement, and he has told us, in almost every instance, of the prolonged enquiry, the careful investigation, the many sources of information from which he drew, in coming, himself and his colleagues, to a conclusion as to the merits of each one of these proposals. But the hon. gentleman did not vouchsafe to give to members of Parliament, before they are called on to decide whether the proposals be just or not, that information, those papers, those materials which were the painful results of his long labor in coming to a conclusion on those subjects. The hon. gentleman has made a speech in which he has condescended to give some particulars with respect to some of these railway grants, with that lavish hand with which he is accustomed to fling out such assurances of the toil, the labor, the care, the patience which he took to reach a just conclusion on this matter. But members of Parliament are bound to form conclusions for themselves, and they are entitled to the materials upon which such conclusions can be formed, and, therefore, I repeat that it was the duty of the hon. gentleman, if he contemplated advancing these propositions to Parliament this Session, to have preceded that step by submitting to us the materials on which to form a judgment. We often hear in this House, and elsewhere, of the vast extent of the country whose concerns at this moment engage our attention; and this Session the hon. gentleman has submitted a map, which conveys, in a very striking manner, the extent of the territory of this country, in which the Province in which we are, or at all events the undisputed territory of that Province, appears almost like a speck in the whole area of magnificent distances which comprise the Dominion. Each of us, I suppose, masters to some extent, as it is his duty to master, the geographical configurations of the particular Province from which he hails. Some of us, I daresay, but I cannot speak for more than myself, have but imperfect information, even with respect to our own Province; but although it may be our duty—I quite agree that it is a high duty—to familiarize ourselves as far as may be with the conditions, circumstances, territory, area and resources of the other Provinces, still we are not able, speaking generally, without some particular knowledge of the particular territory, to speak of these proposals in detail, and I am almost ashamed to confess, as I must confess, that I do not possess such knowledge of the peculiar conditions of the country, and the lay of the land,

so to speak, as to be able, at this moment, to form an intelligent judgment of the proposals before the House. This observation I make as emphasizing and making more plain the proposition that if the proposals of the hon. gentleman were not to be taken wholly on trust, and on the assurance as to what conclusion Parliament ought to arrive at, the prior information, to which I have referred, should have been submitted. There is one sense in which I have no right to be surprised at any of the proposals which the hon. gentleman might bring down in this direction. I told him, last year, when he brought his proposals, that it was impossible to deny with respect to some of them, at any rate, under whatever cloud of words they might be submitted, that he was, in point of fact, aiding Provincial and local works, and that the door was but opened, and he would find it difficult, if not impossible, to close it. He has found it, perhaps, difficult, or impossible, to open it as wide as he would have desired; others may have attempted to close it, but found it too late; but it is open wide enough to admit the various subsidies which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House. The hon. gentleman dealt in several statements with respect to the results of some of these subsidies, which were somewhat vague, and, perhaps, judiciously vague. We were treated to glowing statements of the importance of securing the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway on Canadian soil. We were told that the country viewed with anxiety and alarm the prospect that Boston or Portland might form the Atlantic terminus, and that it was important that arrangements should be made whereby that terminus should be on our own soil, and the hon. gentleman pointed out how he proposed to accomplish this result. But I counted as well as I could, and perhaps I omitted some, no less than four eastern termini for the Canadian Pacific Railway in the course of the hon. gentleman's speech—Halifax, St. John, St. Andrews, and Louisburg, all of which were mentioned, one after the other, as the eastern terminus. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman supposes that these various ports will divide the trade. I do not know whether he felt that it was important to soothe the susceptibilities of the members for Halifax, whose call for the winter port has been so loud and long, and who supposed they might be left out altogether in the cold. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thought it necessary to say a word for the city from which the hon. Finance Minister comes, and, therefore, suggested the probability of St. John becoming the terminus, by virtue of the line proposed to be aided. I was delighted that he also thought St. Andrews would be prepared to take one fourth of the Atlantic trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which port included among its property owners and occasional residents, the hon. Finance Minister and Minister of Railways, and they naturally take a very deep interest in the prosperity of that interesting portion of Her Majesty's Dominions on this side of the water. I hope the hon. gentleman's predictions in placing St. Andrews first and foremost as the eastern terminus, may be fully realized in spirit as well as in letter. The hon. gentleman had several good words for the Island of Cape Breton, which I was glad to hear. He referred to Sydney and spoke of Louisburg; and there he used language of judicious vagueness. The hon. gentleman pointed out the importance of Sydney and the importance of Louisburg; and that we were now arranging a connection between the Pacific and the most easterly point at which we had a harbor in the Dominion possessions. Well, the hon. gentleman pointed out, also, how the distance could be shortened between Halifax to various points and Montreal; and said: "True, the distance by land is a little longer, and the distance by water is a little shorter, but there enter certain other considerations, we all know the importance which over-rule in matters of this kind; but the distance between Halifax and Montreal is greatly

curtailed, and between some other points is greatly curtailed." These are, no doubt, important facts to those who believe that railways ought to be built in the directest line, but very ill news to the few gentlemen who attend to the traffic on the Intercolonial after this time; and the hon. Minister of Railways in future will make his accounts square on through traffic by the short lines, because if a great loss is to be achieved, it is quite clear, that it is the way traffic alone on which, not the hon. gentleman I dare say, who has made this statement in glowing terms, but somebody else, his unhappy successor, will have to balance accounts, notably at the expense of the amiable Postmaster-General which will no doubt be accorded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will allow me to put him right regarding a misapprehension under which he evidently labors. I was not in the House when he made reference in this way to the Postmaster-General; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that my hon. friend pays less on the Intercolonial than on the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not news; I got that from the Postmaster-General on a late occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman is more unfair than I thought.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked the Postmaster-General what he paid for mail service on the Intercolonial and on the Grand Trunk; and I believe that the hon. gentleman referred to the comparative expenditure on other lines, and stated that the estimate was made on the proportion paid by the Grand Trunk and Great Western system.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These payments are made according to mileage; you have to haul the train and postal car, and whether there is one bag or two in the postal car makes very little difference as far as the railway expenditure is concerned, and the payments made; and as I said before, my hon. friend pays a smaller amount for the performance of the mail service on the Intercolonial Railway, than on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. We know that the Great Western gets less than the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk. The Great Western is paid \$124 a mile; the Grand Trunk, \$160, and the Intercolonial \$130. When the hon. gentleman makes a statement he had better make it complete. I was about to say, when the hon. gentlemen interrupted me, with what results we all appreciate, that the hon. gentleman proceeded to point out that he was defending himself on the ground that this was the policy of the late Government. The late Government had old rails to a limited extent to dispose of, while this Government professes to supply the means for obtaining new steel rails. The late Government proposed to Parliament, and Parliament agreed that these old rails should be lent as far as they would go to certain branch lines, supposed to be feeders of the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman says I vindicate this policy because it was the policy of the Government of my hon. friend from East York; and inasmuch as some old rails were lent by them as far as they would go to feeders of the Intercolonial, with the sanction of Parliament, therefore a general scheme of subsidy to railways is proposed all over the country to the extent of \$3,200 a mile. Now, the old steel rail proposition was naturally limited in its character, and the late Government could not lend more rails than they had; but this proposition to furnish new steel rails is entirely different, and is only limited by the extent to which they can find money in the Treasury. Then the hon. gentleman said it was a great advantage to the country to have more railways. Everybody knows that, and agrees that this is a great advantage. It is a great advantage to have new highways and new means of communication; and railways are more and more becoming the

Mr. BLAKE,

main highways of the country. These observations, apart from certain leading questions which may affect the sum of the subsidy, are applicable, *sub modo*, to highways as well as to railways, and are certainly applicable to every railway which it might be proposed to construct everywhere. It is impossible to build a factory, aye, a dwelling-house, or a railway, making easier the means of communication anywhere in the country, to economise the labor of the people and to raise the price of produce by facilitating transport, or to make any public improvement that will not tend to the advantage of the locality concerned, and if of the locality, then, *sub modo*, of the country at large; for all of us in that sense are interested in the progress and prosperity of each part of the country—but that is another question. The question with reference to which the simplicity of one form of the Constitution makes it admissible to some gentlemen; but we cannot have both. You have a Federal or Legislative form of Union at your disposal. If you adopt a Legislative Union, you subsidize from the central enterprises, whether they are local in their character or not, but which yet tend to the advantage of all, because they are to the advantage of a part; but if you adopt the Federal system, you have certain advantages and also certain limitations. You cannot get both and combine inconsistent advantages. This attempt is not being made to-day in more directions than this, and it is an attempt which must result in the end in the ruin of the system under which we now exist. Well, then, the hon. gentleman said he need not defend the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company subsidy, because it was to develop a water-power. Well, we have heard a good deal about this company's subsidy, and what went on, notably in Lennox and Addington, in which certain promises and pledges were made during the late Elections. There was an agreement or suggestion made that a subsidy would be given if the Elections terminated in a particular way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No! You may have heard it, but you have heard what is not true.

Mr. BLAKE. I am inclined to believe that some things were suggested in the way of aiding this scheme. I believe that a surveyor was sent there to survey the country. This went on some time ago, and it was indicated that aid and support would be accorded under certain conditions, expressed or implied.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; this is incorrect.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think that direct promises were made. Perhaps there was a nod, perhaps a wink.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps you know how.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how, but I heard how it had been done; and I have been informed that certain persons, who were very largely interested in the construction of this road and in this company, were converted or perverted—one side of us would say one and the other side the other—within a very few hours of the Election; and by what means we can very well conjecture. I believe, also, it is said that the auditor of this company has been unable to reconcile the accounts of the expenditure with the vouchers, and that a large portion of the expenditure already made remains unvouched for, as far as is known to those concerned in its affairs. I believe, further, that proposals were made to the company sometime after, under which the work could have been taken over by another company and constructed without this subsidy; but I daresay that value has been received, and where value has been received, of course, a return must be made. Well, then, the hon. gentleman says that he proposes the Callander subsidy. We all agree, I presume, in the importance of this connection; and I made an observation the other night which showed how very willing I



was, that what is necessary to be done to secure that advantage in the interest—not merely of the Province of Ontario, but also of the North West in this connection—should be done. Now, it is considered well understood I presume by those who know anything of the subject, that there are two systems of railways which tend towards the point from which the railway is to stretch in a northerly or north-easterly direction—namely, the Midland system and the Northern and North-Western system. Each of those corporations is, I believe, a parent of another corporation which is to construct the intervening link. The infant corporations to which I have referred are chartered upon conditions designed by the Legislature, to secure—so far as legislative provisions can secure—equal rights and privileges to all railway companies which may be connecting railway companies. We can do no more, I suppose, than has been done. I am not personally responsible, but I believe each of the rival companies scrutinized the clauses of the other's Bill; but, as the hon. Minister frankly stated, it is extremely difficult, by legislative provision, to secure equality where one of the companies is in the interest of the other. There is no doubt of that; and what we should aim at is to secure practical, not nominal, equality. You want competition for the North-West and Ontario between these centres of trade. You want real competition which will subsist when each of the railways which strike Gravenhurst and the other southern point approach the neutral link. I believe it is objectionable to give to either of these infant companies, created as they are in the interests of, and to be controlled by, each one of the main railway companies, practically a preference—not a monopoly, but practically a preference—the advantage which arises from the circumstance that it is to be a controlling power. The Northern Railway Company has a line to Toronto and Hamilton—the Midland has a line to Toronto. The North-West between that point and Toronto would, therefore, if you secured perfect equality, have the benefit of competition over these two lines for Canadian Pacific Railway freight, have that benefit. I say this, that in order to save money you might incur the disadvantage of dealing with one or other of these companies, and give \$6,000 a mile subsidy; but if you are going to give \$12,000 a mile—which is nearly or, perhaps, quite enough to build the road without equipment—the true course would be that you should take care that the country receives the true and full benefit of that expenditure. How? In two ways. First of all by securing the thorough independence of that link, by taking care that none of the railways connecting have a practically preferential rate by virtue of the company running the road in its interest, though nominally on equal terms, but by virtue of an independent contract which would secure equal rights to both; and, secondly, by taking care that the rates and fares charged on that piece of railway were based on the proposition that it was practically constructed at the public expense, as it will practically be constructed under the management proposed by the hon. gentleman. We know what has happened with reference to the subsidies heretofore granted. I do not know whether there has been any case—there certainly have been but few—in which the railway which has been aided, although aided very largely by municipal and Governmental bonuses has not been stocked and bonded “up to the handles,” as they say—beyond the intrinsic value of the land and the cost of construction, beyond the point at which it would sell as a commercial enterprise; and being so stocked and bonded, it is, of course necessary that the rates and fares should be kept up high enough—if commercial contingencies render it possible—to meet the interest on the bonds as well as pay dividends on the stock if it is possible to obtain them. That will be the result. The public will build the road; bonds and stock will be issued, not to make up the deficiency beyond the

subsidies, and practically representing their face value; but they will go on the market and be used for other things, and the road will bear the freight, so that the country will have to pay as much for rates over that road as if it had been constructed solely at private expense. If it is worth while for the country to pay \$12,000 a mile for 110 miles, an arrangement should be made by which the contract should be really under the control of the Government by which it would not be necessary for the Government to put an engineer on the road, and the road should be worked so as to pay its running expenses, its maintenance and repairs at the cost of the companies running upon it, which should not be entitled to charge beyond the proper haulage rates. I shall not protract these observations at this time. I still hope the hon. gentleman will comply with the suggestion I made last year, that all the papers and documents which might throw light on these various proposals—scattered as they are over a great extent of territory with which some of us are not so familiarly acquainted as himself, affecting as they do three or four Provinces—will be laid on the Table of the House, and that forthwith.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman complains that information has not been brought down which would enable the House to judge of the propriety of making these grants; but he must be aware that a notice has been on the paper for some time, stating that on a certain day certain grants would be asked for certain roads, with particulars as to the mileage, the rate of subsidy, and the conditions upon which it shall be paid. So far as I have been able to learn from the hon. gentleman's observations, he makes no objection whatever to these railways; on the contrary, he says that these railways, if built, will be of great benefit to the various sections of country through which they will pass. While I am not prepared to say that I am in favor of granting aid to railways at all, I beg to say there is just as much information regarding these roads, before the House at the present time, as we had before the Local Legislature when railway aid was being granted in that House.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman says “hear, hear,” and I know that he does not desire to have any reference made to his acts while he was in the Local Legislature. On every occasion in Parliament and out of it, I have opposed the granting of aid to railways by the Government, and I have stood almost alone on that question in the Local Legislature, and, perhaps, in this House. I recollect one occasion where the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) and myself stood up against granting aid to railways in the Local House, and we were almost laughed at by the majority of the House because of the position we took on that question. However, I will not discuss that proposition, but I would like to remind the hon. gentleman who makes complaint against this Government, that he pursued the same course, and perhaps in an aggravated form, in the Local Legislature. We desired to place on record a resolution, declaring it inexpedient that any aid should be granted to railways under Order in Council until such time as the House had proper information regarding these railways—their financial standing, the country to be served by them, &c. We desired to place on record our view that at least five days' notice should be given to the House before it should be asked to decide. The hon. gentleman condemned that resolution, and why? Because he knew right well that it was necessary, in the interest of his party, that he should hold a certain amount of control over the members of that Legislature. Let us see what was the course of the hon. gentleman in reference to that matter. It will be fresh in the recollection of this House that the late Sandfield Macdonald provided a grant of \$1,500,000 for railways. The hon. gentleman opposite, by means which I shall not

refer to at the present time, induced the House, by a majority of one, to vote out that Government, and with eight seats vacant at the time. A few days afterwards the hon. gentleman stated to the House the necessity of granting \$400,000 more, and a further appropriation of \$100,000 a year for twenty years, in aid of railways, and that too without having appropriated a single dollar of the \$1,500,000. The hon. gentleman was asked: "Why do you not appropriate the \$1,500,000 before you ask for \$400,000 more? Why do you not do that before you impose on the country an obligation to expend \$100,000 a year for twenty years?" The hon. gentleman answered that the money was pledged. To this it was answered that it was not pledged except for some eighty-six miles of road. When I pointed out that this was a bait held out to the House, the hon. gentleman was very indignant. On the 22nd of February, 1872, the hon. gentleman brought down his resolutions, and, without giving any information to the House, without stating that any more would be appropriated, he forced them through the House; and on the 24th of February he introduced a Bill founded on this resolution. On the 28th of February, he carried the Bill through, and during the course of that debate, the hon. Mr. Cameron, the present Judge, and myself, who were opposing him, asked him to tell the House what railways required aid, and the hon. gentleman professed not to know what railways would receive aid. The Bill was passed, and, to the astonishment of the House, the hon. gentleman opened his desk and pulled out ten Orders in Council for granting aid to that many railways. We had no opportunity of ascertaining anything regarding these railways, and the hon. gentleman the next day forced the ten Orders in Council through Parliament to grant aid to these railways. Then we said: "Let us now, for the future, try to ascertain what should be the proper rule of Parliament regarding railway grants; let us lay down a rule so that hon. members shall not be taken by surprise, and so that no Government can force railway grants through Parliament until the House has received proper information regarding them." If hon. members will look at the Journals of the House of the 28th February, 1872, they will see that a resolution was moved to the following effect: "That the country will have just ground for dissatisfaction unless some plan is adopted, whereby, while making all just and necessary provision in aid of railways and other public improvements of provincial interest, provision should be made for municipal obligations, &c." That resolution was voted down, and the Bill was carried. The hon. gentleman then passed his Bill, providing for \$400,000 more, on the flimsy pretext that the whole of the \$1,500,000 had been pledged; but he did not tell us what railways the money was pledged for. In order to enable us to judge whether these railways were entitled to have aid or not, we asked for delay. "No," said the hon. gentleman, "I cannot grant you delay"; and he forced the resolutions through the House the same day. I am pointing this out in order to show that when the hon. gentleman had control of the Ontario Government he was not so fastidious about the House obtaining information. Now, let us see what resolution was moved in order to establish a rule so that hon. gentleman might know whether or not the Orders in Council were forced through by the Government without proper notice. On February 29, 1872, the hon. Mr. Cameron moved, seconded by Mr. Rykert:

"That the said order, together with nine others, involving an aggregate appropriation of \$1,500,000 having been placed on the Table of this House yesterday, and the Government, to repeated requests, having refused to give information as to the undertaking they intended to pass Orders in Council in favor of, till the House had voted an additional subsidy of \$400,000, and a further appropriation of \$100,000 a year for twenty years, the Government has not given this House sufficient time for the consideration of the Order in Council to enable it to give an intelligent and just judgment upon the claim of the several enterprises, and that in future, Orders in Council requiring the ratification of the House should be submitted at an earlier period of the Session, and should  
Mr. RYKERT.

not be taken into consideration by the House until the same has been laid before the House at least four days."

Where was the hon. gentleman then? I find amongst the nays on this resolution the names of Barber, Baxter, Blake, &c., and it was lost by a large majority. I merely point this out to show how inconsistent the hon. gentleman may be. In principle, I am opposed to the granting of a single dollar of aid to any railway company. But we are seized with certain facts, and those facts justify those who are in favor of granting aid to railways, and I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman himself knows right well whether those railway companies are entitled to receive aid or not. I am satisfied that this House is possessed of sufficient information to enable it to judge whether those railways are entitled to this aid or not. If the statements of the hon. Minister of Railways be correct, and no one can doubt them, these railways will help, to a large extent, the great chain which will extend from ocean to ocean. I simply rise to say that while the hon. gentleman attacks the Government with negligence, he himself on another occasion was unwilling to lay down a fixed rule.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I would like to know whether this short line which is now proposed to be subsidized, will proceed the full length of the line described on the map which is laid before Parliament, or stop at some point short of that; because by the speech we have just heard from the hon. Minister of Railways, it is now going by St. John instead of direct from Moncton to Montreal. Where will it connect with the Intercolonial now, for I presume it will connect at some point with the Intercolonial Railway, and proceed by that road to St. John?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is quite impossible for me to say. The project which was laid before the members of the House of Commons by Col. Snow, General Manager and Chief Engineer of the Great American and Short Line Railway Company, is the project, no doubt, they desire to carry out. The hon. gentleman is aware that the charter for what is called the Central Railway has recently been changed in the Legislature of New Brunswick, in a direct line from Fredericton to Salisbury.

Mr. BURPEE. From a point between Salisbury and St. John?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is quite impossible for me to say. There are several lines by which they propose to shorten the connection that are not provided in these resolutions. In fact the full subsidy proposed to be given to that railway company is \$3,200 per mile from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. These resolutions contemplate—and I thought I had made that clear—the connection by the line, as the hon. gentleman knows has been worked upon, as I may say—that parties have endeavored to work out for many years, or what is called the Megantic line. It is only recently that the Great European and Short Line Railway has struck directly to Houlton from Lake Megantic. That is the line they propose to build, and then ask a subsidy from Fredericton to Salisbury, or some other point near there. They then ask a subsidy from Painsic Junction to Baie Verte, and from Baie Verte to Pugwash, in order to shorten the line from Louisburg to Montreal, the long projected line, to secure which so many efforts have been made in order to shorten the distance between Montreal and the nearest ocean port, St. Andrews, and the next nearest, St. John, and the next Halifax. The hon. gentleman is aware that that line has always been projected to go from the State of Maine, in the neighborhood of Lake Megantic to Matawankeag, on the European and North American line. That is the line that has been projected, and it has this advantage. It not only goes through the great commercial centre of New Brunswick, St. John, but it has the advantage that it utilizes

the Intercolonial all the way to Halifax. The hon. gentleman will see that in the one case about seventy to eighty miles more of the Intercolonial Railway by this line would be used than if they made the direct connection with Salisbury. No doubt if that line is constructed, it offers a shorter means of communication from Fredericton, and would be undoubtedly a still shorter and more direct line from Montreal to all these various ports and Louisburg.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I wish to know whether the Short Line Railway which has been incorporated will continue to be subsidized? The Government have subsidized it now as far as the Gut of Canso. We have no information as to whether it is going to proceed further. If it does not, then it is no short line, or a very short line. Is it going to proceed further, and if further, by what route? Do I understand that it is from the Gut of Canso to Pugwash and thence to the Intercolonial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, it is going to Halifax, you go through St. John to Halifax, so far as these resolutions are concerned. The line to Louisburg leaves the Intercolonial Railway at Oxford. The line that was subsidized last year runs from Oxford to New Glasgow, and direct from that by the present Eastern Extension Railway to the Gut of Canso, and from that to Louisburg by the line subsidized by these resolutions.

Mr. BURPEE. Then I understand the only part of the short line of railway now subsidized is the line from Canso to Louisburg, because it takes the Intercolonial from there to St. John, and from St. John by a rival line until it reaches MacAdam Junction, so that after all the only short line subsidized is not the "Short Line" of railway at all. But I wish to say further, that I was given to understand that no local railway would be subsidized. There was a railway in which I was interested and which formed a part of this short line railway which has merits, independently of its being a portion of that Short Line Railway, not inferior to any of the railways which I see subsidized, and which are emphatically local railways. Now, I was informed by very good authority, as the hon. Minister knows, that no local railways would be subsidized by the Government, and therefore this Central Railway could receive no subsidy. I now understand that the policy of the Government, as announced at that time to me and others, has been changed, and that local railways are to be subsidized.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where?

Mr. BURPEE. By these resolutions I see two or three railways that are nothing but local railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Name them.

Mr. BURPEE. In fact it is difficult to put your finger upon one that is not a local railway. I take a local railway to be a railway in one Province. An inter-provincial or national railway is defined to be one running between two Provinces, while a local railway is confined to one Province. These railways are certainly local railways, although two or three of them connect with the Intercolonial Railway, and may be considered feeders of it, while others do not connect with any inter-provincial railway whatever. The Napanee and Quebec Railway and the Gatineau Railway are certainly local railways; in fact, all but two or three of them are local railways, and are within the bounds of a single Province. Therefore, I contend that the hon. Minister of Railways should explain why the policy of the Government, as announced heretofore, has been changed; because we were most emphatically told that no local railway would receive a subsidy from this Government, and, therefore, the subsidy for this Central Railway was not pressed further. I do say that this Central Railway for which a memorial was presented to this Government two or three times, and with reference to which members of

this House, notably those for King's and Queen's (N.B.), with myself, waited upon the Department, has merits quite as great and more inter-provincial than any of those railways, and its claims would have been pressed had we not been assured that no local railway would receive a subsidy; though I do not pretend that any assurance was given that it would receive assistance if it should be made a portion of the Short Line Railway. But we were advised by the hon. Minister to apply for a subsidy for the Central Railway as a portion of the Short Line through railway. Now, this Central Railway leads from Fredericton to the Intercolonial Railway; it was to pass by the head of Grand Lake and proceed to some point on the Intercolonial Railway, between Salisbury and St. John, leaving it to the engineer to decide at what point it should connect with the Intercolonial Railway, and just there it would form as important a branch of, and feeder to, the Intercolonial Railway as would some of those railways mentioned in these resolutions. I am glad to see that St. John is likely to be made a terminus at last, as it should have been long ago. My material interests are much bound up in St. John, and I am glad to see aid given to St. John; but at the same time there are other portions of the country which should not be neglected. The portion of country through which this Central Railway will pass abounds in resources which require development. It is a good agricultural country, there are good farms fruitful in agricultural products, but it has no outlet except at one point for a portion of the season. During the winter the people are entirely shut up, and have no railway communication, and I think their interests demand some attention from this Government. Then there still remains a large amount of lumber in that portion of the country which could be got out and made available by a railway to the Intercolonial between Salisbury and St. John. Investigations have shown that there are large mineral resources in that portion of the country, together with large deposits of coal, but all these natural riches are useless without a railway to develop them. I contend that the development of these coal mines alone would warrant the Government in subsidizing this road. At present this coal is of no material advantage to the country. There are also in that region deposits of iron and several other minerals which only require development to create a large industry, and I do think that this part of the country has not been developed to the extent its importance demands. It was said by the hon. Minister of Railways, in his speech to-day, when speaking of the Gatineau Railway, that it was important that the country should be opened up in order to keep our people at home. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any part of this Dominion which requires attention in this respect it is this very portion of New Brunswick. It is a fact that the people of that part of the Dominion are rapidly leaving it. I do not wish hon. gentlemen to cry "blue ruin" because I state a fact, for it is a fact, and it is well known that that part of the country, instead of increasing in population, has decreased during the last few years, simply because the resources of the country have been neglected. I could point to one school district in New Brunswick where every young man left last winter and went to the United States. I do not say they have all remained there, some have returned, but the majority are in the States to-day. I do say this: That if there is any part of the Dominion which is being neglected, and which demands from this Government attention, so that its resources may be developed, it is this part of the country lying between Fredericton on the line known as the Central Railway. There are some 10,000 inhabitants who would be benefited by a railway, and they are entirely shut out during six months of the year for the want of facilities furnished to almost every other part of the Dominion. I have spoken of people leaving the country. I assure the House it is a fact that in the district to which I have referred, the value of all real estate

has fallen during the last ten years from 30 to 40 per cent., and in some instances very much more, for the reason I have mentioned, and that alone. It has resources equal to those of any other part of Canada I know of, but it has not facilities for communication with the outside world. If the Short Line Railway is diverted to St. John and made a long line, this Central Railway has the merits, independent of being a through line and a portion of the short line, that should receive attention; and I can assure the hon. Minister of Railways that had we known the policy of the Government had been changed, and that local lines would be subsidized, the different schemes being considered in regard to the resources with which the sections of the country were endowed, the claims of this road would have been pressed more vigorously. As it is, a large petition was presented to the Governor in Council from that district, asking for this railway to be assisted; I do not know the number of signatures attached, but the petition was a large one. I press the claims of this road, but I am not personally interested in it, and it will not bring railway communication nearer to me than it is at present, in the interest of a portion of my constituents, and portions of the counties of Queen's and King's—the member for King's I see before me, and he no doubt will speak for himself. In conclusion, I beg to say that this railway should have received larger consideration, or at all events some consideration, at the hands of the Government.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I regret exceedingly, as was stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we have so little information before us with respect to the railways to be aided. I think it is very desirable, indeed, that in voting such a large sum as \$2,138,000 we should have full information furnished in regard to the various lines of railway to be aided; that we should have a map especially of the Eastern Provinces, so that we could see the various connections to be made. We should also have information as to the nature of the country to be travelled, the traffic to be secured, the resources which the railway is expected to develop so that we might form an intelligent judgment as to the propriety of voting the subsidies. Hon. gentlemen will remember, and particularly the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) will remember, that in the Ontario Legislature before an Order in Council was passed granting aid to any railway, full information as to the cost of constructing the road, as to the cost of working the road, as to the financial status of the company asking aid, as to the resources of the country through which the railway was to pass, and information of a similar nature, was furnished.

Mr. RYKERT. There is a rule to that effect, but it is very seldom adhered to.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am speaking of the rule, and it is a very important one, because such information is necessary in order to form a proper judgment as to the propriety of voting the money proposed. I think this legislation is very hasty, that these subsidies are to be voted very hastily. I do not agree with the hon. member for Lincoln, that the hon. leader of the Opposition is inconsistent with himself because he objects to voting these subsidies now, having, when leader of the Government in Ontario, passed several Orders in Council through the House to assist different railways in the Province. I do not think the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln is correct. His statement was that the Ontario Legislature voted money without information as to the railways to be subsidized, that legislation was forced upon the House, that the House had no opportunity of judging as to whether the roads to be aided required the desired aid, that the Orders in Council were forced through the House in a night, and so on. The hon. member for Lincoln should know, for he was in the Legislature at the time, that the House was in

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury).

full possession of all necessary information in regard to every one of the railways to be aided, and had been in possession of information with regard to some of them for a long time. I will give the hon. gentleman the date and then he can make the necessary calculations. On 21st February notice was given of the railway aid resolutions; on the 22nd the debate commenced, and ended on the 23rd; on the 24th the report was received and Bill introduced founded thereon; the Bill was not read the second time until the 27th; the third reading was on the 28th, and on the 29th the Orders in Council were passed. Let us bear that date in mind, and we will see how long the House was in possession of the information on which they were expected to pass judgment.

Mr. RYKERT. Of what year?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). February, 1872. There were ten railway companies aided. Information respecting the Kingston and Pembroke, the Canada Central, the Montreal and Ottawa, and Grand Junction, was laid on the Table on February 5th, and therefore the House had twenty-four days to consider whether aid should be granted to those four companies. On February 7th information in regard to the Midland, Toronto, Simcoe and Muskoka was laid on the Table of the House, so that members had twenty-two days to consider whether aid should be granted to those lines. On February 8th information was laid on the Table with respect to the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, and Toronto Grey and Bruce, and thus members had twenty-one days to consider whether aid should be granted to those companies. And on 16th February information was laid on the Table of the House as to the Toronto and Nipissing and Hamilton and Lake Erie, so that the House had thirteen days to consider the giving of aid to these railways. Further supplementary information was brought down on the 20th, so that hon. gentleman will see that varying from thirteen to twenty-four days the House had ample time to consider all the information laid before it, as to whether various lines of railway should receive subsidies; and I think that the hon. gentleman must have agreed in that view himself. I said that the House was asked to pass judgment on this matter on the 29th of February. Now, my hon. friend says that the Ontario Legislature had not the necessary information on which to pass judgment, but what did the hon. gentleman do? Without that necessary information the hon. gentleman voted for every one of these subsidies from the very first to the very last. The first Order in Council was moved on the 29th of February, and there were only some nine members of the House who voted against it. The other members voted for it. How many of them did so? Sixty-two voted yea, and seven nay; and among those who chose, without information on which to pass judgment, as the hon. gentleman said, to do this, I find the names of Reed, Robertson, Rykert, &c.; and this runs down through to the tenth Order in Council. But what did my hon. friend do when the tenth Order in Council was proposed? He gets up—no, he did not get up, hon. M. C. Cameron, the leader of the Opposition got up, and moved an amendment as follows:—

“That while this House is willing to make all just provision for railways, and assents to the said resolution, it feels bound to express the opinion that the said Order in Council, together with nine other Orders in Council, involving an aggregate appropriation of \$1,500,000, having only been placed on the Table of this House at its Session yesterday, and the Government, to repeated requests, having refused to give information as to the undertakings they intended to pass Orders in Council in favor of, till this House had voted an additional subsidy of \$400,000 and a further appropriation of \$100,000 a year for twenty years, Government has not given this House sufficient time for the consideration of the said Order in Council, to enable it to give an intelligent and just judgment upon the claims of the several enterprises, and that in future Orders in Council requiring the ratification of this House should be submitted at an earlier period of the Session, and should not be taken into consideration by this House until the same has been before the House for at least five days.”

What does this mean? That the hon. gentleman, after declaring that hereafter they should have five days to consider every Order in Council, declared by his votes, that he did not need five days in which to consider Orders in Council at all—that is, after voting for every one of these resolutions and ratifying every Order in Council, then he comes down and says: "We want five days in which to consider any other Order in Council;" and with these votes ten times repeated on the Journals of the Ontario Legislature, the hon. gentlemen gets up here and censures the leader of the Opposition for bringing in resolutions without one consideration.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. ROSS. I complained, in my opening remarks, that the hon. Minister of Railways, in asking the House to vote the large sum of \$2,138,000 as subsidies to railroads in different parts of the Dominion, did not furnish us with the necessary information on which to form a judgment as to the propriety of the subsidies which we are asked to give, and of the course which the hon. Minister asks the House to take. I think that I had just ground for making this complaint. The hon. Minister understands that it is no small matter in the face of the large expenditure which is already imposed upon us as a Dominion, to ask us to subsidize railroads to the extent of \$2,000,000 more. He is no doubt aware that the expenditure of the Dominion is rapidly increasing—that it has risen nearly \$1,000,000 in the last five years; and that every subsidy which we are asked to vote to a railroad, and every expenditure which we are asked to make, are adding to these burdens. I think that my complaint was well founded. We have, however, in the speech of the hon. gentleman a few hints as to why some of these railroads in this list should be subsidized. He tells us that he thinks that the House will be justified in subsidizing the Baie des Chaleurs Railroad to the extent of \$320,000, and the Caraquet Railway Company to the extent of \$115,200, because it will furnish the fishermen of the Eastern coasts of the Dominion better facilities for sending fish to the Western market. It is a new thing, I think, in the history of Canada, for us to build 136 miles of railway at a subsidized expense of \$435,200 for this purpose; these fishermen have ample facilities for sending their fish to the Western markets as things now are. If this was a country into which no railway had ever entered, and it had no facilities at all whereby the fishermen on the Eastern coast could reach the Western market, and the markets in the different parts of the Dominion, then I, as readily as any other person, would most gladly assist the Government in providing every facility for these men, in order that those engaged in that industry might receive the best reward possible for their labor. But, Sir, we have the Intercolonial Railway. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Intercolonial Railway is inadequate to the task? We have built that road at an expense of \$39,000,000; that road certainly furnishes ample facilities, it makes the best possible connection with all the railroads of the Dominion, and it is thoroughly equal to the task of carrying the produce of the sea to the western markets of the Dominion. Besides, we have in summer the water facilities necessary for that trade, so that I think the argument of the hon. gentleman in respect to this railway is rather far fetched. Having disposed of the objection which he supposed might be raised to the subsidizing of that road, the hon. gentleman proceeds to discuss the propriety of subsidizing the Gatineau Railway. His reasons are new ones. He has discovered that up in the valley of the Gatineau there is a vast tract of fertile land hitherto undeveloped. There may be some truth in that statement. Ottawa county is one of the largest in the Dominion,

though its population is somewhat sparse—a state of things which would undoubtedly be one of the best arguments for the construction of a railway. But I contend, Sir, that this is a purely local work, that it has no claim upon the Dominion Exchequer at all. There is a company already organised for the construction of that road. Has the hon. gentleman informed the House that that company is unequal to the task of developing that country? That its resources have all been exhausted. What peculiar emergency has arisen which renders it necessary that this road should be subsidized? I fear—and I must speak my mind frankly—that there are other reasons besides the hon. gentleman's desire to develop the resources of that fine country. The land may be fertile, but are there not other reasons at the back of all this? Is he prepared to say that that railway is not to be built there for the encouragement of other industries as well as the agricultural industries. Does he not know that one of his strongest supporters is vice-president of that road, that an old supporter is president, and that there are political interests which the hon. gentleman is just as anxious to cultivate as the agricultural interest of that county: Besides, if he could give us a Dominion reason, a general reason for the construction of that road, we would sink all these political distinctions on a question of this kind; but whatever reasons apply to the construction of the Gatineau Valley Railway will apply with equal force to the construction of any road similarly situated in the Province of Quebec; and I think he would find from Montreal to Quebec numerous instances in which claims might be made quite as strong—if political influences are equally strong—as any claims which this road may have upon him. Then he proposes to subsidize a road called the American and European, the particular portion to be subsidized being on the Island of Cape Breton. I think it would be only fair that our Western Provinces should be equally loyal in the development of the Eastern part of Canada as the representatives of the Maritime Provinces have been in the development of the Western Provinces; particularly as every effort for the development of the great North-West has received a hearty support from these representatives. Our great trans-continental railway has received from them an almost undivided support from its inception. But this is not a trans-continental railway; it is a local railway. If it were necessary, in the interest of the Dominion, if it were like the Canadian Pacific Railway intended to bind the different Provinces together and afford facilities for intercourse between them my objections would be immediately removed. Indeed if that were its purpose it should be more liberally subsidized than it is. But this is practically a local railway through the Island of Cape Breton with an area of 748,000 acres and a population of something like 31,000 souls.

An hon. MEMBER. That is only one county, and there are three more.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am glad the hon. gentleman has put me right; but let us say the Island is four times as large as I stated, and has a population of 96,000. The hon. Minister of Railways used a different argument with regard to this road from the argument he used with regard to the others. He said this was to be the eastern portion of a great railway which is going to shorten the distance from Montreal to the sea, and also shorten proportionately the distance to Liverpool. At first sight that argument seems to be a pretty strong one, as it is very desirable that we should place ourselves in connection with the Old Country by the shortest possible route—that being the argument which was used here a few years ago when it was proposed to construct a railroad on to Newfoundland, with various ferriages. But in proposing to build this road he is proposing to carry out a policy which is adverse to the interests of the Intercolonial, which was built by the people of this country at a very large

expense. Though the road is tolerably well managed by the hon. gentleman, still it did not pay running expenses the last six months, and we do not know that it will for the current six months. But we do know that if other roads are to be subsidized to compete for the traffic which rightfully belongs to the Intercolonial Railway, all hope of its paying running expenses will be gone. Is that the policy which the hon. gentleman pursues with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway? The other day, when asked if he would sacrifice the interests of the other Provinces to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he said: "Yes," in his emphatic way. He has one policy for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, to a certain extent, a reasonable one, and another for the Intercolonial Railway. On the one hand, he is going to feed and nourish a great railway monopoly, and on the other he is going to starve, as far as competition can starve, another great railway to the East. That is a policy which, I think, the House will not approve. It strikes me as being a suicidal policy—as being one which the House should not adopt, because it is the beginning of a series of competitions which may result more disastrously than we can foresee. But that is not all, for while he is subsidizing that road to compete with the Intercolonial Railway, he is subsidizing others, as for instance the International, which is to divert the trade in another direction. I cannot state whether it will divert it into the State of Maine, because I do not remember. But if it does, where is the propriety of subsidizing the Sherbrooke Railway to the extent of \$156,800? What is the condition of that railway? It is nearly completed at the present moment. The hon. Minister's proposal is to lay that road with steel rails in lieu of iron rails, with which it is laid at present. Now, who is most interested in that road? One of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). He is one of the largest stockholders in that road, and shall we be uncharitable if we say that the hon. gentleman's colleague is going to profit from this subsidy. Not only is it wrong to subsidize a local railway with Dominion money, but this fact of the hon. gentleman's colleague being interested, is in itself a suspicious circumstance. Then going West, I come to a railway in the Province of Ontario, the Napanee, Tamworth, and Quebec Railway. This is of all others perhaps the greatest outrage in the whole list of subsidies. Where does that road lead to? What is the object of the subsidy? The hon. gentleman says to connect the Quebec and Ontario road with the water on the front, as if that road could have no connection without the subsidy. If that principle is to hold good, why not subsidize the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, the road running from Belleville to Madoc, or the road running from Cobourg to Rice Lake? I can find a dozen instances in which the argument of the hon. gentleman will be just as strong as it is in this case. If he could show that he was developing some great industry or the resources of the northern parts of the counties of Lennox and Addington, as he has shown in the Gatineau Valley Railway there would be some ground for assuming that his subsidy is proper; but it is just to connect by a short railroad twenty-eight miles long, the back part of the country with the front part. Are there any local difficulties to prevent the construction of that road? Is there not something a little suspicious in this case also? That railroad had applied repeatedly to the Ontario Legislature for a subsidy; for some reason it was refused. I fancy on the ground that the company could not show that they had the means to build the road and carry it on successfully. Were there not promises made during the last Election that if certain things were arranged politically, that road would be subsidized? Were there not certain rumors that if the hon. the First Minister were elected for Lennox, and certain things were done in the local election, that road would receive all possible consideration? And

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

on the back of these rumors we have this subsidy placed before us for the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway. Put this and that together and they confirm the suspicion that political considerations have been made to override all other considerations. Going further west, I come to the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, and I will tell the hon. gentleman that I approve most cordially with that subsidy, just as I would approve of a subsidy to the Cape Breton Railway, if it was shown to be an essential link of our national railway system. I think the hon. gentleman's argument on this point was unanswerable. The argument was that inasmuch as the Canada Central Railway was subsidized to the extent of \$12,000 a mile, and that the Canada Central connected the Canadian Pacific with the Quebec system of railways, therefore the Ontario system should be similarly favored. That position is sound. You have a great system of railways placed by two similar subsidies in connection with two other systems of railways; both are treated alike. So far as that subsidy is concerned it is one that this House could not well refuse, for it rests on national grounds; it is not for a local road, but for one for the development of the whole Dominion. Now, after having referred to the different subsidies which the hon. gentleman proposes, allow me to call his attention to the dangerous step he is taking. I was unavoidably called away before the close of last Session and did not hear the argument used in favor of the subsidies for railways then granted; but I notice, on referring to the Votes and Proceedings, that this House granted \$1,500,000. This year it is proposed to grant \$2,138,000, an increase of one-half a million dollars in one year; and that increase is not the worst feature in the case. What the hon. gentleman began is going on grandly. What amount shall be required next year if hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the same course? The very argument the hon. Minister used to-night in favor of the different subsidies proposed will be invincible in the mouths of the deputations and lobbyists who will come down with demands for railroads in future years. He has opened the flood-gates, and close them he cannot. He has laid down a precedent which too many in different parts in this country will be disposed to act upon. And what is the most dangerous side of the precedent is this: That he has stepped entirely outside of what is purely national and Dominion, into what is purely Provincial legislation, and instead of leaving the Provinces to develop their resources according to their discretion, he takes the surplus of this Dominion and subsidizes local railways with it. What is it but another mode of subsidizing the Local Legislatures, to do for them what they should do for themselves. Every grant to the Province of Nova Scotia, or to the Province of New Brunswick, is an additional subsidy to that Province. We have some 274 miles of railway subsidized in the Province of Quebec. We have heard something of "better terms" for the Province of Quebec. Better terms were refused, so far as I can learn; but we have here another form of "better terms." We know that when the Province of Quebec could not get a subsidy for the North Shore line, the people of that Province built it out of their own resources. They have now exhausted their resources, and the hon. gentleman fearing to give them a subsidy directly, gives them this subsidy indirectly. The same with reference to the twenty-eight miles from Napanee to Tamworth, in Ontario. The other Ontario road I do not look upon as being in a similar condition, for it is not a local but a Dominion road. Since the hon. gentleman has subsidized one railroad in the Province of Ontario, a local road, will he be surprised if deputations from various parts of the Province next year should wait on him and ask him to subsidize their railroads. I will not be surprised if he should be waited upon by deputations by the score, but I will be surprised if he should succeed in resisting their claims, and refusing them subsidies. He

has entered on the domain of Provincial legislation, and by a direct process has subsidized the various Provinces instead of leaving them to carry on their own enterprises. Then the basis on which the hon. gentleman subsidizes those roads is very flimsy. If the hon. gentleman, in the course of his arguments, had examined the course adopted by the Province of Ontario, he would find, as I said before, that every railway in Ontario is obliged to show that it has a good financial basis before it can receive one dollar from the public exchequer. I have just had time to look into some of those Orders in Council that were under discussion before the House took Recess. The first one that I came upon was with reference to the demand made by the North Grey Railway Company, for a subsidy from the Local Legislature. They first put in a statement in which they were obliged to show that the line was surveyed and located, how much it would cost per mile, and whether a contract was let, and at what price; also, how much more over and above the local aid and stock would be required to build the road. This was the first representation made by the North Grey Railway Company; but that was not satisfactory to the Government, and they were obliged to supplement it by another, showing the bonuses granted by the various municipalities. That was not satisfactory, and the Government called for a list of the stockholders. They furnished the list, but still that was not satisfactory, and they were obliged to state the amount of money subscribed by each stockholder. Nor was that satisfactory, and further demands were made. The Government required to know the contract price as fixed by a competent railway engineer, and it was not until all this information was given that the Order in Council was passed to aid the North Grey Railway. You see, therefore, how in Ontario the Government guarded itself by every possible means, so as to be sure the money voted would not be lost. Has the hon. gentleman so guarded himself? Is the hon. gentleman satisfied the bonus to the Gatineau Railway will build it, and that when this bonus is spent the company will not call for another bonus? He has no guarantee that it will not. It is the thin end of the wedge, as the hon. gentleman himself stated once in speaking of another subject, that has been inserted, and it is thus that men who are disposed to draw on the Government rather than on their own resources will, when compelled by necessity, feel themselves entitled to ask Parliament for farther aid. And the hon. gentleman will be compelled, in order that the money spent be not lost to the country, to give further aid. The proper way is to help those who help themselves. The proper way is to spend the money on a somewhat similar basis as that on which the Ontario Government spend their money, so as to be assured that every dollar is expended in an investment which will be productive of benefit to the people. The hon. gentleman, in order to find an excuse for those subsidies, said that Mr. Mackenzie's plan was to subsidize local railways. The hon. leader of the Opposition has sufficiently answered that allegation. I remember when we had a discussion as to the loan of iron rails, Mr. Mackenzie declared his policy to be not to subsidize local railways, but to dispose of the unnecessary iron rails of the Intercolonial Railway, in order to assist these roads that might be feeders for the Intercolonial Railway, and not be competing lines. Can the hon. gentleman show a single line assisted by Mr. Mackenzie that was a competing line? As far as I remember they were feeders and not competing lines. I look upon this system of subsidizing local railways—and let it be understood that I am speaking for myself alone—as a dangerous step for this Dominion to take. You will allow me to say so strongly and earnestly. I think the House should pause before we vote any more subsidies, and that the hon. gentleman should at least give us more information than he has given before asking the vote. I

trust he will be able before calling upon us to vote this money to give substantial reasons why we should do so.

Mr. BURNS. I rise for the purpose of correcting the hon. gentleman in some particulars with reference to one railway, that is the Caraquet Railway. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that if the fishermen of that or any other locality in the East were deprived of the means of getting access to the western market, he for one would gladly furnish them with that means. The hon. gentleman asked if the Intercolonial were not equal to the task. The particular point with which I desire to make the hon. gentleman acquainted, is, that in order to reach the Intercolonial Railway it is necessary, in the case of the road on the Baie des Chaleurs, to traverse a distance of 100 or 120 miles, and in the case of the road known as the Caraquet Railway, it is necessary to traverse from forty-five to seventy miles. How can the fishermen living at a distance of seventy miles from the Intercolonial Railway have access to that road unless they are afforded facilities by the construction of other railways. With reference to this project it is no new scheme. It has occupied the attention of the House and country for very many years. As far back as 1865, when the question of the Intercolonial Railway was under discussion, the engineer of the Government at that time, Mr. Sandford Fleming, made a very exhaustive report on the various routes, and in that report he made reference to this scheme in connection with a short route to Europe; and this, I may say, is another short route, but it does not follow that it is a competing line. I cannot do better in informing the House with reference to the merits of this road in that particular character, than by reading an extract or two from the report of Mr. Sandford Fleming:

"Under these circumstances, it is too apparent that the International Railway may find in the United States route, a formidable rival for Canadian passenger traffic, to and from Europe, by way of Halifax.

"Fortunately, with a view to counteract this difficulty, a line by the Bay Chaleurs would offer special advantages, which may here be noticed.

"The chart which accompanies this will show that the entrance to the Bay Chaleurs is so situated, geographically, that while it is about as near Europe as the entrance to Halifax Harbor, it is, at the same time, several hundred miles nearer Montreal and all points west of that city.

"Some of the projected lines of railway touch the Bay Chaleurs at Dalhousie and at Bathurst; the latter place is not admitted to be suitable for the purposes of steam navigation, and the former, although in possession of a fine sheet of water, well sheltered and accessible at all conditions of the tide, is, nevertheless, from its position at the extreme westerly end of the Bay, farther inland than might be wished. In order to reduce the steamship passage to a minimum, it is desirable to have the point of embarkation as far easterly as possible, and therefore the existence of a commodious harbor near the entrance of the Bay is of no little importance. A place named Shippigan, on the southerly side of the entrance of the Bay Chaleurs, appears to have many of the requisites of a good harbor. It is thus spoken of in the reports on the Sea and River Fisheries of New Brunswick, published under the authority of the Legislature of that Province.

#### "GREAT SHIPPIGAN HARBOR.

"This spacious harbor is formed between Shippigan and Pooksoudie Island and the mainland. It comprises three large and commodious harbors: first, the great inlet of Amqui, in Shippigan Island, the depth of water into which is from four to six fathoms; second, the extensive and well-sheltered sheet of water, called St. Simon's Inlet, the channel leading to which, between Pooksoudie Island and the main, is one mile in width, with seven fathoms water from side to side.

"The principal entrance from the Bay Chaleurs has not less than five fathoms on the bar, inside which, within the harbor, there are six and seven fathoms, up to the usual loading place in front of Messrs. Moore and Harding's steam saw mill at the village; from thence to the gully there is about three fathoms of water only. Vessels within the Harbor of Shippigan have good anchorage, are quiet safe with every wind, and can load in the strongest gale. The rise and fall of the tide is about seven feet.

"The noble haven called St. Simon's Inlet, the shores of which are almost wholly unsettled and in a wilderness state, runs several miles into the land, maintaining a good depth of water almost to its western extremity.

"Duncan McNeil, an old pilot, frequently employed on the Government steamers when calling at New Brunswick ports, describes Shippigan as a good harbor, with plenty of water, regular soundings and tough blue clay-holding ground, indeed where vessels would be perfectly secure in any storm. He says that he could take a ship of heavy draught

into it in any weather, by night or by day; that in dirty or dark weather he would go entirely by the lead.

"Others describe Shippigan Harbor as unobjectionable. The Admiralty Chart seems to agree in the main with the descriptions above given; it shows that the area of the basin, embracing only the water over the three-fathom line at low tide, is about two and a half square miles; a sheet about double the size of Halifax Harbor between St. George Island and the narrows to Bedford Basin. The only objectionable feature seems to be the channel at the entrance, which is about three miles long, to the basin, a little crooked, and at present without leading marks; it is, however, about half a mile in width, free from all obstructions the depth varying from five to nine fathoms at low water. There is good warning by the lead in the channel and the approaches to it.

"It would appear from the above, therefore, that Shippigan Sound presents a favorable opportunity for forming a traffic connection between the Intercolonial Railway and Ocean Steamers.

"A comparison of distances will now show the importance of Shippigan, in connection with the contemplated Railway:

DISTANCE TO LIVERPOOL.	
	Miles.
From Halifax, by Cape Race .....	2466
From Shippigan, by Cape Race .....	2493
From Shippigan, by Belle Isle.....	2318
Difference against Shippigan, by Cape Race.....	27
Difference in favor of Shippigan, by Belle Isle.....	148

DISTANCE TO QUEBEC.	
	Miles.
From Halifax, by Bangor and Danville.....	865
From Halifax, by Bay Chaleurs route .....	685
From Shippigan, by Bay Chaleurs route .....	419
Difference against Halifax by Intercolonial line.....	226
Difference against Halifax by United States line.....	446

DISTANCE TO MONTREAL.	
	Miles.
From Halifax, by Bangor and Danville.....	816
From Shippigan, by Intercolonial route.....	575
Difference against United States route .....	271

While at the same time Halifax will be nearer to Montreal and all points west by 300 miles. Therefore, I say that on that ground alone the promoters of this scheme would be warranted in asking this House to aid a railway which in the future, at all events, will be of incalculable benefit to this Dominion at large. But, Sir, the scheme is not put forward on that ground alone, it is put forward, perhaps, with even greater force on other grounds, and that is, the immense trade the road would develop and would tend to build up, not only in that particular locality, but over the Dominion as a whole. By the construction of that road an enormous trade would be given to the Intercolonial Railway; as a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway it is not second in importance to any other road, and because it is a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway I assume that my hon. friend opposite can have no objection to it. As I understand him he is in favor of any road that will feed the Intercolonial Railway. To give an idea of the amount of trade done along that road, and of the population interested in it, I may inform the House that between the point where it is proposed to connect with the Intercolonial Railway and the terminus of Caraquet or Shippigan, a distance of 45 miles, there is a population of 18,000 souls. The whole country from end to end of the proposed road is settled. The value of the products of that section of the country during the past year amounted to some \$1,000,000, made up as follows: Lumber, \$300,000; fish, comprising canned goods, codfish, salmon, herring, mackerel and oysters, \$500,000; grindstone, \$50,000; farm produce, \$150,000. There are a number of other industries which would contribute to give the road a large trade, and all of which would find its way to the Intercolonial Railway. To the West this road will be a great benefit, inasmuch as it will afford the people an opportunity, which is now denied them, of getting their fish in a fresh condition, and they will have a larger market for their products, as well as the East a larger market for theirs. Another thing I may say in connection with this road is, that notwithstanding the many applications made to the

Mr. BURNB,

Government of Canada during past years, no aid was given in the shape of steamboat subsidy to promote the trade of the section of country through which the proposed road will pass. My predecessor in this House last Session, a gentleman, Sir, who filled your position for some years, urged on the Government that a steamer should be subsidized in order that facilities might be given to carry on the trade of that locality, but he was unsuccessful in procuring such aid. During last Session, when the matter of railways was under discussion, he called the attention of the House to this particular railroad; therefore, the House is familiar with it and its merits, and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the House. In view of some criticism that has been made on the other side, I would remind the House that during the Mackenzie Administration in 1874, a road was surveyed from Bathurst to Shippigan; so I think it comes with ill grace from our hon. friends opposite to say that these railway subsidies are given in order to make political capital. Was it to make political capital for my predecessor that, in 1874, they proceeded to make a survey of that railway? Was it in order to prepare for the Elections that they caused a survey to be made from Shippigan to the town of Bathurst? I will accord to them what I desire to be accorded to ourselves, that they were actuated by the best possible motives in making a survey for this railway. While I think hon. gentlemen, more particularly interested than I am, will be able to reply to the observations of the hon. gentleman with reference to the Louisburg road, I may be permitted to say in answer to the argument the hon. gentleman adduced that the building of that outlet would be an injury to the Intercolonial Railway, that on the contrary, by carrying out the scheme of what is called the Megantic Road, passing from the Province of Quebec through a portion of the State of Maine, tapping western extension and passing through St. John, that same line, in order to get to Louisburg, on the ocean, will pass over the Intercolonial Railway for a great portion of its distance. Hon. gentlemen more particularly interested can substantiate those arguments.

Mr. WRIGHT. I generally listen with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for West Middlesex. But to-night I have been much disappointed. His statements concerning the county of Ottawa and the Gatineau Railway have not been characterized by his usual accuracy. The hon. gentleman stated that the president of the Gatineau Railway was a member of this House. This statement is incorrect, and the hon. gentleman has been misinformed. The president of this road is Mr. Carrier, late M. P. for the city of Ottawa, and an old colleague of mine, whose name is respected throughout the Dominion. With regard to the subject-matter before the House, I can state that the Railway Resolutions introduced by the Government, meet with my hearty and cordial approval. During the last Session of the last Parliament, the Government inaugurated the policy of granting aid to certain railways. On that occasion I congratulated the hon. Minister of Railways for his liberal and enlightened policy, and expressed a hope that that most important scheme, the Gatineau Valley Railway, would meet with favorable consideration when this policy was carried to its natural and legitimate conclusion. I have to thank the Government to-night for the consideration which they have given to my remarks in this connection. I think that the policy of the Government in granting aid to railways throughout the Dominion, is a wise and good one, as, without railways, it will be impossible to develop our resources, and keep pace with the march of progress and civilization throughout the world. I have always been in favor of railroad extension and development. It appears to me that in a young land like ours, they are indispensable to our advancement and prosperity. We have granted aid to many railroads, and in every case the money has, I think, been well spent. We



have aided the Grand Trunk, the Pacific, Occidental, and all the main lines. We have the Intercolonial connecting us with the Maritime Provinces; and now, having arranged for the completion of the main trunk lines, we help just the branches which will feed them. In this way only can our railway system be made complete. The hon. member for West Middlesex alluded to, in a somewhat sneering manner, the sparseness of the inhabitants in the county of Ottawa. Well, I can correct him also on that point. It is quite true that the county could afford land for millions of settlers instead of the thousands who now inhabit it. But the hon. gentlemen should recollect that we have spent many millions, and must still spend more millions, to reach British Columbia, a Province that is inhabited by 20,000 white people. I do not underrate that splendid Province on that account. I recognize its importance to the Dominion, and, on all occasions, I have done my best to aid every proposal which would contribute to its development. We are giving millions in aid of enterprises which will benefit that Province. The county of Ottawa has a population nearly approaching 50,000, which is more than twice the entire population of British Columbia; I think, therefore, that my hon. friend must admit that we are not unreasonable in asking for some aid to our railway enterprises. The county of Ottawa has contributed more than any other county in the Dominion to the resources of the Dominion, by means of lumber dues, and has received less in return. The small subsidy which the Government proposes to give is well deserved, and I only regret that it is not larger. I forwarded a memorial to the Government, signed by more than a hundred members of this House, praying that the Government would give \$6,000 per mile to the Gatineau Valley Railway, and the Colonization Railway from Buckingham. I regret very much that no grant has been made for the Buckingham branch; the construction of this line would give a vast impetus to the development of the magnificent mineral resources of that region. I must hope that the desired aid will be afforded next Session. The mineral resources of that phosphate region are somewhat marvellous. I am delighted to learn that some arrangement will soon be made by which the iron pyrites of the Eastern Townships, and the phosphates of the county of Ottawa, will be brought into contact, so that that most valuable fertilizer will be manufactured in that county, instead of phosphates being taken over the sea. The construction of those railways will practically add another Province to the Dominion. I said to a member of the Government the other day, in discussing the general railway policy of the Government in connection with the North-West and its ultimate development, that under the very shadow of the Parliament buildings, lying at our very door, was an immense and unknown territory, teeming with mineral and all other kinds of wealth. I also told him that it is only a railroad system which can secure for this its appropriate development. The county of Ottawa extends far into the interior, the Gatineau River runs some 400 miles into this region, and takes its rise in the vicinity of the great affluents of the Saguenay and the St. Maurice. The country lying between these rivers is the one which we are trying to open up, it is literally a *terra incognita*. This country possesses great mineral, lumbering and agricultural resources. The splendid eulogium passed on this region by the hon. Minister of Railways was well deserved. Its colors were very gorgeous and brilliant, but were not overdrawn, he literally held the mirror up to Nature. Any one who travels on the Occidental Railway must notice a wealth of phosphate; for miles along the line of that railway. We can hardly realize what the effect will be when scientific skill and railway enterprise come to the aid of the hardy miners. The construction of these railways will aid the settlement of the country, and will prove invaluable feeders to the great Dominion railway system; will develop the mineral, agricultural and all other resources of this region.

I am assured that far up in that Gatineau region there is much good land, on which millions of Canadian people could find happy homes. The Lacustrine system of this country is one of the finest in the world. The whole country is dotted with lakes, teeming with trout, and filled with all the fish which abound in our Canadian waters. The construction of this railroad will enable large forests of maple, beech, and other hardwoods, to be utilized for the purpose of supplying the cities of Ottawa, Toronto, and Quebec with valuable fuel. Owing to the number of falls on the Gatineau river, only certain kinds of timber can be brought down it, and consequently much of the timber remains there. I have been assured that immense forests of oak, birch, maple, and all other hardwoods which exist in Canada, still remain there, and cannot be utilized except by means of a railway. It is intended to construct this railway to the River Desert, ultimately to James' Bay. It will pass for a hundred miles through a country somewhat rough, but settled by a prosperous, active, and intelligent people. The way traffic alone would justify the construction of the road. The Gatineau River is a series of water-powers which would drive the spindles of the world. If manufactories could be started in that region, if these water-powers can be used in promoting the development of our mineral, agricultural and other resources, the advantage to the Dominion and the Province of Quebec would be incalculable. Every year we have a great fair at the Pickanock, a place in the township of Wright, which it is proposed to touch with this railway. I attend this fair every year, and I am much pleased with the exhibition. Some of the finest cattle in the Dominion can be seen; chosen specimens from the herds of Senator Cochrane attract attention; the display of cereals is very fine, and the root crops equal, if they do not exceed, those of Manitoba. Mr. Ellard tells me that his Gatineau wheat is used by agents to lure emigrants to Manitoba. Taken altogether the display in that exhibition would reflect credit on any part of Canada. Some of the farmers in that Gatineau country would astonish those who think it to be a poor country. Those of the Messrs. Hall, G. Hamilton, Gilmore and Ellard would be regarded as model farms anywhere. Some years ago I visited Maniwaki, a settlement away near the confluence of the River Desert with the Gatineau. I found this a thriving settlement with a people full of life, energy and activity. I was assured that the future of that section depended on the construction of a railway; as the timber was cut off, the market of the inhabitants receded, and railway communication with the outer world was indispensable to their existence. It was there I met the Rev. Mr. Deleage, the worthy successor of those grand French missionaries who did so much to illustrate the early history of this country. For forty years this priest has resided in the wilderness. For forty years he has devoted himself to the services of the savage tribes who inhabited the Upper Gatineau. He built a splendid church of crystalline limestone, which stood like a beacon light to point the way from the darkness of the forest to the light of Christianity and civilization. He built grist and saw mills, and devoted himself to the temporal, as well as the spiritual, wants of the people. He was beloved and respected by both the Protestant and Catholic. It was from this worthy man that I derived my information concerning this region. He assured me that in that region there was good land on which millions of Canadian people could find happy homes. He described the fertility of the soil, telling me that on one occasion he had reaped sixty bushels of wheat from one bushel which he had sown, and that in all respects the country was a most desirable one. I am much pleased to find in these resolutions a subsidy to Father Labelle's road from St. Jerome to the River Desert; it is desirable that this road should be encouraged in every possible manner. Father Labelle is engaged in a great work of repatriation and colonization. He has already, I am assured, settled

10,000 people within a few years in the new townships on the proposed line of this railway. He is endowed with an ardent patriotism and singular energy and intelligence. He recognizes distinctly the importance of railroad extension and development. Many years ago at a great banquet in Montreal, I heard the reverend gentleman enunciate his faith in railways as promoters of civilization. I think that the policy of the Government is likely to keep the people in our own country, although the great North-West may be all that it is described to be. I for one prefer our own country and should like to keep our people in it. I honestly trust that the Government will be able to give us an additional grant next year, feeling that its policy will meet the approval of the vast majority of the people of the Dominion.

Mr. RYKERT. I desire to place myself right before the House in consequence of the remarks made by the hon. member for West Middlesex. He seems to have the happy faculty of endeavoring to mis-state the facts he presents to the House, and in distorting what gentlemen say on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman has contradicted me on several points. What I did say before Recess was based entirely on my recollection of facts which took place twelve or thirteen years ago. Since that time I have consulted his own organ, the *Globe*, and I find that everything I stated is entirely correct. In order that the House may fully understand—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not object to the hon. gentleman speaking again, but, of course, he knows his position; I only wish to point out that sometimes an hon. member on this side who takes the course he is now taking, is objected to. I simply wish him to bear that fact in mind.

Mr. BERGIN. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. RYKERT. This is a little game that two can play at. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem desirous of having the facts placed on record; and inasmuch as they have made the same mis-statements throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, I desire now to set these statements at rest, and to place before the House and the country the facts; and I defy contradiction. I stated before Recess that the leader of the Opposition had, while Premier of the Local Legislature, brought down certain resolutions on the eve of the close of the Legislature without giving opportunity to the members fairly and honestly to discuss them. I stated also that the hon. gentleman had been challenged to give information as regards these resolutions, and the hon. gentleman shook his head, denying my statement. I think I will be able to show before I sit down from his own authority, the *Globe*, that my statements were correct, and justified what I did state. The member for West Middlesex states that all the information was given to the House in order that the members might come to an intelligent conclusion upon those several resolutions then before the House. The hon. gentleman said that certain petitions were presented in the early part of the Session. Certainly they were, but he forgot the most important fact that petitions are not before the House until they are ordered to be printed; and if the hon. gentleman consults the record he will find that a number of these petitions were not ordered to be printed until the day before the resolutions came down. Now, I have the facts as they are presented on the Journals of the House. There were ten resolutions which I say were sprung on the House and forced through in one sitting. Four of these petitions were presented on the 5th of February and the supplementary papers on the 20th of February: two of them were presented on the 7th and the supplementary on the 20th of February; two upon the 8th and the supplementary on the 23rd of February, that is, one day after the resolutions were carried in the House; two on the 21st of February; four were ordered to be printed on the 6th, two on the 16th, and two on the 21st

Mr. WRIGHT.

of February. The resolutions were introduced on the 22nd of February, and carried through Committee on the 23rd; the Bill was introduced founded on these resolutions on the 24th; it was passed on the 28th, and the Orders in Council were presented on the evening of the 28th. The first Order of the Day on the 29th was the resolutions moved by the leader of the Opposition. Now, the hon. gentleman says, I did not state correctly my position regarding these resolutions. I stated distinctly to the House—and I had before me the resolutions he referred to at the time—that I opposed every motion for the appropriation of money in favor of railways, and if the hon. gentleman refers to the Journals of the House, he will find on pages 201, 202, 205 and 206 two motions, on page 228 three motions, and on pages 229 and 230 that I opposed the resolutions at every stage; that when the House had decided to appropriate the funds in favor of railways, and when the Orders in Council were presented I distinctly told the House, as is reported in the *Globe*, that I offered all opposition to the appropriation of the money, but that it rested entirely with the House to say which railways should have aid. That is what I stated. I have the record before me, and it is just as well that I should set the leader of the Opposition right. When the resolutions were brought down I am reported as having said:

“Having done all he could to oppose the Railway Resolutions he could not raise any further objection, but would lend his aid in carrying out the policy of the Government in good faith.”

Those resolutions were brought down to the House, and one division taken, and I supported them. Eight others were proposed without any division in the House. When the resolutions were read in the House, Mr. Cameron moved, and I seconded, a resolution condemning the Government for bringing them down without giving proper explanations which would enable us to come to an intelligent conclusion. On that occasion I stated my views on the subject, and I am reported in the *Globe* as follows:—

“The country had not the right to expect such a dangling policy from the leader of the Government. The leader of the Government had ample means of knowing how many of the Railways applying for aid came within the meaning of the Act, so as to be entitled to assistance. The leader ought to be able to show to the House what Railways were entitled to aid, and ought to be able to show it was in the interest of the country that such and such Railways should be constructed. Until this was done, the House had no right to add to the Railway Fund.”

The answer made by the hon. gentleman showed that I was right in describing it as a dangling policy, for his reply was in these words:

“It was utterly impossible for the Government to bring down any complete scheme of all the railways that would require and deserve aid. It would be an injustice to all these enterprises to name which should receive aid until they know what fund the House could devote for railway aid.”

When the motion then came before the House on Concurrency on the report of the Committee, I asked the hon. gentleman to name the railways which he proposed to aid. The hon. gentleman knew what railways were to receive aid, and yet he refused to tell the House; and yet the first thing he did after the Bill was carried was to take the resolutions out of his desk and give them to the House. I said on that occasion:

“The Government had not dared to tell the House what railways they proposed to aid, though they must know what Order in Council had been passed, if any had. The Premier (Mr. Blake) had brought down a list of railways to which he said the late Government had promised to give aid. But the House would find that there were not two promises made without the saving clause, ‘if it comes under the provision of the Act.’”

Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman refused to give the information until the money was voted; and if the hon. member for West Middlesex will consult the records of the House he will find that the Legislature was not possessed of the

information until after it was ordered to be printed, which was on the 21st February. No documents were before the House on the 20th February. Having set myself right on this matter, I beg to add that the Minister of Railways having fully and satisfactorily explained that these roads are entitled to this aid in the interest of the country, and feeling bound to support the general policy of the Government, I shall support the resolutions before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman having made the remarks with which he has just favored the House for about the hundredth time, and having followed the example of the hon. gentleman in bringing up transactions of some ten or twelve years ago, the House will allow me a few words in reference to matters which took place in another Legislature some time ago. The hon. gentleman's claim is an old one, but it is not a valid one. I have always repudiated it, and I am not going to acknowledge it now. I came in power during a Session of the Ontario Legislature, and I was called upon to deal with the question of railway aid under a policy inaugurated by my predecessor, Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, and to deal with it during that Session of Parliament. The policy of the former Government of Ontario had been to obtain from the Local Legislature a grant of, I think, one and one-half million dollars; they took to themselves the power of distributing it as they pleased, without further reference to Parliament, in aid of railways of a certain general description, wide enough to cover any of them. I was called upon when I came in to attend to the election of myself and colleagues, and the whole business of the Session, and amongst others to deal with this question of railway aid, which was a very pressing question, because many companies had been incorporated and arrangements had been made, so that the general progress of the country was, in one sense, in suspense until the question was disposed of. The first duty I discharged before going to my constituents, was to ascertain what papers there were—what information there was on the files of the Departments as to the different railways which had made application, upon which a judgment might be formed either as to the engagements of the Government or as to what should be submitted to the Chamber. I found, as I often stated, everything at loose ends; and I immediately directed that steps should be taken to obtain such information from the companies, including the negotiations which had taken place between them and my predecessor, and all the evidence showing the exact state of the case. As soon as I obtained that information, I came to the conclusion that the fund which had been proposed by the late Administration would not be adequate to discharge the obligations which, it was suggested, should be entered into. That information was given to the House, from day to day, as it was received, pending the further information which I sought as to the ability of the companies to complete their enterprises, as well as other matters needful, in order to arrive at an intelligent judgment on the whole subject. While this was going on I invited the attention of the Legislature to the subject of a further appropriation, and I gave to the House all the information which was then before me with reference to the negotiations of the late Government, their promises and pledges, and the condition of affairs in that regard; and I succeeded in convincing a majority of the Legislature that it was proper that further aid should be given. During the progress of that discussion, as the hon. member for Lincoln has stated, demands were made upon me to state what aid should be given to particular railways. I stated, as the hon. gentleman has correctly informed the House, that it would not be right for me to accede to these demands at that time, and the reason was obvious. The decision of the Government upon the question necessarily depended upon the resources which the Parliament was

about to place at their disposal. If the Parliament was indisposed to give more than \$150,000, it was quite clear that aid could not be granted at the expected rate, which I think was \$3,000 a mile; and until the Legislature should decide the total quantum of resources which it would place at the disposal of the Government, it was impossible for the Government to determine finally and to inform the House what particular railways they proposed to aid, and in what particular amounts. That was my statement to the Legislature, and I have always been prepared to justify it. But it was quite consistent with that, that we should come to a conclusion ourselves as to what we should propose to the Legislature, in case the Legislature would grant us the aid we expected, and we did proceed to come to that conclusion. But the hon. gentleman says he had no information. He has already said that the Bill was printed on the 20th February, and was actually passed on the 28th or 29th of February.

Mr. RYKERT. It was ordered to be printed on the 20th of February.

Mr. BLAKE. It was printed as soon as it was ordered to be printed, I suppose, and the Orders in Council were not passed, I think, until the 29th. Therefore, it was before the general Bill had passed that these papers were printed, and the Orders in Council were brought down at the earliest possible moment, as the hon. gentleman has said, after the Legislature had decided that we should have these resources to distribute, and I did not ask the House, against the will of any hon. member, to take them into consideration. Neither the hon. member for Lincoln or any other hon. member, asked for delay; on the contrary, the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Cameron, wanted me to say on what day prorogation would take place. I stated that there was important business before the House, that I had no desire to hurry its deliberations, and that I would decline to indicate any day for prorogation until it should appear what business was to be disposed of, and what time the House required for deliberation upon it. No demand or request was made for further time. My hon. friend has said, that on the first motion there were seven dissentients, and on the second, three; and these three hon. gentlemen called for no further divisions, and the rest passed unanimously, until the last on which the hon. gentleman proposed a rider, which expressly assented to the resolution, but proposed to tack on this thing, that thing, and the other thing. I have stated that I was called to deal with a very large matter in the very middle of a Session of Parliament; I have stated that I used the utmost diligence to procure from all quarters the information that was necessary to an intelligent decision by the Government first, and the House afterwards; I state that I laid that information before Parliament just as soon as I obtained it; I state that so soon as I had ascertained that more funds would be required to carry out the practical pledges of the late Government with reference to railway aid, I called upon the Legislature to decide whether they would grant a larger sum, and after debate, resistance and division, the motion prevailed; I state that so soon as the Legislature had decided what amount it was proper to grant for distribution, I laid on the Table the Orders in Council, and signified the view and determination of the Government with reference to these very matters upon which every information had been given to the House from time to time, just as fast as it was possible to give it.

Mr. RYKERT. Had not the Orders in Council been in the hon. gentleman's desk before the House had passed the Bill?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly; I said so already. I said that we decided for ourselves what we would do if the Legislature would grant us those funds, but that we could not propose to the House those grants until we knew what

resources the House would place at our disposal, because if the House declined to give us what we wanted, we would be obliged to make a wholly different disposition—either to propose less money for each railway, or to aid fewer railways; and therefore, it was impossible to tell what aid could be given until we knew what money we had. I say again, that no request was made for delay, and no demand for further information. I say I was prepared to accede to any request for further delay that might have been tendered, and no hon. member proposed any motion that this matter should be delayed for an hour; and last of all, the men who now raise this cry against me, and for ten years have raised it, of having unduly hastened the decision of the Legislature, are the same men who persistently insisted that the law and constitution of the country were properly served by their declining to allow the Legislature any power to interfere at all. They are the men who insisted that the fund should be at the disposal of the Executive, independent of the Legislature altogether. They are the men who passed a law declaring that the Legislature should have no control over it. They are the men who went to the country to sustain that proposition; they are the men who got beaten on that issue; and having got beaten upon it, now turn round as the vindicators of popular and Parliamentary rights.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am not anxious to discuss Ontario politics in the House, but I want to say a word or two in regard to a statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). He made the astounding statement a little while ago, that matters are not properly before the House until they are printed. As I understand Parliamentary procedure, when papers are laid on the Table they are in the possession of the House, and we have been obliged this Session over and over again to get such information as we could in that form, or do without it; but the hon. gentleman forgets that if there was any censure for the delay in printing, he was a member of the Printing Committee himself.

Mr. RYKERT. No; I was not present.

Mr. ROSS. Yes; and if there were any delay the hon. gentleman was responsible for his share in that delay. The hon. gentleman says he opposed every grant to railways. He is decidedly mistaken. Did he not support the hon. Sandfield Macdonald's resolutions in favor of aid to railways?

Mr. RYKERT. I am not sure about that.

Mr. ROSS. I am sure about it.

Mr. RYKERT. The *Globe* says differently.

Mr. ROSS. We are not now discussing the *Globe*, but the hon. member for Lincoln, and I will read from the Journals of the House to show how he voted. The hon. Sandfield Macdonald's resolutions were introduced the 3rd February, and on the 8th February Mr. Blake moved in amendment to the original motion that they be not passed without at the same time considering the settlement of the Municipal Loan Fund. On that amendment the first division on the Railway subsidy resolutions was taken, and the hon. member for Lincoln voted with the hon. Sandfield Macdonald in favor of the railway subsidy of \$1,500,000.

Mr. RYKERT. What is the motion?

Mr. ROSS. It is this:

"That the aid granted in the past by the late Province of Canada to railway enterprises, connecting with each of the great centres of population and trade, has been largely instrumental in increasing the development of the wealth and resources of this Province.

"That towards securing these desirable objects, it is expedient that the sum of ——— dollars be set apart from out of the Consolidated Fund of this Province and be designated the Railway Fund; and that railway companies shall be entitled to such aid until they shall furnish proof to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, that their railway charters authorizing the construction of a road ———"

Mr. BLAKE.

And so on. These are the railway resolutions appropriating \$1,500,000 for building railways in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Blake moved that they be not passed unless the municipal indebtedness be settled. Against this amendment Mr. Rykert voted, and on the 10th of February another amendment was moved by Mr. Blake when the resolutions were brought down:

"That all the words after 'that' in the report of the Committee be omitted, and the following words substituted therefor:—'The report be not now received, but that the said resolutions be referred back forthwith to a Committee of the whole House for the purpose of providing that the decision of the Government to grant aid to any railway company shall be subject to the ratification of the Legislative Assembly, so as not to have so large a sum of money as \$1,500,000 to be expended at the will of the Executive without a vote appropriating the same to particular works.'"

Mr. Rykert voted that \$1,500,000 be expended by the Executive without the ratification of the Legislative Assembly. On the same day another amendment was moved that no railway bonus be paid in the case where a bonus was heretofore voted by a municipality, in respect to the construction of the road through any part of such municipality, without its consent. Against that amendment Mr. Rykert also voted. A third amendment was moved:

"That the said report be not now received, but that the said resolutions be referred back forthwith to a Committee of the whole House, for the purpose of inserting a provision that any Order in Council, made under the powers proposed to be conferred by the said resolutions, shall be published in the next following issue of the *Ontario Gazette*."

Against that Mr. Rykert also voted. Thus, then, were four different votes taken, each asking amendments to the railway subsidies, and in those four the hon. member for Lincoln voted with the hon. Sandfield Macdonald in favor of the railway subsidies. When the railway subsidies were moved by Mr. Blake, when he was Premier of the Ontario Government, the hon. member for Lincoln voted for each one of them. Thus he first voted every amendment to the Bill down, and then, when the appropriations came up, he voted for every appropriation—first ratifying the Bill, then ratifying the appropriations. The hon. gentleman can reconcile those statements and facts with the statements of the *Globe* if he chooses, but I am now curious to see what course he will take. After voting ten times in the Ontario Legislature, and asking for information, some of which he had in his possession for three weeks, I want to know if he will vote for these without a word of information except the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways. If I do not mistake, the hon. gentleman will do it. I believe, in the Ontario Legislature, he wanted more light, because he was in the Opposition; but now, because he is a supporter of the Government, he wants no light, and is willing to go it blind.

Mr. RYKERT. I will vote for anything you will oppose. Motion to adjourn debate negatived.

Mr. GILLMOR. I cannot see what information can be given on this matter more than is contained in the resolution. There may have been correspondence between the companies and the Government in regard to this question. I find on my desk a pamphlet containing a map of the Great American and European Short Line Railway. I am aware that last year a memorial was being signed in this House asking for aid to this line. The gentlemen who were soliciting signatures to that did not press me to sign it, perhaps because they thought my views would not agree with theirs. That memorial was generally signed, and I was led to believe the Government had actually endorsed that scheme and intended to give what aid they could to that line as shown on this map. While I am not pleased that any of my friends should be disappointed, I am pleased, in the public interest, that the hon. Minister of Railways and his associates have not committed themselves to this

line. I think this great inter-provincial railway is entitled to aid, and I think the Government are consulting public interest most by not aiding this line as laid down in this plan. It has been remarked by the hon. leader of the Opposition that we have four ocean termini. I think the Government are doing well when they give this company opportunity to use any or all of them. I think, therefore, if they give public aid at all, they should give it to a line that would best serve the public interests, and one by which they could avail themselves of the four ocean termini mentioned by the hon. Minister. The first and best one is the town of St. Andrews; there is no doubt about that; and there is no cost to the public in allowing this company to use that line if it suits the public interest. I think the Government have adopted a wise policy, and I may say that this is about the first measure they have ever introduced that I could endorse. I regret very much that circumstances over which the Government have no control, prevent them from giving very much aid to the International Line. They cannot go farther than the first 49 miles from Sherbrooke to the boundary line. I expected the resolutions would correspond with the plan I have in this pamphlet. I find the hon. Minister of Railways went as far as he could; he indicated that this aid was granted with a view to strike the European and North American Line not further north than Vanceborough, but it may go as far south as possible. In his speech to-day, I discovered that he had the true idea of the public interest. Of course, I do not know that he will be able to control this company when they build across this territory and strike the European and North American Line. Perhaps the company would not be disposed to go further than that, because when they strike that line they are on the European and Western Extension, and they have railway communication then provided already to the port of St. John. But I believe, the company will see that it will be for their interest when they strike the European and North American Line at Passidumkeig. If they cross that line they will only have fifty miles further to build through to St. Stephens. The leader of the Opposition said that the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance had invested in property in St. Andrews. Why did they invest there? Because it is one of the most inviting spots in the Maritime Provinces. The town of St. Andrews is very inviting, and as for the bay of St. Andrews even the bay of Naples cannot approach it for beauty. The fishing facilities of this bay are unsurpassed. I have seen more than 200 vessels fishing there at once, not in the spring or summer, but in mid-winter; and the only fish I have eaten since I came to Ottawa, that were fit to eat, came from St. Andrews and were taken out of St. Andrews Bay. Of course, I do not want to speak about the agricultural facilities. Perhaps the district has not got quite so many facilities as the Gatineau district, but I think those who have driven along the shore and seen the tens of thousands of bushels of turnips that are exported to Boston every year, and the comfortable farm houses, would form a high opinion of the agricultural value of that country. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, I believe, has a very good farm there himself, and he knows how fertile it is, and what income it has brought him. I may say that the pioneer of railways in Canada resided in St. Andrews, and nearly forty years ago he projected a railway from the town of St. Andrews to Quebec, on the shortest and most direct line; but on account of difficulties connected with the Ashburton Tract and the boundary line, the scheme did not proceed very rapidly, but it got up as far as Aroostook County with some Provincial aid. I am glad the Minister of Railways has taken the course he has; I am not glad that any of my friends on this side are disappointed; but I do not see how he could, consistently with the public interest, have gone in any other direction. It is true it may be a little shorter to Louisburg and Halifax, to

take the line projected here, but it serves the public interest most when he gives an opportunity to select the most commodious port on the Atlantic, and he does the greatest amount of justice to the people of the Lower Provinces; and if it is eighty miles longer, I think he has done his duty faithfully with regard to this matter. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Railways had it in his power to establish a line across the territory of Maine, he would endeavor to let it go direct down to Passidumkeig, then across the European and North American Line down direct to St. Stephen, using both ports of St. Stephen and St. Andrews, and then on to Halifax and Louisburg. These resolutions look like a new departure with regard to aid to railways. I am not going to express an opinion about that further than to say that if the people have got to have an enormous taxation from the National Policy, and if it produces a great surplus of revenue I do not know any better mode of dealing with it in the public interest, and if they have got to spend it I would rather see it spent on railways in the older Provinces of the Dominion than to see it all going west. I think it can hardly be said that these resolutions proposed to aid local railways. The fact is, you can hardly aid one railway without aiding another. The history of railways has altogether changed. When we had but few railways in Canada it was quite different, they have become so common that they are all more or less connected with each other, and they all aid each other to some extent. I think the Government have gone much further than their predecessors; I do not think that putting some old iron rails on lines of railway that were supposed to be feeders of the Intercolonial Railway, was going anything like as far as these resolutions are going. With regard to the Intercolonial Railway, I think they are taking the right view with regard to that matter, because that railway was projected years ago under certain circumstances. Is the commerce of the country and the advantage of the people got to be subservient to that road because it was built in a wrong place? The commerce and growing business of the country must be considered first, and the paying capacities of the Intercolonial Railway must be second to the public interest. Whether they obtain Government aid or not, these roads will be built by private enterprise. That shows the folly of building great lines of railway by the longest possible route. They might as well say that we shall have to use the Intercolonial Railway, and go by the longest and most tedious route, and follow all the old practices of former years. Of course we have got to pay for that railway. I do not regret, however, that it was built, because, if we had not got the Intercolonial Railway then, we would never have obtained it under any circumstances. I do not desire to trouble the House further, although I should have liked to have said something in praise of the town of St. Andrews, the shire town of the county which I have had the honor to represent for many years. The Finance Minister and Minister of Railways are among my constituents; they have never supported me; I trust they may cease their opposition.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). I wish to correct some of the remarks made by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), and I regret he is not now in his seat. The hon. gentleman stated that the proposed railway through the Island of Cape Breton was not of national importance and was merely a local line. If that hon. gentleman had looked into the matter more closely, I am sure he would have come to a different conclusion. This railway to Louisburg will bring Montreal 230 miles nearer to that port than at the present time. The distance from Montreal to Louisburg by the proposed line is 764 miles, while by the Intercolonial it is 994 miles, the proposed new road thereby shortening the distance by 230 miles. I think the people of Canada must see that a line of railway which shortens the distance from one end of the country to the

chief city of the Dominion by 230 miles, is of Dominion importance. The hon. gentleman evidently intended in his speech to refer to the county of Cape Breton only, and he mentioned the population and area of the county. This railway through the Island of Cape Breton is of interest, importance and value to the whole of the Island, which is composed of four counties, with a population of nearly 90,000, the length of the Island being nearly 120 miles, and its width 100 miles; and I am sure the hon. gentleman must have known this to be the case, for no hon. member in this House possesses more intelligence than he does. I observe also that the hon. member differed from the leader of the Opposition in regard to this matter. I was very glad to hear the former before six o'clock, say a good word for the railway through the Island of Cape Breton, and I thank him for doing so. The hon. gentleman, however, changed the course of his speech after six o'clock for some cause which I do not know.

Mr. RYKERT. He had got his orders.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). The hon. gentleman stated that the line through Cape Breton would compete with the Intercolonial. Nothing could be more ridiculous than that statement. The Intercolonial is about 130 miles from the western point of this road on the Island of Cape Breton, at the Strait of Canso; the new line will be 130 miles due east of that portion of the Intercolonial and will run due east to Louisburg a distance of eighty miles. It will, therefore, be impossible for the new railway to compete with the Intercolonial; and the hon. gentleman must have made the statement without consideration or without a knowledge of the facts. It is not necessary that I should say much as to the development and impetus which the building of this road through the Island of Cape Breton will give to that Island. We have large coal areas which will benefit by this road; we have iron ore in abundance, we have copper ore in abundance, and vast deposits of manganese, a mineral of great value which has been developed in that Island within the last year or two; and this proposed line from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, whatever route it may take through the Island, will pass through vast deposits of this valuable mineral. I must thank the hon. Minister of Railways and the Government on behalf of the people of Cape Breton Island for this valuable resolution to vote a subsidy to this road. I am sure the people will be forever grateful to the Minister of Railways for this aid, and that he will always continue to retain their esteem and confidence.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have no desire at this late hour to prolong the discussion, but I deem it to be my duty to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for West Middlesex. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald), who has just resumed his seat, has already referred to some arguments used by that hon. gentleman, and therefore it does not leave me so much ground to traverse as I at first intended to cover. I observed, in the course of the hon. gentleman's remarks, that he opposed all the railway subsidies proposed, except that for a line from Gravenhurst to Callander. He declared that all these other roads were local lines, except the one which happened to be in the great Province of Ontario. I cannot comprehend by what line of reasoning he made out that all the lines proposed to be subsidised were local lines, except the one which is in his own Province, which is subsidised to the extent of \$1,320,000, including that granted by the Act 45 Vic., chap. 14, and the present Statute. It is just possible that if a larger amount had been granted to other railway companies he would conclude that, instead of their being local lines, they would have been lines worthy of the consideration of the Dominion. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was under the impression that the county of Cape Breton, one of the four counties composing the Island, was the whole Island, and that it was only the  
Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton).

size of a small parish, of one of the counties of Ontario, and he ridiculed the idea of subsidizing a railway through such a small tract of country. However, there can be no doubt that if he studies more carefully the vast resources of that county of the Island of Cape Breton, he will come to the conclusion that in importance it is second to none, and is not even equalled by any county in the Dominion of Canada. The coal exports during last year were not less than 500,000 tons from the county of Cape Breton alone; and the shipping which entered the ports of Cape Breton was greater than that which entered any harbor outside of it in the Dominion of Canada. These facts alone prove conclusively the vast importance of the county and Island of Cape Breton. In 1876, under the Mackenzie Government, a line of railway, part of the Intercolonial from Truro to Pictou, in Nova Scotia, was given as a subsidy for building a railroad eastward; and it was then supposed that this subsidy would be sufficient, aided by subsidies from the Nova Scotia Government, to build a railroad from New Glasgow to Sydney or Louisburg. Unfortunately, with this subsidy and all the aid the Local Legislature could grant, the eastern extension was only carried as far as the Strait of Canso. At that time I held that the Dominion of Canada should assume the responsibility of building this railway out of the Dominion Exchequer. However, a different policy prevailed; and notwithstanding that the line between Truro and the Strait of Canso is apparently a local line, yet it is one in which the Dominion of Canada has a direct interest. The line between New Glasgow and the Strait of Canso was built by a private company subsidised by a railway from Truro to Pictou, and a cash subsidy from the Local Legislature. Local legislation was enacted in 1879 by which the Government of Nova Scotia might, under certain circumstances, assume the ownership of that road; and it is now the fact that that Government have taken steps to assume the ownership of the road between Truro and the Straits of Canso; and under Dominion legislation in 1879, I believe, in the event of the Nova Scotia Government failing to run the line between Truro and the Strait of Canso satisfactorily, the Dominion Government must assume that responsibility. Under these circumstances, in the near future, it is just possible that the line between Truro and the Strait of Canso, instead of being a local line, will eventually become a part of the Intercolonial Railway; and the extension of this line from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg will only be a construction of a road which is a Dominion line. It is, therefore, evident that the Dominion Government has an interest in that extension, as a feeder to a road which may, in the near future, become a road owned by the Government; and whether this will be so or not, it is well known that the eastern extension through Cape Breton to Sydney or Louisburg will be a feeder to the Intercolonial from Truro westward. On these grounds, I hold that it should not be considered a local road. Although the subsidy for Cape Breton is not as large as the people of the Island would possibly desire, and although I have no doubt that they would expect and suggest a larger subsidy, still I hold that this subsidy will be sufficient to ensure the extension of the road from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg; and that, as soon as railway enterprise will take a firm footing on the Island, it will no doubt ensure a network of railroads over that Island, developing the resources of this important section of the Dominion; and although my hon. friend from West Middlesex seemed to depreciate the great importance of the great Island of Cape Breton, I have no doubt that when he acquires more knowledge, he will come to the conclusion that instead of being comparatively equal to a parish in one of the great counties of Western Ontario, he will perceive that it is the brightest gem in Her Majesty's dominions.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I have to ask the hon. Minister of Railways, if it is proposed that the bonus to the Great

American and European Short Line Railway, is to be conditional on the construction of the unfinished portion of the road from Montreal to Houlton? My reason for this enquiry is this: We have not, I think, too much information before us, and a considerable part of what we have is drawn from the map placed on our desks, showing that the distance from Montreal by the proposed line to Houlton is 293 miles, and from Houlton to Canso, 391 miles. The hon. Minister, in urging the claim for this grant, drew our attention to the great advantages which this scheme afforded for providing an outlet to the Pacific Railway, at a Canadian port. He spoke of his regard for the great Republic alongside of us, but said that he loved Canada more—a sentiment in which, I fancy, we will all join. If that is not the condition of this grant—that the unconstructed portion across the State of Maine is to be built—I fail to see how we can be sure that either St. Andrews or St. John is to become the Canadian port as an outlet for our western road. If the hon. gentlemen who come from the sea suppose that we in the West take no interest in matters in the East, they are mistaken; and I can assure those gentlemen that whenever any Western man looks at the plan and sees the line dotted down upon it, by which it is proposed to bring St. Andrews within 385 miles—if the figures are correct—of Montreal, and St. John within 443 miles of Montreal, it is a pleasing prospect, because I believe the most of us know that the closer the commercial relations are between the Provinces, the firmer will be our political bonds. One word with reference to the proposed bonus to the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander Station. The former grant, I understand, added to the proposed one, amounts to \$12,000 per mile; and speaking only for myself I certainly hope that in making this grant the Government will endeavor to retain the actual and practical control of that railway. The control which would please me most would be the absolute ownership of the road by the Dominion, and the working of the road by the Dominion. I believe the time is not far distant when the people will again claim the right which they always possessed until the present generation, of owning these public highways. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Railways is informed as to what would be the cost of grading that road, but I do know that there are many sections in the West in which \$12,000 per mile will not only grade a road but will tie it and iron it to-day. Some portions of the route I believe are rocky, and in these it may cost more, but there are many people who would prefer that even a larger grant should be made, if that were necessary, to retain control of the railway. With regard to the 80 miles from Canso to Louisburg, I see by the papers which have been laid on our desks that the total amount which has been asked for is \$1,200,000 to complete the road from Montreal to Louisburg; and I am sure that if we can for the small sum of \$256,000 accomplish what is proposed to be accomplished by a grant of \$1,200,000 we will all be delighted. I fail to see how the granting of a subsidy to the portion of the railway 390 miles east of St. Andrews is going to give St. John and St. Andrews connection with Montreal, unless the building of the wanting links between these places and Montreal is a condition of the grant.

Mr. PICKARD. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the matter which is now before the House. I am prepared to support the Government in the resolutions respecting certain roads, but I shall not be as selfish as the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), whose views were purely local. I regret that the Government could not see their way clear to subsidizing the Great European and American Short Line, from Louisburg to the international line, but I am not going to oppose the resolutions because we have not got all we asked for when we signed the memorial to the Government. I think the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr.

Ross) took a sectional view of the case when he said that the line from the Gut of Canso to Louisburg was a purely local road. It was the connecting road from Canso to New Glasgow. We have a river from New Glasgow to Truro, but this Short Line Railway Company are building a line from Oxford to New Glasgow, and an extension of that line was to go by Baie Verte to Memramcook, the junction of the Intercolonial, to utilize a portion of the road as far west as Salisbury, and from Salisbury on to the west. I believe St. Andrews and St. John would have been as well accommodated by the Short Line road had it gone direct to Fredericton, and thence on to the west. But we cannot expect everything we want all at one time; but the commerce and trade of this country seek a port on the Atlantic sea-board, and will not be covered by any sectional roads. The King of the Gatineau, the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright), wants me to pitch in because his road has been called a local road. I am satisfied, if the country through which it is to pass is what it has been portrayed by the hon. Minister of Railways, it is one of the best lines in the whole Dominion.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation). Mr. Speaker: I desire to offer a few remarks on the resolutions which are now submitted to the House. These resolutions have reference to enterprises which are destined to develop the resources and increase the revenues of the entire country. For ten years our statesmen, our Parliaments, have devoted their attention, their energies to create new Provinces. For ten years we have expended millions to construct this portion of the road which will develop the country from one end to the other, and especially that vast region situate west of Lake Superior. I congratulate myself on the sacrifices and efforts that have been made to construct the great Pacific link. No person more than myself appreciates the importance for these new Provinces and new territories of the great route which we have constructed. Moreover, I know that the old Provinces will find in that new country the best outlet for their products, their manufactures. We can judge of that by the fact that in one single year, in this very year, the commerce carried on between Manitoba and the Eastern Provinces has amounted to \$12,000,000. Now, that we are certain that the Pacific railway is to be built without costing the country a cent; now that we know that the whole Pacific railway is the most profitable speculation that Canada has ever made since the surplus arising from the sale of our lands will not only enable us to pay every cent of the cost of its construction, but will also leave a surplus in the Treasury; now that we are about to crown this great work, which will be forever the glory of Conservative Governments, which since 1881 have been at the head of the affairs of this country—I say that our duty is to think a little about the welfare of the old Provinces, which until now have borne the burden of the construction of the great Pacific road, and of the creation of the new Provinces. I say that our duty is to consecrate a part of our energy, of our studies, of our capital, to do for the East of Canada what we have done in preceding years for the west. That is what the Government meant last year in asking us to vote \$1,500,000 to assist the construction of railroads in the old Provinces, and that is what is understood in asking us to vote \$2,000,000 for the same object. Whether this policy be a new departure, as the hon. leader of the Opposition contends is of no consequence, the question simply is whether it is an advantageous one. In reality what is the duty of the Government? What is the duty of the statesmen who conduct the affairs of the country, if not to develop the resources not only of western but of all Canada, whether they be in the east, the west, the north, or the south? I am not in a position to say that I am entirely familiar with all the roads mentioned in the

resolutions; but in view of the statements which have been made to-day by the hon. Minister of Railways, and the other hon. members who have spoken on this subject, I am entirely convinced that the Government only came to the conclusion to aid these roads after having made all necessary investigations, and only when they came to a correct conclusion that these roads were calculated to develop the resources of Eastern Canada. But there are some of these enterprises with which I am more particularly familiar. For instance the Lake St. John Railway, the Montreal and Occidental Railway, and the Gatineau Railway. As to the Lake St. John Railway I understand that our friends from the Quebec district attach the greatest importance to it, and in my opinion they are perfectly right, for the Lake St. John Railway is destined to become the backbone of the city of Quebec, and the inhabitants of other parts of the country. We will always be happy to see the old capital flourish, and take a forward step in the path of progress and prosperity. I am happy to know that the valley of Lake St. John is able to sustain a population of from 200,000 to 250,000 souls; that the soil produces wheat in point of quality and quantity as good as in the North-West. As to the Montreal and Occidental Railway, I visited last year a stretch of country more than eighty miles in extent of this road, of which fifty miles are subsidized by these resolutions, and I can say that this visit for me was a revelation. That part which extends in rear of the Laurentian ranges was until this last five years an unknown country, a *terra incognita*, as the hon. member from the county of Ottawa remarked. But, Sir, during the last five or six years we have been able to locate 10,000 souls, and as the hon. Minister of Railways remarked, the Province of Quebec and the whole country owe a debt of gratitude to that great patriot, to that great apostle of colonization, who is called the Abbé Labelle who for so many years has concentrated his energy to explore the resources of our country and direct colonists to the north. With reference to the Gatineau Railway, I have studied the country through which it passes, and I can entirely corroborate everything which has been said by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. member from Ottawa county. The valley of the Gatineau is one of the most important sections of the valley of the Ottawa. It is an immense valley, having a rich soil, great forests and mines of all kinds. At the present time we are all aware of the extensive commerce of phosphates which is being carried on there. Well, Mr. Speaker, these two railways, to the construction of which we are going to subsidize for a distance of fifty miles in a few years, and I trust before long, will reach the Lake of the Desert, and later on will continue step by step and will reach the Hudson's Bay to give a new outlet for commerce for this important branch of Canada. I heard the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) say that the subsidies given to the railways mentioned in the resolutions were not protected by sufficient guarantees. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the proviso which accompanies these resolutions, he would have seen that the Government has taken the necessary measures to see that the expenditure of the moneys which are now asked shall only be expended during the construction of the work. This is the part which refers to these guarantees. All the aforesaid subsidies shall only be paid out of the consolidated revenue of Canada by instalments, according as each ten mile section is completed. Thus it is necessary that ten miles of the road be completed before any proportionate subsidy be given—proportionate to the value of the section thus completed, comparatively, to the total of the work, the value of which will be established by the report of the said hon. Minister. I heard with regret the hon. member from Middlesex oppose the construction of these enterprises, because, according to him, they are of a local character. It is easy to convince myself that the greater part of these

Mr. Tassé.

enterprises are far from being of a local character. So far our own policy, since we assumed the construction of the Pacific Railway, has been not only to construct this great railway, but also to subsidize the branches and connections of this road. The Gatineau railroad will connect with the Pacific Railway. The railway about to be constructed, starting from St. Jérôme into the interior, and which later on will be connected with the Gatineau Railway, is also an important branch of the Pacific; and I can say the same of the Lake St. John Railway. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that another reason is at the bottom of the opposition of the hon. member. I observed with regret that my hon. friend appeared to allow himself to be guided by sectional prejudices in lieu of the objections which he raised against the measure which is now submitted. For whilst my hon. friend raised objections against the construction of roads east of Toronto, he raised none against voting a much greater subsidy, a subsidy of \$6,000 a mile, which is in reality a subsidy of \$12,000 a mile, as we voted the same amount last year, making a total of \$1,300,000 for the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander. I am far from being opposed to the grant of this subsidy to this railroad, whose object is to place Western Ontario in connection with the great Pacific route; but, on the other hand, I think it is right that the hon. member and the other members who call themselves *par excellence* the Liberal party—and which it is only in name, for I want no better illustration than that of the hon. member for West Middlesex, who, on the one hand, approves of the subsidy between Callander and Gravenhurst, and, on the other, blames the Government for subsidizing roads East of Toronto—I think that it is well that these hon. members should understand that these roads do not interest the Province of Quebec alone, but all that section, Eastern Ontario and the city of Ottawa, of which I have the honor to be one of the representatives in this honorable House, are also considerably interested in the construction of the Gatineau road. Consequently it is not a question of subsidizing a railway which will merely benefit the Province of Quebec, but a road which concerns several Provinces, and I can say the same of nearly all the other roads. I should also dispose of another pretext of my hon. friend, the hon. member from Middlesex; he says if we adopt this policy it will be a suicidal one. Every time that the Conservative party has submitted an important measure to aggrandize Canada, we always have heard our opponents cry aloud and contend that we were leading the country to ruin and bankruptcy. When the construction of the Grand Trunk was proposed we saw these gentlemen declare war, contending that the Grand Trunk would always be a source of embarrassment and financial disaster. The same objection was made against the Victoria Bridge. In 1872 when the first measures were taken for the construction of the Pacific we saw these gentlemen contending that it would be for Canada a source of ruin, and to-night I am not surprised to see the hon. member from West Middlesex, faithful to the traditions of his party, protest with all his might against the generous and enlightened policy of the Government. If we consider the question from a revenue stand-point, no one is so much interested as the Federal Government in subsidizing the railroads which it is intended to construct, because railways are the best factors for the prosperity of the country. The railway is the most important lever which can be applied to develop the resources of the people of any country. Take, for instance, what has been done in the regions north of St. Jérôme. In the last five or six years the Curé Labelle alone has been able to settle there 10,000 souls! If each person pays \$5 of indirect taxes, 10,000 persons will pay \$50,000 of taxes annually, or a half million in ten years; and if these people have a railway, what a development will take place. It is certain that no one is more interested than the Federal Government in sub-



sidizing these railroads, which are of a character to increase the population and thereby the taxes and resources of the Government. This has been so well understood that the Federal Government has so far paid and has promised to pay \$114,000,000 in the form of railway subsidies, whilst the municipalities have given \$13,000,000, the Quebec Government more than \$14,000,000; the Government of Ontario, \$4,000,000; the Government of Nova Scotia, \$3,000,000, and the Government of New Brunswick, \$2,000,000. Besides this, if we are to adopt the views of the hon. member from West Middlesex, the Province of Quebec should have no more railroads, for it is a well-known fact that the Quebec Government has contracted very heavy engagements to afford that Province important railways, and for this object it has expended enormous sums. I can say the same of the Province of Ontario, whose treasury, unfortunately, will not likely be long, in such a flourishing condition as it has been in the past, owing to the numerous engagements which she has been obliged to assume in order to construct railways. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have taken a broader view, a more generous view, and we are ready to sustain the policy submitted by the Government, which wishes to encourage—in any part of Canada—the principal lines of railroad which have a tendency to develop the resources of the country. Mr. Speaker: the hon. Minister of Railways said that if we assisted the various railroads mentioned in the resolutions, these subsidies would have the effect of facilitating the repatriation of a large number of our fellow-countrymen from the United States. I am entirely in accord with that opinion. Two things we must especially attend to, to facilitate the repatriation of our Canadian emigrants: first, to develop our industries, and that is what we are doing by the National Policy which is producing such admirable results; and, secondly, to develop our agriculture and colonization by the construction of railways, which will open up vast uncultivated territories, east and west. Let us work therefore, energetically, with this object in view, let us continue to adopt a broad and enlightened policy for all parts of Confederation, and before long we will have solved the great problem of repatriation.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to make a few remarks with reference to the resolution now before the House. I refer to the resolution of the hon. Minister of Railways, subsidizing different railways in the Dominion. If there is one county which more than another is interested in these railway subsidies it is the county I have the honor to represent. I had the honor a few days ago to submit a memorial to the hon. Minister of Railways asking for assistance to a railway running through the county of Pontiac. I asked this assistance for the building of an inter-provincial bridge to connect the two great Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It was with great pleasure yesterday morning that my attention was drawn to the subsidies proposed to be given to roads in different parts of the Dominion; but I can assure you that I would have felt greater satisfaction had I seen that the county of Pontiac had received the same consideration at the hands of the Government. But I believe there is yet hope, and I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Railways will be in a position to give his reason why assistance to this inter-provincial bridge has not yet been granted. I propose to draw the attention of this honorable House to the position of our railway in the county of Pontiac at the present time. Hon. gentlemen are, no doubt, aware that this road was subsidized by the Provincial Legislature for a distance of eighty-five miles, from the town of Hull or Aylmer to Pembroke, at the rate of \$5,000 a mile; but at a meeting of the Executive Council it was decided to change this subsidy into a guarantee of bonds on the property of the road. Operations were begun last June, and twenty-three miles have been graded; and I understand that the contractor who has the contract for building the road from Hull to Pem-

broke, went to England to dispose of the bonds, and I am informed that he is now on his way back to Canada, and in a position to complete the road, which would shorten the route from Ottawa to Pembroke by about twenty miles, thereby saving immense outlay on through freight from the west, and securing that directness of route, which the hon. Minister of Railways alluded to to-day, as being of such importance on all Canadian roads. I may say, however, that this inter-provincial bridge, for which I ask assistance, must be a high level bridge, which will necessitate a great outlay. I understand that it is estimated to cost something like \$500,000, and I approached the Government for assistance because I believed that it was not a work of a local character, but a Dominion work; and, Sir, I contend that if assistance had been granted to aid us in completing this bridge, the county I have the honor to represent would, in a very short time, be in a very favorable position as compared with neighboring counties. This road, when constructed through the county of Pontiac, will be a feeder westward from the Black River, the Coulonge River, and other tributaries to the Ottawa. That county is now a large lumber district; but, with the completion of this railway, mills would spring up, and the lumber would be sawn there, instead of being sawn in the Chaudière mills, as at present. There is no doubt, also, that the county of Pontiac is rich in minerals, which would find an outlet through the town of Hull, and thence to the sea-board. It is of the greatest importance to my constituents that something should be done in this matter. There is not a man in my county but feels greatly interested in obtaining a subsidy for this railway. I may state that the county of Pontiac contributes as much, if not more, than any county in the Dominion to the revenue. Last year the slideage and Crown dues received from the three tributaries to the Ottawa in that county amounted to more than \$100,000, and I claim that we deserve some consideration at the hands of the Government; and although we have not at this present stage been favored with a subsidy, I have every reason to hope that ere this House rises, the hon. Minister of Railways may see fit to place a vote in the Supplementary Estimates to aid us to build this bridge this summer. It is a matter of the greatest importance to this whole district, and I can only say that although I shall cordially vote for these subsidies to other roads, I should have had much greater pleasure in voting for a subsidy for this inter-provincial bridge and the road running through the county I have the honor to represent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If no other hon. gentleman wishes to address the House, I would say a few words in reply to the remarks that have fallen from hon. gentlemen in relation to these resolutions. I may say first, that I regret extremely that the Government were not able to meet the views of my hon. friend from Pontiac in his application for aid for the construction of a bridge connecting the railway in his county with the Province of Ontario. The road is being constructed, but there is some distance to be constructed yet, I think, before it will reach the point where this proposed bridge should cross the river; and as it is an inter-provincial bridge, it seems clear that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec should both contribute to its construction. I may say that the subject will still receive the consideration of the Government, and I shall be only too glad if, at any future time, it is found that the Government can give any aid to a work of such great importance. There is no doubt that a line of railway which will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway by crossing the Ottawa, is of great importance; but as the hon. gentleman says, the bridge will be very expensive, as it will obstruct navigation, and must, therefore, be constructed as a high level bridge. I shall be very happy if, at a future day, matters can be arranged so that aid may be afforded. Now, I may say, in the first place, that I have no reason to find fault with the manner in which this important proposition

has been received by the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition, whatever may have been his practice in another Legislature, I must frankly admit, naturally took exception to the fact of so important a resolution as this, involving the expenditure of so large a sum of money, being brought down at so late a period in the Session. The hon. gentleman knows very well, for he has had the duties and the responsibilities of a Minister on his shoulders on more than one occasion, that in dealing in questions of this kind, the Government, with all the questions pressing upon their time and attention during the Session of Parliament, find it extremely difficult to bring matters of such importance as this to such a conclusion as to enable them to be brought before the House at an early day. I may say, that in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I have already given instructions that they shall be copied as rapidly as possible, and I hope by to-morrow or next day to be able to lay upon the Table of the House all the papers that are important in their bearing on these resolutions—the applications, and the sources from which these applications have come, and the extent to which they have received the sympathy, either of the outside public or of members of Parliament. I shall take the earliest opportunity of placing as full information as possible in relation to this matter on the Table of this House. I shall not have much to say in reference to the hon. gentleman's criticism of these resolutions for the fact that I think they were of an extremely moderate character, and I came to the conclusion, before the hon. gentleman sat down, that brief as was the time he had taken for its expression, it was long enough, with the explanations I had been able to make, to satisfy me that in the main he was of opinion the resolutions were entitled to the support of the House. To those who are familiar with the mode in which the hon. gentleman attacks any measure to which he is strongly opposed, his moderate criticism on this occasion is an indication that the resolutions really commended themselves to his judgment, and that, so far as was consistent with his duties as leader of the Opposition, he was prepared to give them unqualified support. I am not surprised at that, because the hon. gentleman must readily perceive the fact that these resolutions are for appropriations of public money for purposes which cannot fail to be of great advantage to the general public and to largely promote the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman said that it was opening a very wide door; but I think he has already learned from the sentiments of some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him who have, on this occasion, given an independent expression to their sentiments on this question, that some of those hon. gentlemen would be prepared to open the door a little wider. The most cursory examination of this question is sufficient to satisfy the House that it is absolutely necessary we should look at these measures proposed for the development of our country from a somewhat different stand-point to that from which we have been accustomed to look at them. The hon. member for Middlesex especially takes exception to interference with Provincial legislation. I am under the impression that Provincial Legislatures will be very much obliged to us for coming with our great resources to the aid of the country in its development, let it be in one Province or the other. So far as its being regarded as an interference, the great sentiment of the country will be that where public works of this description are shown to be essentially necessary for the development of the country they should receive the careful consideration of the Federal Government and the Federal Parliament. The hon. gentleman wants to know whether the Provincial resources have come to an end, why it is that all these different Provinces should not have been left entirely to be dealt with by the Provinces themselves. I am sorry to say that, to a very

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

large extent, the resources of the various Provinces have come to an end. I am sorry to say that there are very few Provinces that are in a position, however anxious to give that aid and support to the development of the country it is desirable they should give, on account of the condition of their resources; and I believe they will be only too grateful to find that there is a disposition, when works are of general importance to the whole country, to give their careful consideration and assistance when practicable. I may say that the construction of railways by these Local Governments stands to-day in an entirely different position from that in which it stood while these different Provinces were separate and independent of each other. The hon. gentleman knows that in any one of our Provinces that which would have been perfectly practicable, feasible and justifiable before Confederation could not be entertained at all. The hon. gentleman knows that it was quite practicable for the various Provinces to lend their credit and aid to the construction of railway enterprises when the revenue of the country was going into their coffers; but that it would be impracticable for them in the existing condition of things. Take Nova Scotia as an illustration. Nova Scotia expended \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 in the construction of railways by her Government. Capitalists could not be found to embark their means in the construction of railways there, as it was not supposed, commercially, they would give an adequate return for investment. The Government used the credit of the Province, expended \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 upon the public credit, upon a mortgage of the revenues of the Province in England, and constructed these roads as Government works. Did they pay? No; if they had paid their working expenses it was all they did. Probably a fair adjustment of accounts on the two sides of the ledger would have shown that, instead of having anything to their credit, they had not covered working expenses. Was this an unwise expenditure? No; the increased revenue of the country, and the increased development of the country were more than sufficient to enable Nova Scotia to pay the 6 per cent. interest on the capital invested, and still leave a larger amount in the Treasury than we would have had, had we not spent a dollar. Now all that is changed. Under the existing condition of things, this increased revenue goes in to the Dominion coffers, and the Province in which the expenditure is made does not receive that indirect benefit which, previous to Confederation, would warrant it in incurring such an expense. That is the view which the hon. member for Middlesex has not taken of this question, or he would not have taken the ground he did. The hon. leader of the Opposition felt disposed to have a little amusement at my expense at the divided condition of my affections among these four ports. What is the position I took at the outset? I believe it is a matter of great importance to Canada to find a Canadian port that will be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was rather surprised at the hon. gentleman's allusions to a somewhat personal matter connected with my investment in the port of St. Andrews. I have no hesitation in saying, although I am not very fond of talking of my own private affairs, how I came to have a very humble investment in a seaside home in the town of St. Andrews. When I came to re-side in Ottawa as a Minister, I found it was necessary for the health of my family, they should spend the hot season at the seaside, as they had been always accustomed to. I found that by stopping at St. Andrews—the Intercolonial was not then built—that I could have a seaside home for my family, which I could visit and be two days less absent from the Capital, where my duties kept me, than if I had to go to the city of Halifax. St. Andrews was the nearest port on Canadian soil where my family could spend the hot season, and which I could occasionally visit without deserting my post for too great a time. The investment was a very humble one; and I may say to

my hon. friend across the floor of this House that if he thinks my object in propounding these resolutions is to improve the character of that investment, that as soon as these resolutions have become law I will make him an offer of my entire investment at St. Andrews at a very liberal margin under what it has cost me, so that the hon. gentleman will find that this circumstance will not be considered a very serious objection to these resolutions. Then, Sir, I say that the port of St. Andrews, by the proposed scheme, will be put in a position to compete with the port of Portland. At present the city of Halifax, with all our efforts, is handicapped with too great an increased distance to enable it to do so; but I do not forget that the city of Halifax will secure, by the construction of this road, an advantage which it does not now possess, because by taking the train through the city of St. John, and there taking the Intercolonial Railway, we will reach Halifax by a line between 100 and 200 miles shorter than we are now obliged to take. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank), who dealt with this in an independent manner, and who has uttered sentiments with regard to this question that does his independent character, in my judgment, infinite credit, has touched two or three points of great importance, and I commend a consideration of his remarks to the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman says truly that it is impossible to overrate the value to this country of anything that will bring the great commercial centres and the people closer together. I say that that hon. gentleman's breadth of view in grasping that idea, is well worthy the consideration of every hon. member of this House. Everyone knows that one of the great obstacles to Confederation was the remote distance at which we were from each other, that Halifax and St. John were so far from Montreal and Ottawa; and taking that view of the question any means that can be devised that will enable the population of the various Provinces, and the people inhabiting the commercial centres to be brought closer together by a saving of time or a decrease of expenditure, is a means more calculated to cement and consolidate our Confederation than any other measure that can be proposed. The hon. gentleman went so far as to say, in approving the policy of the Government in securing the thorough independence of the Gravenhurst branch, that he for one would be quite prepared, if necessary, to see the road built, owned and operated as a Government work. Now, I do not go so far as the hon. gentleman in my admiration of Government control of railways. There is a great deal to be said from that stand-point; but with all the means I have had of observing the management of railways and their operation, I believe they can be better managed by private enterprise than they possibly can be by Government. But I will go this far with the hon. gentleman: that if, to-morrow, it was found necessary to secure the complete independence of that link, it would be better to do it than to have it constructed at a greatly smaller cost, but without securing the thorough independence of that section of the road. Then the leader of the Opposition wants to know whether this is not bad news for the Intercolonial Railway. Well, Sir, he got his answer from the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who told him that if any means could be devised to carry on the commerce and business of the country with greater facility than can be done by the Intercolonial Railway, the better means should be adopted; that he should look primarily at the national development of the country rather than to the maintenance of this or that road. The hon. gentleman got his answer, but I may say to him from my experience as Minister of Railways that if we were choosing a line to-morrow for that railway, I would put it where it is. Notwithstanding its increased length, notwithstanding that by that line the ports of Halifax and St. John cannot compete with the ports of Portland and Boston, I say that I would still select the same route for the Intercolonial Railway, and for

this reason: It is not only a source of strength to the country, but it is required by the Imperial Government as giving them confidence in the continued retention of their Canadian possessions on this side of the Atlantic. Its being remote from the frontier gives it value as a military line. If we had not the Intercolonial Railway and were to-morrow seeking a line of communication between the various Provinces, I would not propose to adopt a line that would carry us through a portion of the State of Maine, because I know that at any moment we might, either commercially or in case of difficulty be cut off—one section of the country from the other. The construction of the Intercolonial Railway that the country was able to build and have maintained so successfully, gives strength and security to the country, and it opens up a vast section of the country along the northern shores of New Brunswick that could not have been opened up in the same time by private enterprise, and I believe, that from this time forward it will be no burthen to the people of this country in its operation. I say these resolutions contain the antidote to the bane the hon. gentleman sees in having a rival line to take away the traffic from a certain portion of it. These very resolutions contain the means of opening up branches in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and will bring into our country, through shorter lines, a traffic that we would not otherwise obtain. A vast amount of traffic will be brought over the line from Louisburg to St. John that never would come into our country at all unless we had these shorter lines. Therefore, I say that under these circumstances, so far from any injury accruing to the finances of the Intercolonial Railway, its position will be just as good or better after these resolutions are carried than it is to-day. I will just notice a remark that the hon. gentleman threw out, that the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway were balanced by an increased subsidy from the Postmaster-General. Now, I have seen the General Manager of the road. I thought I was quite right when I stated to the House that the Postmaster-General pays less to the Intercolonial Railway for the postal service performed than he does to any other railway. Having made enquiry of the General Manager, who has gone fully into this question with Mr. Griffin, and taken it up in all its bearings, I am able to disabuse my hon. friend's mind at once of the impression that any advantage has been gained in the arrangement of accounts between the different Departments of the Government, by the Intercolonial Railway. I am in a position to tell the hon. gentleman that the amount I have received from the Postmaster General, is less per train mile than was received under the late Administration, and that I am receiving a smaller payment from the Post Office Department than the late Government received. So far from the accounts having been altered in favor of the road, whatever changes have been made, have had distinctly the reverse effect. I desire to say a word with regard to the Napanee and Tamworth Railway. The hon. gentleman could not understand how it is possible for the Government, and the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) labored under the same impression, to look at anything except through political spectacles. I cannot blame the hon. gentlemen for taking that view, because hon. gentlemen opposite naturally judge the Government by themselves; they naturally imagine that we will be influenced by like passions with themselves, and they have, I dare say, too much reason to believe that there have been such things as Governments using railway subsidies in such a way as not only to give them power, but to increase vastly their majority and enable them to control the Legislature. I do not intend to go into that matter. But I also heard a rumor with respect to the Napanee and Tamworth Railway. The rumor was this, and it was stated to me by a deputation from that section of the country, who said that, although their road had not received a subsidy, Mr. Mowat

was prepared to pledge that a subsidy would be given, provided that they would, at the coming election, elect a supporter to his Government in the Local Legislature. I do not say that is true, but if we are to deal with rumors I give that rumor on the one side to meet the rumor on the other side. If the hon. gentleman heard the rumor mentioned by him it was an unfounded rumor. Those gentlemen came to me a year ago, and I told them the question would be investigated. They came again, and I said I would send down an engineer to report as to whether this line could be brought into the category which would entitle it to Dominion aid. I sent an engineer of standing and character to make the exploration and investigation, and he made a report in which he stated that it was shown not only that this aid was needed in order to complete the road—because I take exception to the policy of the hon. member for West Middlesex that the first thing to do is to find out whether the company has a financial basis, so as to enable it to carry out the work itself—and also to make available great water-power. With respect to that declaration of the hon. member, I have to say that the very reason why aid is granted in some cases is because the companies are unable to do the work themselves. Where there is a financial basis, and the promoters of the enterprise can go into the open market and raise money, there is no necessity for subsidies; it is in cases where we believe general advantage will accrue to the country by constructing the work, that the Government are warranted in coming to Parliament and proposing grants in aid. Not only in this case was it desirable to have this line in order to connect the waters on the Bay of Quinté with the Ontario and Quebec Railway, but most valuable water-powers would be opened up by the construction of the road, which otherwise would be useless, but which now will be converted into a source of profit and national wealth. Under these circumstances I consider a case has been made out; but down to within three days ago no man living could have stated that a dollar would be given. No hon. member connected with the Government, so far as I know, was then aware that one dollar would be given to the work. All he could say was that the matter was receiving careful consideration; and I can say this, in the presence of the House, that I, myself, three days ago, or a week ago at outside, could not have said that one dollar would be proposed, because down to that time it had never been determined to grant aid. It was only on a careful review of the whole circumstances that I considered a case had been made out to warrant the Government in asking Parliament to grant this small amount of aid. The hon. member for West Middlesex said he was afraid the Gatineau Railway was a political railway. The Gatineau Railway a political railway? Is there a man in this House, is there an intelligent man in the country, who does not know the hold which the hon. member, the king of the Gatineau, has upon his subjects, so as to render it utterly unnecessary whether a railway subsidy or not is obtained for the constituents who have so long enjoyed the distinguished honor and great advantage of having his services in this House, and are too proud of that position to make it necessary that a railway subsidy, or anything else, should be given, in order to prove that he has their confidence, that he has a warm place in the affections of the great mass of his constituents, the strongest and most enduring bond that can exist between a member and his constituency? If the hon. member for West Middlesex had wished to show how utterly unnecessary it was to bring in political allusions, he could not have chosen a better illustration than he did in regard to this matter. The hon. member got widely astray in his geography. He took up a hostile position to these resolutions on an entire misconception of what they were. It is true he had not had the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

advantage of having had the resolutions very long in his hands, but he had had them long enough to have prevented him making such serious blunders. He had doubtless under his hand Colonel Snow's plan for an air line from Louisburg to Port Moody, and he should have learned two things: (1) that the Island of Cape Breton had more than 31,000 inhabitants, and (2) that a line of railway running, not alongside, but at one end of the Intercolonial, could no more be a competitor with the Intercolonial than the line from Ottawa to Montreal is a competitor with that from Montreal to Quebec. But I suppose that when the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) informed the hon. gentleman that the Island of Cape Breton was not a little county with 31,000 inhabitants, which was the ground on which the hon. member based his hostility, and the impression that it was a parallel line to the Intercolonial, I thought the hon. gentleman would have taken it all back and would have told us, as the hon. leader of the Opposition did, how delighted he would be to obtain, for a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile, a line to the harbors of Sydney and Louisburg. But no; the hon. gentleman, when he found he was all wrong, that this was not a parallel line, but one that must develop a vast amount of traffic, that instead of the Island of Cape Breton being the size of a county with 31,000 inhabitants, it proved to be a great Island with enormous resources, sending five representatives to Parliament—he was still just as much an opponent as before. The basis of his opposition had broken down, but he was still an opponent. He reminded me of a witness in court who was examined with respect to the height of a horse. He said it was fourteen feet high. The Judge asked him whether he did not mean hands. The witness said: "Have you got me down as saying fourteen feet?" The Judge replied, "yes;" thereupon the witness said: "Then, by Jove, I will stick to it." The bottom has fallen out of the hon. gentleman's argument, and the whole basis of his opposition has proved to be wrong, and yet the hon. gentleman still sticks to it. The hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) is, no doubt, disappointed, and I am sorry for it. He naturally felt a very great interest in a subsidy being given to the direct line from Fredericton to Salisbury, and there is no doubt that so far as making the very shortest line of communication is concerned, there is a great deal to sustain that view of the case; but there were two considerations—first, that this line will carry us through the great commercial centre of New Brunswick, St. John, a matter of no small importance. It takes us by the most direct route to that fine harbor, and places it in the position of competing with Portland just as well, or on about the same terms and footing as the line which the hon. gentleman himself favored; and with this addition, that we run on the Intercolonial the whole distance from St. John to Halifax instead of over the portion only from Salisbury to Halifax; so that, all things being considered, this selection was made. My hon. friend knows that the Legislature of New Brunswick have subsidized the section of road in which he takes special interest; and I have no doubt that this subsidy will result in the construction of this road at no distant date. Then I may say, I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in saying that the Province of New Brunswick has been neglected. Where has he found evidence of this? On what does he found the statement to this House that the Province of New Brunswick has been neglected? Will he show me any place on the face of the globe, where a population the same in numbers as that of New Brunswick has a greater number of miles of railway than it has? Will the hon. gentleman show me any other country where this is the case? And when he remembers, that a large portion of this mileage has been constructed by funds provided by this Parliament, the hon. gentleman ought not to stand here, in

the face of what has been done for the Province of New Brunswick by this Parliament, and say, that this Province has been neglected. Why, as I told the House before, my predecessor subsidized half a dozen lines of railway in New Brunswick, and founded and established the principle of giving, what is now by a little extension made into \$3,200 a mile by furnishing rails to lay the track. My hon. friend from West Middlesex says that that was an utterly insignificant subsidy compared with what we propose? But was it? Why, does the hon. gentleman not know, that these iron rails could have been sold a dozen times since they were used for that purpose for only \$5 a ton less than you could have bought new steel rails for; and, therefore, these were substantial subsidies. I approved of it. I sustained that policy, when my predecessor stood here and I stood in Opposition, as a wise one, just as I call upon the hon. gentleman to sustain the policy contained in these resolutions. I have paid him the highest compliment that one person can ever pay to another; that is to imitate him. My hon. friend surely had forgotten that the railway from St. Martin to Upham, thirty-five miles, was subsidized by my predecessor, by furnishing rails for it; that the Elgin Branch, fourteen miles, was subsidized; and that a portion of the Albert Railway, the Chatham Branch Railway, eight miles, was subsidized; and since my predecessor left office, I have carried out the pledge which he had previously given, to subsidize the Kent Railway by furnishing the rails to extend it for twenty-two miles.

Mr. BURPEE (Sanbury). The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not complain that the Province of New Brunswick, as a whole, had been neglected in railway matters. I did not refer to that subject at all. My complaint was that a portion of New Brunswick through which the Central Railway runs has been neglected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry I misapprehended the hon. gentleman, because I confess I heard what he said with a great deal of astonishment. I am glad, however, that we have obtained the support of my hon. friend from West Middlesex on a portion of the resolutions, if we cannot have it on all. That hon. gentleman in common with some of his friends on that side of the House, gives an enthusiastic support to the proposal to subsidize the Gravenhurst Railway, and that to the extent of \$12,000 a mile; so that, I think, if he finds that my friends from the Maritime Provinces and the Province of Quebec are prepared to go on in extending such a subsidy to the Gravenhurst Railway, I think I must ask my hon. friend in return for that to give us his assistance to secure the small subsidy of \$3,200 a mile for these various lines to which, in some sections of the country, almost equal importance is attached. Now, I think I have said all that is necessary to say on the present occasion, except to express my gratification at the very handsome and statesmanlike manner in which my hon. friend from York (N. B.) has addressed himself to this subject. That hon. gentleman, of course, in common with my hon. friend from Sunbury was somewhat disappointed that the road in which he naturally takes a more direct and special interest had not received the same consideration, for the reasons which I explained, that some other sections have obtained; yet that hon. gentleman has stated very frankly, that he believes that the whole policy propounded is a useful one, that the country will benefit from it, and that he is prepared, although it does not cover all the ground he would like to see it cover, to give it a handsome and independent support. I thank him for it, and I believe that I may congratulate myself on the fact that no proposal ever submitted of equal importance to this House, has received more general approval from both sides of the House, than the resolutions which I have had the honor to submit.

Resolution to be reported.

### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act thirty eight Victoria, chapter fifty-six, intituled: "An Act respecting the Graving Dock in the Harbor of Quebec, and authorizing the raising of a loan in respect thereof."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 130) to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter sixty-two, and the Act forty-third Victoria, chapter seventeen, respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

### INLAND REVENUE ACTS AMENDMENTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 115) to consolidate and amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue, be now read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are they important?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The first important change is after section 161, where a new section is added by which a penalty is provided. The next important change is in section 185, by which the 2½ per cent. allowance to which they were formerly entitled is restored to the Bill, leaving it as it was before.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain why a change was made in the old law, and why that change is now withdrawn?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under the operation of the Act it was found that the 2½ per cent. rate did not equally bear on all the maltsters, and we thought it would be better to strike out the 2½ per cent. entirely. That, however, was an increase of taxation on the brewers, of which they complained, and under all the circumstances we thought it would be a reasonable conclusion to leave the law, in this respect, as it was. I wish to make a statement for the special information of the hon. member for South Brant. During the discussion upon one of the clauses of this Bill which provided for notices being attached to the packages of tobacco, the hon. gentleman asked me if they would be furnished free by the Department. I think I left him to understand that they would; but I find that such a course would lead to great misunderstanding and difficulty. Cut tobacco is put up in packages of all sizes, and the hon. gentleman can easily see what a variety of labels would have to be struck off. Therefore, we cannot undertake to supply these labels to the trade, and I think it will be no hardship to the trade to get these notices printed on their labels at no extra cost to themselves, in the same way as it is done in the United States.

Amendments read the first and the second time, and concurred in.

### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 308,

To pay the balance of the accounts of L. J. Demers et Frère for printing the first volume, and also the second volume in French, of the Report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Commissioners.....\$2,920.88

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to ask the hon. Minister why this work was given to L. J. Demers? The Order in Council stated that the printing of the evidence was not confidential, but that the report was. Why was not this work done by the contractor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was a work that was pressing at the time. We wanted to have the volume ready at a certain period. Under these circumstances the work

was given to these printers to prepare the first volume, and afterwards, seeing that they had done the work well, we gave them the second volume. The price was fixed by the Crown Printer, and the amount, \$2,920, was in accordance with the tariff.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). If the matter was pressing, the Government took the longest way to get the work done. We have not got those reports yet. The French report has not yet reached us.

On Resolution 309,

To pay Mr. A. Audet for translating into French the Report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Commissioners ..... \$1,300.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I have been asked, in connection with this item, to draw attention to a motion which appeared on the Notice Paper some time ago, calling for correspondence with reference to the dismissal of Mr. A. Audet from the Inland Revenue Office, Montreal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman on that.

On Resolution 310,

To pay sundry expenses incurred in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, *vide* statement of Unforeseen Expenses laid before Parliament ..... \$16,821.49

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The great expense of this Commission is a strong argument against the appointment of similar Commissioners hereafter. Mr. Keefer received \$6,928; Judge Clark, \$6,917. The payment to a Judge of a County Court for acting on a Commission while drawing his salary as a Judge seems to me a gross irregularity. The system of—I must not use the word subsidizing—permitting a Judge to draw such a large sum, while his judicial duties are neglected, is a bad one. I cannot impress too strongly on the Government the propriety of discontinuing that system. It cannot be possible that the judicial functions of a Judge are properly discharged while he is closely engaged on a Commission, and this supplement to his salary will be an inducement to other Judges to ask, possibly, for some little contract which will enable them to supplement their salaries also. This is in keeping with the system of employing officers in the service overtime at extra pay. Mr. Davin, as Secretary, received \$4,483; Mr. Stevenson, \$6,646; Mr. Demers, \$2,920; Col. Audette, \$3,706, making a total of \$39,213. The Commission was as unproductive in its results as could well be conceived, so that the \$39,000 have been simply thrown away, and perhaps in some respects worse than thrown away, though the Government may feel that a certain portion was well spent in the interest of their friends.

Mr. RYKERT. During 1875 these hon. gentlemen opposite employed no less than 191 extra clerks at a cost of \$45,423 and gave thirty-five bonuses to these amounting to \$940, which they charged to Contingencies. One-fourth of the whole Contingencies was caused by the employment of extra clerks.

Mr. ROSS. That is a *tu quoque* argument. I have not checked the hon. gentleman's figures, but, in any case, we are not dealing with the late Government. I object, not to the employment of extra clerks during the Session when there is a rush of work, but to the employing of the permanent staff in working extra hours. I think the effect is demoralizing, and I say so conscientiously. But whether I believe it or not, I have a perfect right, with my increased Parliamentary experience and increased attention to that matter, to call attention to what I believe to be wrong. I take my present position in this matter where I have always stood, and I stand by that. I am willing to be condemned when I am wrong. I think the hon. member for Lincoln has done  
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

many things he would gladly not have done, and I think he has given many votes in this House he would not give over again.

Mr. RYKERT. No, no.

Mr. ROSS. Perhaps not, as he reached his maturity years ago. However, I hope he will live long enough to withdraw some of the statements he has made, and regret some things he has done.

On Resolution 326,

Unprovided Items of 1881-82 (*vide* Auditor-General's Report, page 435) ..... \$542,992.32

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to ask a few questions on some of these items, and the first is \$20,000 for Contingencies in Civil Government. Could the hon. Minister give me some details of that large amount of money?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that is mainly covered by a warrant issued for something like \$20,000 to cover the increased Contingencies of the Departments over and above the estimate. That was very largely arising from the number of clerks it was necessary to employ in preparing returns that were asked for the two last Sessions of Parliament. The Session before the General Election there was a general spirit of enquiry on the part of our friends opposite for all kinds of information upon all kinds of subjects, and this Session we have asked for a vote for that express purpose. My hon. friend will remember that down to the present Session, and in the accounts of last year, all these were paid out of the Contingencies of the Departments, and, therefore, increased considerably the estimated sum. In addition to that there is an enormous increase of business in the Department of Interior from the large surveys, applications for lands for settlement, and in various other ways. Under the regulations for the disposal of these lands, every hon. member knows that the duties of that Department were largely increased, necessitating many extra clerks. So, with reference to the Post Office Department, the amount of business was increased by the increased number of deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank, the increased number of accounts, and increased business in money orders.

Mr. ROSS. There was a further item of \$2,059 for Contingencies in the Senate.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I regret that I have not the papers by me by which I could give the hon. member the details.

Mr. ROSS. Then the item under the head of Immigration, \$1,239.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is well known that Immigration expenditure was made larger during the close of last year than was expected, and much larger the current year, and the wonder is that, under the circumstances, and considering the calculations of the Government as to the amount of immigration, it was not even a greater amount.

Mr. ROSS. I see a charge of \$6,940 for rolling stock for the Pacific Railway.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There were some open accounts when the transfer took place which were not closed until the end of the year, and I think even the present year there is a small item of a few hundred dollars that is not closed.

Mr. ROSS. Then there is a further item of \$96,000 for Dominion Lands.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is owing to the increased surveys. It was vitally important that as large a portion of that country should be put under survey as possible, and the Department considered it desirable to push forward the survey with greater rapidity than was provided for by the sum voted. The Government felt that Parliament would vote any extra sum necessary. We are doing the work as rapidly as possible with the sum at our disposal.

Mr. ROSS. There is a sum of \$192,920 for Manitoba and the North-West Territory under the sub-head of Indians. We are voting a large sum for Indians, and here we have drawn in advance almost \$200,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know we have. We hoped the last year or two that we would be able to keep this expenditure down, and we have approached Parliament with the estimates at the lowest possible sum. But as the time arrives we find it necessary before the close of the year to supply a sufficient quantity of food for any emergency that may arise, as was the case last year when it was found absolutely necessary to supply at an early day an ample quantity of food. It will be found that the expenditure will be about the same, and we have asked about the same sum. In some cases the price is more under the new tenders than it was under the old contracts. Beef, for example, which was 8½ cts. under the old contract will now cost 12 cts. or 13 cts., owing to the increased demand in the United States for animals for cattle ranches; and we have not yet had a supply in the North-West sufficient to meet the demands of the Indians and Mounted Police.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12:25 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 18th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns this day it shall stand adjourned until three o'clock p.m. to-morrow, and that on that day and the following Monday Government Measures shall have precedence.

Motion agreed to.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Mr. Speaker: I find, by the Debates of the House, that during my absence last week owing to suffering from a severe cold, reference was made to a matter in which my name was connected with that of Mr. Whitehead, and I think some explanation is due to the House, as well as to the country, concerning it. The only reason I have not brought the matter before the House before this is simply because I was unwell. The evidence given before the Commission on Pacific Railway matters has been published and read by hon. members, and it has been made the subject of an attack on me, and insinuations that, I think, are not only unjust, but absolutely untrue. When the Pacific Railway Commission was formed I was absent from home, and, reading in the newspapers that certain statements had been made by parties—I am sorry to say some of them interested in misrepresenting me—I wrote a letter to the Commission, and the following is the purport of it:—

*"To the hon. the Commissioners appointed to enquire into Pacific Railway Expenditure, &c.*

*"GENTLEMEN, — From reports in Winnipeg newspapers Mr. Joseph Whitehead was examined by you, touching certain business transactions with me in connection with his contracts with the Dominion Government. Garbled extracts from his evidence as well as what must be the hearsay evidence of others have been republished in newspapers of this and other Provinces, these being used by my political opponents, and the political opponents of the existing Dominion Government, for the pur-*

pose of making unjust insinuations — if not direct charges against the latter—as well as against myself.

*"As my business relations with Mr. Whitehead began when the late Government, to which I was politically opposed, held the reins of power; as I acted as his agent in Ottawa, as all my monetary dealings with him were the result of deliberate agreement, entered into at his request, and of his own free will—I have been unable to discover in what capacity I or my business affairs can be subjected to the inquisition of a Royal Commission appointed 'to enquire into and report upon the acts of the Government of Canada, its officers and servants,' and the conduct of those who have entered into contract and dealings with the Government. Nevertheless, as the Commission has deemed it advisable to examine Mr. Whitehead as to his private and public affairs, outside of the public and official 'record,' I desire to supplement Mr. Whitehead's statement, made as it apparently was without the aid of counsel or of the opportunity of referring to documents and papers relating to this matter—so that the public may be able to distinguish the facts which bear on the conduct of their representatives and servants from those which are personal and private, and, therefore, not to my mind, constitutionally within the inquisitorial jurisdiction of Commissioners, Royal or otherwise.*

*"Hence I shall be glad to be informed on what day it will be convenient for the Commissioners to give me an opportunity of making my statement.*

*"I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,*

*"O. H. MACKINTOSH.*

*"OTTAWA, Ont., October 23rd, 1880."*

Pursuant to that application made by me, I was requested to appear. I was not summoned before the Commissioners, and was not asked to give evidence. I went there, and made my statement. My statement was a very full one, and I was cross-examined very fully also. I showed that my relations with Mr. Whitehead had no connection with the Government; that on no ground, and on no occasion whatever, had I made any application to the Government asking them to do what any former Government had not done. This was established by the evidence. The judgment of the Commissioners was this:

*"We concluded, upon the evidence on this subject, that no part of the proceeds of the said notes, or any other money coming from Mr. Whitehead to Mr. Mackintosh, had the effect of or was used for the purpose of obtaining for Mr. Whitehead or for any other person any advantage concerning this contract, or any other matter in connection with this railway. The notes were at first discounted by Mr. Mackintosh. They were subsequently returned by him, and eventually returned to Mr. Whitehead. On other occasions considerable sums of money or notes changed hands from Mr. Whitehead to Mr. Mackintosh under circumstances which we found, on investigation, not to affect the public interests, and we do not think it necessary further to allude to them."*

Again:

*"We have taken evidence at some length concerning the dealings between the Government and him, while he was carrying on the contract, with the view of ascertaining whether he had obtained any favor by improper means or otherwise, at the expense of the public; and all the evidence on this subject leads us to conclude that since the execution of the contract, no influence had been exercised on his behalf more effective than his own representations were or would have been; and that he has not gained from the Department, or any member of Parliament, or any engineer, or any other person in the Government's employ, an advantage that was not consistent with the best interests of the country."*

That was the deliberate finding of the Commissioners upon the evidence which had been given; and that evidence was not alone my evidence—the judgment was given not alone on my evidence, but on the corroborated statements of several other witnesses; and I was able to show, as I think the hon. Minister of Railways will bear me out in saying, that on no occasion, and at no time, did I ever approach him and request him to do anything to compromise his position as the Chief of the Department, or myself as a private gentleman. I can also say this: That so far as Mr. Whitehead's interests are concerned, the fact is that when the matter came before the Commission, and since then, and since it has been discussed in the public press, I never approached the hon. leader of the Government. I never referred to the hon. Minister of Railways, and on no occasion whatever asked what I should do in this matter, whether I should make any explanation here to-day, or as to what I should say when I went before the Commissioners. I may also state, that on no occasion did I ever ask the Government for a favor which I would be afraid to make this

honorable House conversant with. I know too well my duty not only as a member of Parliament, but also as an occupant of a position of public trust, even to approach a Minister and ask him what would bring the blush of shame to my constituency. However, my political opponents have deemed proper, with reference to the granting of a certain amount to Mr. Whitehead, to make insinuating attacks on me; and with malignant ingenuity they have endeavored to misread and partially quote as well certain portions of the evidence calculated to be detrimental to me, and this they have circulated through the country, while I had no means of defence against such attacks. When the attack was made on me, the *Globe* said:

"Soon after the change of Government, it became necessary for him to prefer a large claim, and another thing he wanted was that the engineer in charge of the works, should be superseded by another, who was known to be favorable to Mr. Whitehead's claim in being paid. In order that he might stand well with the Government, Mr. Whitehead employed Mr. C. H. Mackintosh to act as go-between in the negotiations with Sir Charles Tupper. Mackintosh was no doubt employed because he was popularly supposed to have the ear of the hon. Minister, and for that reason Mr. Whitehead thought it would be profitable to pay the go-between a considerable percentage on the claim."

Now, I can inform this honorable House that, so far as I am concerned—as Mr. Whitehead as shown by his evidence, as I also showed, and as was corroborated by other evidence—I was acting for Mr. Whitehead, and on Mr. Whitehead's behalf prior altogether to the change of Government, and it was at Mr. Whitehead's request that I so acted. It is not necessary to go into private affairs, or to make private explanations, or to refer to private business; but I may say I found that Mr. Whitehead was not the victim of a Conservative interest, that it was not Conservatives who were making money out of him, but leading Reformers were the men who were gradually squeezing out his life's blood—and more, I think it could be established, if necessary, that Mr. Whitehead contributed sums of money to supporters of the previous Government. Consequently, when I found this to be the case, I cautioned Mr. Whitehead, and showed him what would be the result; and events proved that I was right, for at the expiration, I believe, of two years, he came to me, and showed me that his position was what I told him it would be, if he followed that course. I am not a wealthy man, and, as may be imagined, have suffered by my connection with Mr. Whitehead. I have not in reality made a dollar out of him so far as I am specially concerned; and, so far as the Government is concerned, I did not get him to contribute anything to the support of the Government, or of their political cause. Mr. Whitehead acted on his own behalf in these matters. In order to meet his notes I had to sacrifice nearly all the property I had. But these matters have been seized upon by my opponents, in connection with unsupported and uncorroborated statements, for the purpose of damaging me. They succeeded for a long time, and they got me down; but I got up again; and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite who are following me to-day, and who are attempting to insinuate wrong-doing on my part, that they were knocked down, that they were down for the second time, and that they will not get up again, if their policy is to be one of slander and abuse. So far as I am concerned, I can assure this honorable House that I have done nothing that could bring disgrace on any member of this House, and that if I had had opportunity and had known that this item was to have been discussed, I would have been prepared to discuss it fully. When the item came up the hon. member for West Durham said:

"I have a sort of suspicion which may be a very unjust and unworthy one, that there were more people than Mr. Mack—I apologize and retract—than Mr. Whitehead interested in this matter. I ask whether this was the contract about which a great deal of evidence was taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission; whether this is the contract which was the subject of transactions between the Department and the contractor, and between the contractor and those who had been going surety for him and assisting him, and intervening with the De-

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

partment; and whether this is the matter in respect to which divers notes were given by Mr. Whitehead for large sums of money?"

The hon. member for North Norfolk said:

"And I have here a copy of the letter furnished by Mr. Whitehead to Mr. Mackintosh. Now, Sir, it appears from the evidence that Mr. Mackintosh still holds Mr. Whitehead's acceptances for \$13,000 and interest and protest, amounting now probably to \$14,000. Mr. Mackintosh is in the position of a creditor to Mr. Whitehead, he holds these acceptances and can enforce payment, and I think the circumstances of the case point quite plainly to the supposition, at least, that among the creditors who are to be paid out of this allowance of \$88,000 to Mr. Whitehead for profits that he never realized in carrying out his contract, is this same Mr. Mackintosh. I think there is something very peculiar about this matter, something very suspicious about it. I do not think it is in the interest of Mr. Whitehead that this allowance is made. We have this suspicious circumstance, that \$14,000 of this money is very likely going to a friend of the Government, and we may fairly infer, if we could lay bare all the transactions, that there are other friends of the Government who are creditors of the same Mr. Whitehead; and I think that the inference the country will draw is, that the notice of the Government in introducing this vote is to reimburse those friends of theirs who are creditors to Mr. Whitehead in this matter."

I can inform hon. gentlemen that I have never filed any claim against Mr. Whitehead. In pursuance of the evidence I gave before the Commission, when I said that if Mr. Whitehead was pressed at any time financially, although I had taken up his notes, I would be the last one to endeavor to collect them. I said that distinctly; and after swearing to it, it is very unlikely after I took the oath that I would file a claim, or approach the Government, and endeavor to induce them to place in the Estimates an item which I did not know to be in the Estimates, until I came in late in the evening and found it there. I never approached the Government in this relation, and I can appeal to the hon. Minister of Railways, and to the right hon. leader of the Government, and ask them whether on any occasion I mentioned this matter to them, or endeavored to induce them to favor me in the least, as far as this matter is concerned. At that time I was not a member of Parliament, and there was no law to prohibit me from making arrangements with Mr. Whitehead in whatever way I wished to do; but I never did anything that was wrong, or in the least infringing on the rights and privileges of this honorable House. But it appears that this item is to be made the subject of an attack on me, and not only on me, but on the Government; although no more unfair, no more unjust, no more unfounded attack was ever made on a Government. In answer to the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, I may say that I have filed no claim; and, so far as I am concerned, since I became a member of Parliament, and, I may add, prior to that, I can challenge any man to state whether on any occasion I have directly or indirectly offered any bribe, or attempted to forget the allegiance and duty which I owe to my constituents. I think the allusions were not only unwarranted, but unfair, because I was not a member of the House when this transaction took place. To say that, now that I am a member, I am endeavoring to induce the Government to put items in the Estimates, in order that I may be recouped for the losses which I have suffered as a private individual, is to make a statement utterly untrue, the fact being that for the last two years I have had to sacrifice a great deal of property in order to pay those acceptances. But so far as I am concerned, those who know my private business are aware of the truth behind all this. They also know that two years ago every newspaper in the country politically opposed to me endeavored to hound me to earth, but they did not succeed. They struck me down for a time, but when I came before the public it was established beyond a doubt that I had the confidence of the people. If these stories had been true—if they had been founded on fact, if there was nothing behind me other than the character of a mere trickster or speculator, I think it is reasonable to suppose that I would not have achieved the position



I have achieved in this short time. I was at that time elected Mayor of Ottawa for three successive years; I conducted the business of the city during that period without a single charge against me of dereliction of duty or of profiting by the office. I went in a poor man and came out a poor man, and should I continue in Parliament, the probability is that I will leave it as poor a man as I entered. When I resigned office, and when my record was before the people of this city, Conservatives and Reformers alike—among the latter many office bearers of the Reform Association and a great many others—united in passing a resolution placing on record the fact that they had the utmost confidence in my integrity. I say that if anyone doubts my position in the city of Ottawa, or the confidence which the people have in me, let him meet me in a contest here where I am known, and he will find that I have friends among all parties who know that I am not the man that I have been painted by hon. gentlemen opposite—a man who for his personal aggrandisement would sacrifice his honor and violate the sacred pledge he made when he became a member of this House. How willing are those who attack me to forget all the misdoings, all the misconduct, of their own friends. When they were in power they found no fault with their own friends for using their public position for individual purposes; they could do what they pleased, they could do wrong in any and every direction, and it was all proper, and they were all perfect. They have one code of political morality when they are in Opposition and another code when they are in power. I do not wish to indulge in recrimination, but I ask hon. gentlemen to take a fair and dispassionate view of this matter. I say it is most unfair to pursue any man as I have been pursued. For these attacks have not only injured me personally, but they have injured me in my business; they have affected my credit seriously. I ask these hon. gentlemen to place themselves in my position, to hold the mirror to themselves, and then I ask them how they would feel if they had been treated as I have been. I say it ill becomes men who have occupied high positions in the councils of the nation, who occupy high positions in the councils of their own party, to attempt to injure a man who has only been in Parliament but a few months, and who is still but a young man in public life. I rose simply for the purpose of making these explanations, and I now repeat with the same solemnity as though I were making them on oath, that so far as the Government is concerned, I never asked them to put an item in the Estimates for my personal advantage, and that since becoming a member of this House I never asked Mr. Whitehead to pay these acceptances, and I made up my mind when I entered Parliament, that I would never ask any friend of mine to disgrace himself by voting for or supporting any matter on the ground that it would be to my personal interest or profit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman has referred to me, I will only say that he never spoke or wrote to me, or had anything to do with me respecting the item in the Estimates to which reference has been made. Moreover, I would say that originally at the time of these transactions, he never approached me, nor did Mr. Whitehead approach me, directly or indirectly, respecting the negotiations, arrangements, or matters of account between them, and he never asked from me anything connected with Mr. Whitehead.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman having referred to me in relation to this matter, it is only due to him that I should state the fact, that shortly after my taking the position of Minister of Public Works, Mr. Whitehead informed me that Mr. Mackintosh was acting as his agent in the city of Ottawa, and requested me to make any communications for him in his absence, through Mr. Mackintosh. It was not an unusual thing—in fact it was the usual rule—for contractors who were carrying on large works somewhat

remote from the city, to name some person in the city as their agent, to transact business with the Department from time to time, and to make any arrangements they might desire to make which they could not make in person. Mr. Mackintosh called upon me, and stated that he was acting as agent for Mr. Whitehead, and that he hoped that as Mr. Whitehead had a heavy and arduous undertaking on his hands he would receive every possible consideration from the Government. I told him at once that every contractor received all the consideration from the Government that the course he pursued in relation to his contract entitled him to. I say unhesitatingly, in the presence of this House, that Mr. Mackintosh never uttered a word to me in reference to Mr. Whitehead's contract that I should not be perfectly willing should be overheard by the leader of the Opposition himself; and that he never approached me improperly in behalf of any claim of Mr. Whitehead's in any particular whatever. I may say further, that Mr. Whitehead during the period he was carrying on that contract never received any consideration whatever except the same consideration that the Government accords to every person who has a contract with them. As I have already stated, my predecessor, before I came in, assisted Mr. Whitehead in performing his contract. I do not say he favored him, though it might be so regarded, because they were outside the terms of the contract, though in pursuance of the invariable practice of the Department to give all reasonable and proper assistance to contractors that could be given them in order to carry out their contracts. From time to time the money deposit for security is released in proportion to the advanced condition of the works, and in case of difficulties arising advances are made on the plant. This is not an unusual thing. This remission or release of the deposit money was made by my predecessor, as it was by myself, as were these advances on plant, in order to strengthen Mr. Whitehead's hands in carrying on this work, involving extraordinary difficulties, before any return could be received by the contract. My predecessor considered as I did, that in doing all we could reasonably and properly do in that respect we were not consulting Mr. Whitehead's interest, but the public interest. So far as Mr. Mackintosh is concerned the moment the statement was made in the *Globe* newspaper that parties were obtaining large sums of money from Mr. Whitehead under the delusive idea that they could assist in promoting his interests with the Government, I said to him that if he was giving any person a single dollar of his money under the impression that it would assist him with the Government, he was throwing it away, and he had better keep it to himself. I repeat that so far as that contract was concerned there never was any communication between Mr. Whitehead and myself or through Mr. Mackintosh that I would not be glad that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have perfect information upon. With reference to this item in the Estimates from the time the Government took that work out of Mr. Whitehead's hands down to the day before yesterday, Mr. Mackintosh never exchanged a remark with me personally or in writing—never made any communication to me in reference to Mr. Whitehead's affairs until he spoke to me regarding what had taken place in the House and his intention of taking notice of it in his place in Parliament. It is due to Mr. Mackintosh that I should make this statement.

#### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution (May 17th) to grant certain subsidies to railway companies.

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

(In the Committee.)

To the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, for 100 miles of their railway from Metapediac on the Intercolonial Railway to Paspébiac, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$2,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 320,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman kindly say whether this is the whole length of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. I take it that the Baie des Chaleurs is projected from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Gaspé, eighty miles further than Paspébiac. This vote covers the first 100 miles of the railway; for the remaining eighty miles no subsidy is provided.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the character of the country traversed, and the probable cost of the line?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I made that statement to the House, I think, when I made my remarks on the resolution. I may say that after the close of last Session—application has been made for this grant for two or three years—I requested the Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railway to have a proper examination made of the country, and to report. He reported to me that the country was of the character I described, and that it was a fair country through which to construct a railway, and giving the estimated cost, which, I think, I stated to the House yesterday was over \$2,500,000 for the whole length, including the equipment.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state whether he has any information as to the financial standing of the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not. I inferred the position of the company from the fact that the Government of the Province of Quebec, where the company is well known, had granted it a subsidy of 10,000 acres of land per mile. I have no means of knowing that this subsidy, together with that which we propose, will secure the construction of the road; but, as the hon. gentleman observes, it is not proposed to pay any of this money until ten miles or more is constructed, and in the proportion which the cost of that portion bears to the whole work, so that he will see that the subsidy is sufficiently secured. The right of way has been obtained as a free grant for the 100 miles covered by this resolution.

To the Caraquet Railway Company, for 36 miles of their railway, from a point near Bathurst to Caraquet, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$115,200.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I lay upon the Table of the House the information asked for in regard to the Gatineau Valley Railway, the Great American and European Short Line Railway, the International Railway, the Petitcodiac and Havelock Corner Railway and the Caraquet Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make the same explanation regarding this road that I asked as to the other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This line was surveyed by the Government in connection with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Fleming having brought forward a project to build it as a branch from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippigan, a short distance beyond Caraquet. The Government of New Brunswick has subsidized this road to the extent of \$3,000 a mile, covering the entire distance from the Intercolonial Railway to Shippigan. The country is described as a very fair one through which to construct a railway, necessitating no serious difficulties at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any further information as to the financial position of the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I have not. I have inferred its position from the granting of the subsidy by the Local Government.

To the Gatineau Valley Railway Company, for the first 50-mile section of their railway from Hull Station, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, not exceeding in the whole..... \$160,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would like the same explanation with reference to this road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Gatineau Valley Railway Company have located their line, and I am told that this subsidy will be sufficient to enable them to secure its construction. It is true they asked for a larger subsidy, but the Government believe that the subsidy given by the Province of Quebec with this additional subsidy, will enable them to complete the work on this portion of the line.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the local subsidy?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Six thousand acres of land per mile from the Province of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. And the mileage cost, including the equipment?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend from Ottawa county can, perhaps, state.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the estimate was between \$18,000 and \$20,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman state to what point this fifty miles will carry the road?

Mr. WRIGHT. It will carry it from Hull station to the River Kazabazua, within twelve miles of the Pickanock River, in the township of Wright.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend state the point to which the fifty miles will carry the Gatineau Railway from Hull Station?

Mr. WRIGHT. To the place known as Kazabazua, within ten miles of the township of Wright.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the right place.

To the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, for eighty miles of their railway from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....\$256,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would like the same explanations with regard to this road, as to its resources, organization, and prospects. I understand from what I have seen in the newspapers, that there has been a projected line, by which it would go to St. Peter's, and diverge subsequently from there to Louisburg or to Sydney, and also that a place has been suggested by which it will go in another direction, crossing the point called the Grand Narrows. Is this latter place contemplated, and if not, to which point will the road go to Louisburg or Sydney?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The intention is to go about twelve or fourteen miles from the Straits of Canso, on a common line from which you can diverge either east or west, because, as my hon. friend is aware, there was a line projected running through the county of Inverness to Cape North. Of course, nothing would be done on that line until after it would be ascertained whether it was practicable to maintain a ferry on the fifty miles between Cape North and Newfoundland. It is not proposed to give any subsidy to that line. Although some of the projectors of that scheme have been very sanguine as to the maintaining of that communication during the winter season, I always believed they would have to fall back on the harbor of Louisburg or Sydney, the former of which is open all the year, and the latter during a large portion of the year, and both are now connected by railway. It is

proposed, therefore, to run for twelve or fourteen miles on a common line which you would pursue in going to Cape North or Louisburg; then by St. Peter's either direct to Louisburg or to Sydney if found more favorable to railway construction, as these two points are not very divergent and are connected by railway. That is the projected line for which this subsidy is intended. I have taken great pains to ascertain the financial standing and position of this company, and I think I am in a position to state that whatever work they will engage in they will carry through. The Government made a contract with them to extend the line from Oxford to New Glasgow, and although they have made great progress with it and incurred large expense, they have not yet called for any portion of the subsidy, so that I have no doubt at all as to their financial ability. Dr. Norvin Gran, a well-known capitalist, and a gentleman connected with a great many railway corporations in New York, who is associated with parties who can command any amount of capital, is the president of this company, which, I am sure, will vigorously carry the work to completion provided they accept the subsidy. They asked for a larger subsidy.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any assurance that the company will undertake the work at this subsidy—one-half that amount they demanded for this portion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the assurance of the general manager, Colonel Snow, that they will. Previous to his leaving here, I told him, although I knew the work was more costly in Cape Breton than in other sections, I was not prepared to recommend a subsidy of over \$3,200 per mile, and I asked him before taking that step, whether he would be prepared to carry out the work, and he assured me they would.

Mr. VAIL. Would the hon. Minister be disposed, in the event of this company not carrying it out in a reasonable time, to transfer it some other company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have provided all these subsidies shall lapse unless the works are completed within four years. It would be impossible for the company to organize unless they had the assurance of being allowed a reasonable time to construct the road. If they should fail, I would have no hesitation to ask this subsidy for any company that would construct the road.

Mr. VAIL. I am not at all disposed to object to these resolutions, but I must express my regret that the hon. Minister of Railways could not see his way to providing a larger sum for the Cape Breton road. Being a continuation of the Intercolonial, and consequently part of the road from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and considering the larger grants given to the other line through a portion of Ontario which is also a portion of the through road, we might have fairly expected that the \$6,000 per mile asked for would have been granted. However, I suppose there were good reasons why it could not be done; but I hope that before long an additional amount will be given for the extension of the Cape Breton road. The hon. Minister of Railways said the Local Governments were not now in a position, with their limited means, to subsidize railways to any extent. I agree with him and I am glad to hear that the policy initiated last year will be continued, and that the Dominion Government will, in future, recognize as one of their obligations the subsidizing, as far as is reasonable, of railways in the several Provinces. I say I am glad that policy has been carried out this year, and I hope next year it may be further extended, and that the Dominion Government will use any surplus over and above what is required for other important works, for the extension of railways in the several Provinces. In fact I am sorry the Government did not adopt this policy long ago. Nova Scotia had a considerable amount in the public Treasury here, the interest on

which would have kept the Province out of debt. They very wisely at that time expended it in subsidies for the extension of our railway system which was inaugurated before Confederation. They have gone the full length the Province is able to go. In fact their means are so restricted in consequence of this expenditure, that I am inclined to think before long they will have to ask the Dominion Government to consider their position, and make an allowance in return for these subsidies. The Province is at present in such a position that it cannot grant further aid to railways without running into debt, and I hope the Government will consider the position of the Province and do something in return for the amount expended in subsidizing and extending these public works. I am glad to acknowledge that the policy of the hon. Minister of Railways is one that he can claim credit for, and I hope when he finds that the \$3,200 a mile is not sufficient to extend the line through the Island of Cape Breton, which is a very important portion of Nova Scotia that next year, either he, or some other member of the Government, should he vacate the position he holds, will be able to add another \$3,000 a mile as a subsidy to this road and insure its completion.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that the distance from either of these points, Louisburg or Sydney, is about eighty miles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About the same.

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend might be satisfied with the hon. Minister's assurance that \$3,200 a mile is, according to the general manager's assurance, a sufficient inducement to enable the company to construct the road; but it would be much better for the Province of Nova Scotia, if the hon. gentleman could save this \$3,200 for the eighty miles that are not wanted, and appropriate it to some other Dominion work that is wanted.

Mr. CASEY. It is something new to be told that it is the policy of the Dominion to aid local as well as Provincial railroads, but we are accustomed to surprises from this Government. They are in the fullest sense of the word a Radical Government, because the number of radical changes, the number of reckless changes, they have made in the policy of this country exceeds anything that could have been expected from the most radical wing of the so-called Radical party. But I suppose we must take it for granted that this is the policy of the Dominion Government, and will remain their policy as long as these hon. gentlemen remain in power. If the precedent is once established that local roads are to get subsidies from this Government, then applications for subsidies will come in from hundreds and thousands. But we in western Ontario may have something to say if this policy is to be maintained. We built our road before this radical change of policy took place, before it was understood that the Dominion was to build roads for all localities. We took the other view, and put our hands in our own pockets and bonused these roads largely. It has paid us very well, but if the principle is to be established that local roads like these should be built by the Dominion, I am not sure but we may have a claim for damages. In my own county we have paid out no less than \$274,000 to secure the building of the Canada Southern, the Credit Valley, and others. Then different municipalities along the Credit Valley have paid large sums; almost every municipality in western Ontario has paid out large sums to secure the building of railroads, which should have been paid for, according to the present *dictum* of Ministers, by the Dominion Government. But are we to get any consideration for this? Are we to be reimbursed, or are we to be called upon to build roads in other localities which have no bonuses? If we are to be called upon to do that, then we must ask to be reimbursed what we have paid ourselves. It may be said that the Canada Central is largely bonused. But we in western Ontario are very little in-

terested in that. It may benefit the country, perhaps, as far west as Hamilton, but we can reach the great centres by much shorter connections than that. Radicals are supposed to be logical, and if this Government makes a radical change in favor of building local roads they must carry that policy out to its logical conclusion, and reimburse those sections of the country that have built their own roads.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he must not take our policy from a member of the late Government. He must take the policy of the present Government from our statement.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The portion of the railway that is being subsidized lies some 400 miles east of St. Andrews and St. John, and, yesterday, it was spoken of as completing a connection with the western system of railways; and the great advantages of a sea port which would compete with Boston and Portland, were mentioned in support of this claim. I asked, yesterday, whether there was any assurance that, upon the granting of this subsidy, the uncompleted portion of the railway running across the State of Maine would be built, or whether that undertaking would be placed in a better condition to be built?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The great object of this American and European Short Line Railway is to obtain a short line of communication between the Old World and the principal centres of commerce in the new. Its promoters believe that by acquiring certain pieces of railway, using certain railways that are constructed, and constructing certain other portions of railway, a much more direct communication could be obtained between the Old and the New World, between Port Moody, Chicago, Toronto, Hamilton, and the Western States and Liverpool by railway, in contradistinction to the longest line by water. The hon. gentleman knows that between Montreal and Liverpool there is a certain amount of railway to be traversed and a certain amount of water to be navigated. We may fairly compute the speed of the railway at forty-five miles an hour. We often do that between Halifax and Chaudiere Junction, including stoppages, on the Intercolonial Railway, as against fifteen miles an hour by water, and that, therefore, just in proportion as you can cover the distance between Montreal and Liverpool by railway instead of by water you diminish the time occupied in making the journey and voyage. Our aim, therefore, has been to secure a short line of communication between Montreal and the eastern-most port in America, and that port is Louisburg; and our object in constructing these eighty miles of railway on the Island of Cape Breton to Sydney or Louisburg, is for the purpose of being able to carry mails and passengers to that point at greater speed than if they took a steamer to Halifax, which is 200 miles further from Liverpool. The hon. gentleman will see the bearing of the construction of this link of this line in Cape Breton to the port of Louisburg, that is, to enable us to open up this communication; and incident to that, the construction of this short line of communication to St. Andrews, this is the only way the Dominion can compete with Portland, and the distance between Montreal and Liverpool will be shorter by this route through the harbors of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, than through Portland or Boston. I hope I have made myself intelligible to the hon. gentleman. The other section of the line runs through the State of Maine, and the cost of its construction will require to be provided for entirely independent of any subsidy from this Parliament; but this scheme will be the means of providing a rapid trans-continental line to Louisburg on the one hand, and for freight in winter to the harbors of St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax, all of which will be brought from 100 to 200 miles nearer to Montreal than at present.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The point I raised was whether the granting of the bonus for that end of the line would so encourage the company as to lead them to build the unconstructed link across the State of Maine?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These resolutions provide for the completion of the entire communication between Montreal and Louisburg, excepting 120 miles in the State of Maine, which will have to be provided, and which I believe the parties will be encouraged by this aid to construct.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimated cost of the eighty miles to be subsidized?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should say about \$25,000 per mile.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has not stated whether it is the intention of the Government to make the granting of this subsidy to the short line, conditional upon the construction of the link through the State of Maine, which is necessary to secure the object in view?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The resolutions speak for themselves on that point. We do not propose to make any conditions not provided for in these resolutions.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is unnecessary for me to say anything in regard to the proposition to contribute \$3,200 per mile for eighty miles from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, as the House has almost unanimously advocated its adoption. I intended to have said something on this question, but the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has relieved me from saying anything whatever in regard to it. I was gratified beyond measure to find that hon. gentleman advocating this very just measure which solves this crucial question that had baffled the efforts of himself, while he was Provincial Secretary and leader of the Government in Nova Scotia, as it had done other leaders of the Government—the construction of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney through the Island of Cape Breton. This question has been settled through the statesmanlike stand which the Government have taken on it. The hon. member for West Durham has found himself deserted by almost all his supporters, except his *Fidus Achates*, the hon. member for West Elgin, for the majority of the members supporting him seem to be in favor of the proposal now before the House. The Government have done an able, wise, and most generous act, and we congratulate them; and it is a proud moment when we can vote these subsidies and charge them, not to capital but against the surplus that has been accumulated by the wise, economic efforts of the Government. It is a proud thing to be able to give these subsidies without trenching on capital nor running in debt. The Government has done another thing: They have made it almost impossible to distinguish from either those sitting on this side or on the other side of the House, who are their supporters. Hon. members sitting to the right of the Speaker have generally been supposed to constitute the main body of those supporting the Government, but it seems to me that on these resolutions, and on the Government policy, which was attacked by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House have not served their party with allegiance, but have given in their adhesion to the Government scheme. I trust this bomb shell which the hon. Minister of Railways has thrown into the House, will not disintegrate the serried ranks of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman say bomb-shell or bon-bon?

Mr. WOODWORTH. I said bomb-shell, but it would have been more appropriate to say bon-bon. It appears that at this, the first Session of this Parliament, a very large number of Government supporters are to be found

among hon. gentlemen opposite; so much is that the case that party government can no longer be carried out in this manner, and a third party will become necessary. We find the hon. member for West Durham deserted by his supporters, notwithstanding his able efforts, and he is most skilful in making much out of little. I did not hear the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but I think we should listen to his remarks, and answer them. I do not approve of this continual scraping of desks, and noises made to drown a member's voice. We can certainly afford to conduct our debates in such a manner as will conduce to the intelligent discussion of the subjects in question, without making unseemly noises.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that I am not so grateful as I ought to be to my hon. friend's contribution to the debate. These resolutions are submitted by the Government not as a party question at all. They are resolutions which, in the judgment of the Government, touch the vital interests of the country. They are submitted for the purpose of promoting the prosperity of the country as a whole. They are submitted for the purpose of developing the trade and commerce and business of the country; and I cannot conceive that there is the slightest want of party allegiance on the part of any hon. gentleman in the House who believes that by any one of these resolutions the good of the country is advanced, in giving a hearty and cordial support at the same time to these resolutions one and all, and, at the same time, preserve the most perfect party allegiance to the hon. gentleman who leads them with such signal ability in this House. I do not accept such support as any indication of any disintegration of party. I only accept it as an indication from independent gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House, that when, in their judgment, and in the judgment of any one of them, a measure, in their opinion, conduces to the advantage of the country, they are quite as much at liberty to give it a hearty support as is any hon. gentleman on this side of the House at liberty to support anything proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when they believe that such a proposition will advance the interests of the country.

Mr. IRVINE. As an humble member of this House, I would like to say a few words on this question. Much of what I have heard I entirely disapprove of, and I do not know that I would have attempted to address the House at this time except for some of the extraordinary statements which I have heard. I entirely dissent from most of what has been said by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, and who have endeavored to congratulate hon. gentlemen on this side on what I would call a right-about-face. I entirely dissent from the proposition laid down by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or by any hon. member of the Government, that the Government of this country should so depart from well understood principles as to subsidize local or Provincial railways. I disapprove of such a course *in toto*; and I say this: That up till last night I defy any hon. gentleman in this House to point to one instance in which the Government of this country, or any member thereof, acknowledged in their place in this House, or out of it, that the Government considered it their bounden duty to take Provincial or local railways under their control; and I believe I am correctly informed on this point, when I say that the hon. Minister of Railways held the same views until a very recent period. Neither he nor any of his colleagues gave the country any reason to believe that the Government of Canada contemplated any such thing as the subsidizing of local or Provincial railways. We have an hon. gentleman—I know his bland smile, if I am not able to mention his county—who spoke just before the hon. Minister of Railways—

An hon. MEMBER. The member for King's.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. gentleman from King's. He smiles across the House, but I warn him that there are men in Canada to-day who stick to the principles until lately laid down by the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, that local railways should not be subsidized by the Dominion Government; that is, that the people of this country should not be taxed for such subsidies taken out of the revenue collected from the people. This was never contemplated to be done by the Federal Parliament, and never until last night did this Parliament understand the contrary. The hon. Minister of Railways can smile, but I make this broad proposition: That not one of the railways for which \$2,000,000 are to be voted in subsidies, can be properly called an inter-provincial and national railway. You commence and subsidize a piece of line in Cape Breton, and another piece of line in the Province of Quebec near the boundary line; and what is that for? We do not know, and we have no guarantee that this road will ever be built one mile farther than the boundary. What is the plain fact? Another line is built to Old Town or Bangor, nearly opposite to Moose Lake, about twenty-five or thirty miles from the boundary, and nothing is to hinder, when that subsidy comes out of the funds of this country, out of the Federal Treasury, a road in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture is deeply interested, as I am informed, being run down to the boundary and for the other road to meet it at that point, Bangor thus reaping the benefit of our subsidy to that line. I ask the hon. Minister of Railways, to-day, if that is the short line that was projected, concerning which the people of this country and members of this House sent a memorial to the Government for a subsidy; and if one mile of this road is contemplated to be subsidized, which members of this House wished to be subsidized on that score? Not one mile of it is to be subsidized. The building of a road to Louisburg is not part of the short line projected, and for which aid was asked from this Parliament; and the subsidizing of the line to the boundary is not part of the line, in the course which was intended to be taken by the company, which asked for a subsidy. It is very well known to every hon. gentleman that there is a lake not far from the boundary—Moosehead Lake. You must either go north or south of this line, and if south, you must intersect the western extension not far from Bangor, or Old Town if you please; and, as the hon. Minister of Railways said, Mattawamkeag. This was the word he used last evening for New Brunswick, but any person knows that Mattawamkeag is fifty miles from the frontier, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as any man living that the line which this company asked to be subsidized, and the line to be built, is not a line running to Mattawamkeag, but a line to Houlton. And when at Houlton you tap the whole system of American railways, and it is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to carry out this proposition. It is not necessary perhaps for the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, because he has two strings to his bow; and the road from Old Town to the boundary subsidized with money voted by the Federal Parliament, will answer the Americans first-rate to complete their line to Bangor. There is no doubt about that. I, as a humble member of this House condemn *in toto*, in every particular the subsidizing of local lines out of Federal funds. This is a principle which was never acknowledged heretofore until this time. The Government never acknowledged that they would do such a thing. They always disowned it. The hon. Minister of Railways disowned it. I think I am certain in making this statement that until last night we never knew that the Government would take Provincial railways under their care.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Irvine) was in the House last Session when the hon. Minister of Railways brought down his policy with regard to such

roads; and I think it was distinctly understood at that time, that this policy, this admirable policy, as I think it was, which was then initiated, and with regard to the effects of which I so entirely differ from my respected friend who has spoken, should be continued. I remember distinctly the address of the hon. Minister of Railways to the House then, and I pointed out the importance of constructing roads in the county in which I was interested. I pointed out that this county contributed an immense sum to the revenue and received nothing in return; and hoped that some aid would be granted in that direction, and I am pleased to find a favorable response in the resolution of the hon. gentleman. I think that the arrangement is exceedingly wise, exceedingly judicious, and exceedingly proper; and certainly it meets with the approval of the great body of the members of this House. Then, again, there was another difficulty which, perhaps, did not strike my hon. friend who has just spoken, and that was the unfortunate position which is occupied by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Under the National Policy system, his surpluses have increased to such a marvellous extent that it was a difficult question to solve how they could be diminished; and I think that in this way, perhaps, the money can be better utilized for the good of the country than in any other, I think the policy of the Government is an exceedingly wise and judicious one. I was asked a question in regard to the road in my own county, which I will now take the liberty of answering. This fifty miles to which the subsidy is given will take us to Kazabazua, in the township of Aylmer. It is an Indian name—the name of an old Indian tribe of that vicinity. This place is within twelve miles of the township of Wright. Then twenty miles on we come to Desert. I heartily join in the statements made by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) that he hoped that the Government would continue this wise policy. I believe, with my French friend, that *l'appetel vient en mangeant*, and I am sure that this policy is one which will produce admirable results in developing the resources of the country. It is a wise policy to build the main lines and to subsidize the branches; and I may say in regard to this particular road, that it will not only be a feeder to the Occidental, but will connect with that most important and valuable road the Waddington road, which I am assured affords by all means the shortest line to New York. In addition to the opening of the Occidental and affording an outlet to the Intercolonial, this road will also find us a short cut across that country. I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his views, and I believe the excellent ideas promulgated by the hon. member for Digby will meet with the approval of almost every hon. member in this House.

Mr. VAIL. I thought I understood party obligations as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, and I fail to see, because any hon. member of this House feels disposed to differ from other hon. gentlemen on a question of this kind, that he is to be charged with deserting his party. Hon. gentlemen on this side have not gone to that extent, but some of the Opposition have rather hinted that I favored the Government railway policy, and that that was an unusual course for me to pursue. I believe in every hon. gentleman acting intelligently in matters of this kind, and when he finds a measure coming from either side to which he feels he can honestly give his support he should do it in a manly way. I have never been charged with favoring gentlemen on that side of the House, and I think it is pretty conclusive evidence that this is a good measure for it is about the only measure they have introduced for which I have given them any credit. I am not disposed to recall back a word I said in regard to this policy. I believe it is better for the Government to spend the surplus in this way than in the way we have been asked to approve in the  
Mr. WRIGHT.

last few days. I referred to the grant on the Island of Cape Breton as being too small; and notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) has said, I do not believe any company can build a line through that difficult portion of Nova Scotia without a subsidy of at least \$6,000 per mile; and I hope if it is not built, and another company should ask for \$6,000 per mile, the Government will feel bound to increase the subsidy to that amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not often have to differ from my friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), but I cannot allow the impression to go abroad that I agree with his view that this is a mode of assisting my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I entirely dissent from that view of the case, and for this reason, I gave the hon. gentleman an illustration last night. We expended \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 in the construction of a road in Nova Scotia under much less favorable auspices than apply to many of these roads, and instead of diminishing the revenue we had enough to pay 6 per cent. on all the money we expended, and our revenue was larger than before. So far from affording relief to the hon. Finance Minister by diminishing his surplus, I am afraid we will be more likely to increase it.

Mr. PICKARD. I wish to add a few words to the remarks I made last night. Up to the present time there has been expended in the Province of New Brunswick, or the people have made themselves liable for it, no less than \$3,500,000, the whole of which is paid, but the bonds that were issued on the Grand Southern railroad within two years. They failed to carry out what they believed to be a great commercial road, owing to the want of money. That was at the time the Province was entering into Confederation, when they thought the Intercolonial would go by the valley of the St. John. They subsidized a road which to-day is within seventy-six miles of Rivière du Loup; they gave \$2,000,000 to this road and \$2,936,000 to the Baie Verte scheme. The Province of Nova Scotia has been rather handicapped in aiding local railways, from the fact that it had no money to give them, as they have devoted it to through main lines which would bring the Maritime Provinces near to the wheat fields of Ontario, and unite us together by a commercial bond, which is far stronger than the political bonds of the Confederation. Last year, my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Irvine) supported the Government, and asked for a subsidy for a New Brunswick railway from the Province line to Rivière du Loup or Rivière Ouelle. That was a through line, and the only through line on Canadian territory they will ever have.

To the International Railway Company, for forty-nine miles of their Railway from Sherbrooke in the Province of Quebec, to the International boundary line, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....\$156,800.00

Mr. BLAKE. I did not apprehend from what the hon. gentleman stated, what the mileage is which has been completed, and on which steel rails are to replace iron ones, nor how much remains to be constructed. I should also like similar information as to the probable resources of the company, &c., to that which I have asked for in the other cases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The International Railway Company have been pushing on their work steadily for some years, and opening up a very valuable section of country between Sherbrooke and the boundary of the State of Maine. I believe there have been very few local works carried on in this country which have had greater success than this has had in developing the resources of the districts through which it passes. There are four miles to be constructed between Sherbrooke and Lennoxville in order to shorten the distance, and sixteen miles to be partially constructed at the other end of the line, near to the bound-

dary of the State of Maine. The forty-nine miles, including these portions, it is proposed to provide with steel rails, so as to put it in the same position as the other roads to which subsidies have been given. As to the resources of the company, I may say that its president is the late member for Sherbrooke, the present Judge Brooks, and the company have been making great efforts to carry this road forward, and, as I said, have done an immense deal of good in opening up that section of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the hon. gentleman to say that twenty-nine miles out of the forty-nine miles are in running order, but with iron rails.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That portion has been operated for a long time, but the rails, I understand, are unfit for further use.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain how much is saved by the cut-off of four miles, which is to be built between Lennoxville and Sherbrooke?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to say, but it gives the line a more direct course.

Mr. BLAKE. Can he say anything as to the mileage cost of these twenty miles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I imagine about \$20,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. And as to the financial standing of the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All I can say is that the company have made great exertions to push this road, and although not very rapidly, have been steadily prosecuting it. I have no doubt whatever that the equipping of the line at this end with steel rails, and the provision made for the other end of the line to Cape Breton, will secure the construction of the intervening link.

Mr. GILLMOR. I understand that this is the same line for which a Bill was introduced into this House by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) some years ago. A delegation composed of the hon. member for Stanstead and the hon. Minister of Agriculture visited my county with the view of laying this matter before my constituents as well as others. They visited St. Andrews and St. Stephens, and we had a public meeting at Calais, to which delegates from St. Andrews and St. George were sent in order to promote the railway, which was then called the Megantic line. We were all pleased to see these gentlemen there, and I was asked to allow my name to go on the charter. Under these circumstances, I cannot offer any opposition to this measure, but give it all the support I can.

To the Miramichi Valley Railway Company for 32 miles of the railway, the Intercolonial Railway at the Miramichi crossing above Wilson's Point, to Moran's near Demphy Village, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole. \$102,400.00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In consequence of a telegram I have received, I would like to strike out the words, "crossing above Wilson's Point," so as not to define the starting point on the Intercolonial Railway, and that a point within a short distance of that point may be selected, if it is found to be more available for connecting with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain whether, by the resolution as now altered, the line can join the Intercolonial Railway on the north or the south side of the river as the company pleases?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is precisely what I wish to leave open, and that is the effect of this change.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the same explanation as to the probable cost of this railway, and the financial resources of the company?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This railway stands in the same position as the other New Brunswick railways. I presume that the financial standing of the company was considered good by those best able to judge of it, the Government of New Brunswick, who gave the company a subsidy of \$3,000 a mile. I presume the cost of the road will be about \$20,000 a mile.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for the first 50-mile section of their Railway, out of St. Jérôme, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole ..... \$160,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would invite the same explanations regarding this road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This road has also been subsidized by the Province of Quebec to the extent of 10,000 acres of land per mile, and it is projected to run from St. Jérôme to a junction of the road from Hull Station to Desert. The road is projected to run from St. Jérôme to the Mattawan, and it is expected to intersect the Gatineau Valley Railway somewhere about 100 miles north of Hull. The country, as I have already stated, is not only admirably adapted for agriculture, but is rich in mineral resources, and a large population is rapidly crowding into and settling it; and I think we may fairly estimate very admirable results to flow from this expenditure of public money.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimated cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume about the same.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for 28 miles of their railway, from Napanee to Tamworth, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole ..... \$89,600.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would invite the same explanations as to the probable mileage cost of the road, and the resources of the company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The resources of the company have been expended largely in grading the road. I understand that it has already been graded a distance of twenty-eight miles, and this subsidy will enable the company to complete it and open up that section of country.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the statement the hon. gentleman made yesterday on this subject:

"No hon. member connected with the Government, so far as I know, was then aware that one dollar would be given to the work. All he could say was that the matter was receiving careful consideration,"

and so on. Since then a paper has been put in my hands, the *Napanee Express* of the 11th May, which says in reference to this matter:

"If this be the case an explanation will be in order from the Government as to what was meant by the letter written by Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Alex. Henry, President of the Railway Company, the Friday before the Provincial Elections. The following is a copy of the letter as supplied us by a gentleman to whom it was given to read:—

"ALEX HENRY, Esq., Napanee:

"DEAR SIR,—Your report is not in, but we are satisfied it will be favorable. I will lay your case before the Governor with a favorable consideration. This letter is written in concurrence with the Privy Council."

"(Signed) "CHARLES TUPPER."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is hardly correct, except that I think the terms were for favorable consideration. I told Mr. Henry when he came to me about the subsidy that nothing of that kind could be done until finally ascertained; but that, in the meantime, I had discussed the mat-

ter with the engineer sent to examine the road, and from the report he had given me I had satisfied myself this was a road I could fairly recommend for the favorable consideration of the Government; but as I stated before, these parties were all assured that no pledge could be given, nor promise further than that from the information in my possession, my own judgment would be favorable, and I would be prepared to recommend it, but until within the last week when the Government dealt with this, I did not, nor did any member of the Government know a single dollar would be given for the construction of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. The letter written before the Elections declares: "I will lay your case before the Governor"—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Governor?

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose Government is meant. "I will lay your case before the Government with a favorable consideration." That might have been held to express the personal opinion of the hon. gentleman, and not to bind his colleagues, who, on further consideration, might induce him to alter his mind. The letter proceeds to say: "This letter is written in concurrence with the Privy Council," so that there was the assurance that favorable consideration would be given with the concurrence of the Privy Council.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is some mistake. If I was in a position to say the Privy Council had decided to consider the question favorably, the matter was at an end, and I could have told them the Government had decided. But I told them I had not received the report, but from consultation with the engineer I had formed a favorable opinion of the road, and was prepared to submit the subsidy to the Government. The simple distinction between the Government deciding and the Government being aware that I had communicated the fact that I would be prepared to submit the matter for their favorable consideration, gave no pledge, but left the matter to be dealt with entirely on its merits when the case came before us. The whole thing occurred in a very brief period, and I had no means of giving any assurance that aid would be granted, further than that I have generally found, in matters appertaining to my own Department, my colleagues are prepared to give every consideration to my suggestions.

Mr. BLAKE. The letter says: "Your report is not in, but we are satisfied it will be favorable, and I will lay your case."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better read the letter itself, and not the report of it. I generally try to write English, and the hon. gentleman will see that is not good English. I know there is a mistake in the report with reference to the term "Governor." I never wrote such a letter as the hon. gentleman has read. The general terms of the letter are, so far as my memory serves, correct, but I have some doubt as to the accuracy of the expression in the last portion.

Mr. BLAKE. I know no more than I learn from reading the paper; but at the same time this Mr. Alexander Henry, whom I know not, would have been disposed, I should judge, to think this letter meant a little more than the hon. gentleman declares it did mean. The substance of the statement is that the hon. gentleman was satisfied the report would be favorable, but could not put the matter finally before the Council until he got the report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I told the hon. gentleman how I had satisfied myself.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman announces he is satisfied, and then announces he will lay it before the Government for favorable consideration. Then he announces this is written in concurrence with the Council. I think the hon. gentleman—no doubt through a slip—conveyed the impression to Mr. Henry, and then associated with him, that this, though not a pledge, was strong enough:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for twenty-five miles of their railway, from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$80,000 00

In addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 45th Vic., chap. 14.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any change here?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated that there was an error in the appropriation last year of twenty-five miles, not through the fault of the company, and that this covers the subsidy intended to be granted.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the company in a good financial condition?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am satisfied of that. They have \$4,000 a mile from the Local Government, and probably \$20,000 will cover the cost of the road.

For a railway from the Intercolonial Railway at Petitecodiac to Havelock Corner, in the Province of New Brunswick, twelve miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$38,400 00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt this would be taken advantage of, because for some time application has been pressed on the Government and the representative from that Department, that it would form a corresponding road upon the northern side of the Intercolonial, between St. John and Shediac, to that which was partially subsidized by my predecessor, namely, the Elgin Branch, which runs on the south of the Intercolonial, or the St. John and Shediac Railway. This runs from a corresponding point on the Intercolonial into a very good district to the north, and I have little doubt that the aid proposed will secure the construction of that branch, and thus make a very valuable feeder to the Intercolonial.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The country is not difficult to construct a road through, and I should suppose \$15,000 or \$20,000 would construct it.

For a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, 110 miles, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... \$660,000 00

In addition to the subsidy granted by the Act 45th Vic., chap. 14.

Mr. BLAKE. If I rightly understood the purport of the observation of the hon. gentleman the other day upon this subject, the intention is to grant this subsidy to the company which was once known as the Northern and North-Western Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the expectation.

Mr. DAWSON. This is a very important road to the district I represent and to the country at large, and, I think, in no sense can it be considered otherwise than as a Dominion road. There was a grant of \$6,000 last year, making with this additional grant \$12,000, which, I hope, will induce some company to go on and construct the road. For that road there was a grant of \$8,000 made by the Ontario Government in 1877, and it still remains on the Statute-book. It was a grant from the Railway Aid Fund of Ontario, but no company was then induced to assume the undertaking. The grant was \$8,000 per mile from Gravenhurst to Lake Nipissing, or in other words to Callander, but it is now to be applied over the whole line from Gravenhurst to Sault Ste. Marie. The other day the hon. leader of the Opposition made a suggestion which struck me at the time as being a very practical and sensible one, and that was that this grant made by the Ontario Government might be made available for the lines through to Sault Ste. Marie—for it is unreasonable to suppose that the Ontario Government will build a line parallel to the Pacific.



Although the two Governments do not pull together in all matters, still the Government of Ontario is composed of practical men, and they might come into some arrangement of this kind. At all events, a line to connect with the Pacific Railway at Lake Nipissing is of great importance, and no doubt the Pacific Railway will eventually be pushed up to Sault Ste. Marie. If it were, it would lead to immense quantities of agricultural produce being brought through this country, because there can be no doubt that the agricultural produce of the North-West, west of Duluth, will be brought down to Lake Superior. Thence it will come over our railway, if once extended to Sault Ste. Marie. I think this is a grant which will be generally approved throughout Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). As I understand the hon. Minister of Railways, his proposition is to give this aid to the Northern and North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. That company was incorporated in 1881, and in addition to the power given to build from Gravenhurst to Callander Station, power was also given to build from Callander Station to the Ottawa River, and I may say that I look upon that part of the powers given to this company, and upon that part of their line, as being the most important of the whole scheme. A road about forty miles in length, from Callander to Lake Temiscamingue, would bring the whole extent of that lake, some seventy-five or eighty miles of navigable water, within reach of railway communication. I have been told, and I believe it is a fact, that along the shores of Lake Temiscamingue, in both Ontario and Quebec, there are large areas of arable land, which is described as being a clay loam, much of it being covered with heavy oak timber, and admirably adapted for settlement. It is a fact that the few pioneers who have settled along the shores of Lake Temiscamingue have raised most excellent wheat. A mill was erected there a short time ago, under the auspices of the Indian Department, I think, for the purpose of converting wheat into flour, and in consequence the settlers along the lake have gone into raising wheat. I am informed they raise large quantities of wheat equal in quality to that raised in other parts of Ontario and Quebec. I venture to express the hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, will, when he has time to consider the matter, take into consideration the question of granting to this railway company a subsidy upon that portion of their line, as well as upon the portion of the line between Gravenhurst and Callander. I say that, in addition to the agricultural capabilities of that locality, which would be developed by the construction of this line of the road, there are large areas of magnificent timber territory, and large quantities of sawn timber, which could be got out along Lake Temiscamingue if there was any means of getting it to market. The construction of this short line, about forty-five miles, would bring the whole of that large area into almost immediate communication with the railway system of Ontario and Quebec. Something has been said about the Provincial character of these roads to which grants have been given. That part of the Northern and North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie scheme, which runs between Callander Station and Lake Temiscamingue, could be in no sense looked upon as a Provincial road. It would bring a large portion of the Province of Quebec into direct communication, as I have stated, with the railway systems of Ontario and Quebec; and I venture again to express the hope that the hon. Minister of Railways will take this matter into consideration, and eventually grant to this portion of the road the same consideration which is granted to the other portion of the scheme.

Mr. BLAKE Without desiring to say anything more upon the general principle of these resolutions, I just wish to represent that I think it is of the last consequence that the sections of country in Ontario interested in having com-

munication with the North-West by means of this connection, should enjoy the connection as cheaply as possible; and in order to obtain it cheaply it is of the last consequence that there should be free competition in the two lines of railway which stretch towards this point, namely, the Midland system and the Northern and North-Western system. It is also of consequence, now that the Government have proposed—I must confess I do not think necessarily—to pay \$12,000 a mile, which is about the cost of the railway, I say I think it is of the last consequence, and reasonable and fair that consideration should be had to the circumstance that the bulk of this cost is being provided out of the public funds, in arranging what the tariff shall be over that portion of the line. I have already suggested what I think to be the true solution in cases of this description when the Government is providing the bulk of the money to build the line, perhaps the whole. It is not a case in which complications involved in running a railway by Government would measurably exist. It is devised in point of fact as a link between these companies, inland companies I called them the other day. There can be no doubt that the company which obtains the subsidy will have a great advantage because it will have the preference, although there may be nominal equality. I have always felt that difficulty. This will be just as applicable to one of the infant companies as to the other, because by any plan you can devise, however fair it may look in clauses of an Act of Parliament, it will be impossible to arrange for equality, but the company controlling the grant will be able to favor that particular country. The argument is that the order in which trains shall be run, terminal arrangements and arrangements with regard to local traffic, and so forth, are matters very easily capable of being arranged in such a way as to favor a particular company. That this observation is correct is proved by what we know in regard to the contest going on for the contract, a control not wider than the Legislature would allow. I do not blame either company for trying to secure the contract, as it is in the interests of their shareholders; but it is for the interests of the country that a company, perfectly independent of other corporations, should control this connecting branch and secure connection with Toronto and points west, with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will repeat the observation I have made that, in regard to a road of this description, it would be of great advantage were the Government to construct it and to secure absolute equality to all roads connecting with it by undertaking its management, and by imposing such tolls for the use of the road by different companies as would not indeed pay any dividend upon what is proposed to be made a free grant, but to pay the cost of management and all subsequent expenses. I do not think it would be fair or reasonable that the country should be called on to contribute more than \$12,000 per mile, the amount proposed as a subsidy. I have already pointed out a method by which, if joint action were taken by the two Governments, we might spend not more than \$6,000 per mile; and I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not suggesting that this road should cost the country one shilling more than the hon. gentleman proposes. My desire rather is that it should cost less, because I desire, if possible, that we should adopt a suggestion similar to one I am about to make when the hon. Minister of Finance makes a motion on another subject, namely, that if the Government supply the bulk of the money the Government should have control of the work in the interests of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. member for West Durham is mistaken in his statement that the cost of the road will be only \$12,000 per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that; I do not think it will be much more.

Mr. McCARTHY. According to estimates made, the cost will be about double that, as some portions of it will pass through a difficult country, although towards Callander the country may perhaps be easier. I quite agree that the road should be made as cheap a line of communication between the central part of Ontario and the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it is possible to make it. There are two proposals whose claims I have no doubt will come before the Government in granting this bonus. One will be to make an independent line of communication, commencing at Callander and ending at Gravenhurst. It is a matter of doubt whether such a road alone would really be giving the best means of communication between Callander and Toronto and the western part of Ontario, or whether by means of a connecting link with a road which does connect with Toronto and Hamilton, and further west, and necessarily therefore will compete for the trade of that part of the country, will be more favorable to western Ontario. I do not mean to say at this moment, which is the better course, but I am by no means certain that the construction of an independent line would be the best means of securing the end we all desire. The bonus is not too much, I venture to affirm, notwithstanding what the hon. member for West Durham has asserted, and the other road running eastward, the Canada Central, obtained a bonus for the same amount. For less than \$1,200 a mile this connection cannot be built and worked economically and cheaply. The hon. member for West Durham has made a suggestion that the grant, instead of being made wholly by the Dominion, should be divided between the Dominion and the Province of Ontario. I do not know why we, who come from the Province of Ontario, should particularly desire to burden that Province with the payment of half the subsidy when the Dominion is willing to give the whole of it. \$12,000 a mile the road should have, and if that be so why should the road not receive the whole of it from the Dominion, instead of half from Ontario and half from the Dominion as the hon. gentleman suggests? I am very glad, indeed, that at last the Government have fulfilled the pledge which, for many years, the people of the West have understood had been given, not merely by this Government, but by the former Government. I think Ontario has thought, at all events western Ontario has thought, it was entitled to have communication with Callander made as easy to its people as it was made to the eastern part of the country, and we are glad to know that the Government have found their way to make the grant which will enable the road to be built, I hope, without great delay. I may state that surveys have been made, that an estimate of the cost has been arrived at, that in certain parts, and especially at difficult points, the right of way has been acquired; and if satisfactory terms to the Government can be made with the company, there is no reason why the road should not be under contract one month after the House rises.

Mr. DUNDAS. The hon. gentleman, in his remarks, has not conveyed his sentiments so clearly to the House as he generally does. I think the Government, in this case, cannot be too careful in maintaining a complete and independent line between these two points, open to all companies who may choose to send their rolling stock over it. A reason for this is to be found in the fact that a responsible company, as I understand, within the past few weeks offered to build this link for \$6,000 a mile. It is true that this company which offered to do the work is said to be more or less associated with one of the larger main lines of the Dominion, and it has been the contention of the Government that this line should be independent and free for all other companies. I am not going to find fault in this action with hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, because I think the Government are in the main correct; but I wish to point out how important it is that in granting so large a bonus it should be given to a responsible and

Mr. BLAKE.

independent company, so that the interests of all concerned may be thoroughly observed.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Committee rises I should like to say a word or two. It is not necessary for me to say, I think, that with the general policy which has been made apparent in these resolutions I heartily agree. There was a time when I had some doubts as to the policy of the Dominion Government subsidizing railways in different parts of the Provinces; but I have thought the subject over, and, under certain limitations, I think it is a wise and proper policy. When hon. gentlemen yesterday were overloading the hon. Minister of Railways with their congratulations, I did not think it would be well for me to add mine to the number. There has been no item to which I have assented more readily than the last item in this resolution, the item which particularly concerns my own county, that is, the small line of railway which runs from Petitecodiac to Havelock Corner. The merits of that line have been only partially put before the Committee, and I was glad to know that even after the full merits of the object were put before the Committee, there was no dissent to the item being voted. I have one advantage in argument over that of my hon. friend from Ottawa county. His road runs up into what is at present largely a wilderness, but which by-and-bye he hopes may become a paradise, while my road runs into what is already a paradise, but it is separated by intervening roughnesses and difficulties from the great line of road which runs down to the metropolis of St. John. While I am very much satisfied with the resolution as far as it goes, I suppose that I shall league myself with the common run of humanity, when I say that I am not satisfied. The hon. Minister of Railways will know, and the Government will know, that there have been representations for many years made to them with reference to a line of railway running through the central part, or somewhere near the central part, of the county of King's, in connection with what my hon. friend from Sunbury spoke yesterday; and it is for the purpose of adding my word to his, and that of the hon. gentleman from York, that I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the favorable consideration of that route. There are some things in connection with it which scarcely any of these small routes which have been subsidized possess. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister, and of the members of the House, to one thing, which I think may have some weight with them. There is a sentimental reason, if you may call it such, why this road should be built, at least why it ought to obtain the favorable consideration of this House. When Confederation was first mooted in the Province of New Brunswick—I may state it as a fact—which I think cannot be contradicted, although the general idea of forming part of the great Dominion had much to do with moulding the votes for that great scheme, yet through the central and southern part of the Province of New Brunswick a great and prevailing argument in favor of Confederation was the hope, the deeply grounded hope, that the great Intercolonial line of communication would come down through the Valley of St. John and make its ocean terminus at St. John. Well, my hon. friend from Westmoreland—who is not here—and other circumstances, seemed to have been more powerful than nature; for nature had certainly scooped out that particular route for that railway. However, it was carried around by the north there, and the people were disappointed in their hope of having that great central line of communication built and running through the centre of our Province. After that year passed after year until at last a company was organized and built a portion of the central route between the city of Fredericton or Gibson, just opposite Fredericton, and Woodstock, which was afterwards extended to Grand Falls, and later yet to Edmonston; that was the central part. Last year the

Government took into consideration that route, and in their wisdom granted a subsidy to the upper portion, from the Intercolonial near Rivière du Loup, down to Edmonston, thus raising again the hopes of the people who live in the southern and central parts of the country—that this was but a precursor to the completion of the scheme in the subsidizing of the remaining portion from Gibson, opposite the city of Fredericton, down through the counties of Sunbury, Queen's, and King's, until it joined with the Intercolonial. That is the line the merits of which were pressed very strongly by my predecessor in the House, and by hon. gentlemen who are intimately interested in the matter, upon the attention of the Government year after year, and at no year with greater ability and with greater persistence than last year. That is the road which I have been trying, in common with these other gentlemen, to press upon the attention of the Government this year; and I hope, although they have not seen their way clear to granting a subsidy to that line this year, it will not leave their minds, and that the favorable consideration which they promised last year to give it, will be still continued to it. And if at a time in the near future, they can see their way to subsidizing that road, I am sure they would do a great deal to bind to them, to this Government, and to this Dominion, the people, who—out of this hope long deferred, and in fact the disappointment which came to them—have looked upon their lot as not being the most fortunate, or as fortunate as they could have desired. The hon. member for Ottawa county has a large county with immense resources, to which his road goes, and which by-and-bye as it is developed, will make that road a paying road. This is so with the other roads; and the hon. gentleman from Northumberland talked about the salmon fishery, which would be a large feeder to this road. The hon. gentleman from Gloucester talked about the fisheries, which would be a large feeder, and an item in the way of freight to his road; but I have, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman from Sunbury, a still more cogent reason than any of these for an argument why this road should be subsidized to go down to the Intercolonial, and so out towards St. John and connect with the great system of railways. Salmon are here today, and there to-morrow. Fish are very uncertain in their haunts and in their beds. Timber is cut down and the supply from that source fails; but nature has up beyond on the borders of Queen's county, near to the county of King's, in the heart of the country through which this road would go, taken care to put a better argument than any I could think of in my mouth towards urging the construction of this road. She has, centuries and centuries ago, stored up in the heart of the earth these great supplies of coal, full of promise of potency and of power; and that lies there totally undeveloped, and we ask that some means of communication be opened to it. We ask that its resources shall be brought out to help in the civilization, and in the civilization as a fact, of this great country of ours. I want to press that particularly upon the attention of the Government. I know that the change in the charter of the Central Road, which thereby took it to Salisbury as a point farther rather than to a point nearer to the city of St. John, has made it somewhat difficult for me to press this matter as strongly as I otherwise would, or as I otherwise might. I have nothing to say against the building of that link between Fredericton and Salisbury as part of the short line—in fact, I hope that it may be built, but as that does not pass through the county of King's, I had no interest in asking for a subsidy to be granted in its favor. I think it is possible, a road which, from the Intercolonial, will carry its freight and its passengers, will go there, but it is altogether out of the reach of the country through which this line traverses across the Intercolonial and down to our great Metropolis, St. John. I hope that the favorable consideration of the

Government will yet be continued to that line; and we hope that at no distant date it may receive the aid so generously given to other and favored portions of this country.

Resolution to be reported.

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

### After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not propose, at this stage of the Bill, to say anything at all upon the various amendments to the Railway Act which have been proposed for the consideration of the House; as it is obvious that any observations which may be made upon that subject had better be made when the Bill is before the Committee. Nor do I propose, at this stage, to make any lengthened remarks with reference to the hon. gentleman's proposal of another description, namely, to declare a vast number of railways—by a vague and unsatisfactory definition—works for the general advantage of Canada. The objectionable character of this proposal—for such I conceive it to be—is no reason why the Bill should not be read the second time, inasmuch as the measure contains numerous proposals which are to the public advantage, and the sense of the House upon the other proposal may be challenged at a subsequent stage of the measure. I have also said that the definition of the hon. gentleman—if it may be so described—is vague and unsatisfactory; but in the Committee will be the proper time for ascertaining more particularly what railways it is proposed by this general description to embrace within the jurisdiction of this Parliament by the wholesale measure which the hon. gentleman is now proposing. I may say generally that I regard the proposal of the hon. gentleman, wide as it is, as one calculated practically to destroy the efficiency of the Provincial jurisdiction and control in the important question of Provincial railways. I know of no mode by which this Parliament could more effectually dampen the enterprise and check the energies of the different Local Legislatures, with reference to improvements of this description, than by this measure. As well as I can understand, it practically has an effect upon every railway, because every railway connects, either directly or indirectly, with some of the leading lines which the hon. gentleman names. You cannot have a side line or a concession line in the country which does not ultimately connect with a great road and lead to some town or other; so all the railways with which I am most familiar—those in my own Province—are the same with regard to the main lines as it seems to me, though it is not absolutely clear under the definition of the hon. gentleman. I should like to know what prospects there are, what inducements there are to build a railway which does not connect with one or other of those leading lines, and the proposal is for the future to say that all these roads—not merely those at present constructed, but those hereafter to be constructed—shall be taken in charge by this Parliament. Much has been done by the Provinces, very much by the Province of Ontario, and a great deal by some of the Provinces in the way of the creation of local railways. A vast amount of the mileage of these local railways has been put in practical operation by virtue of provincial charters, provincial aid and provincial and municipal encouragement; and to do what the hon. gentleman proposes doing—to take the whole of these works into the control of this Parliament, simply upon the theory that because they connect with leading lines are therefore to be declared to the general advantage of Canada—is, as it seems to me, to violate the letter and spirit of the Constitution on this subject.

We, it is true, have power to declare that a work is for the general benefit of Canada, and declaring that we assume it to be ours; but we are bound to exercise that power *bona fide*. We are bound not to arbitrarily declare railways for the general advantage of Canada within the sense of this clause if they are not such works. Now, there is a sense in which any railway you please to construct is a work for the general advantage of Canada, or of two or more of the Provinces; in the sense that it enriches some part of the country—and inasmuch as we are all interested in the property of each, therefore it is for the general advantage. But that is a sense in which the building of a dwelling house, or a highway, or anything in which the industry, the enterprise and the energy of the people may be usefully employed, may be said to be for the general advantage. But that is not the sense in which this phrase is used in the Constitutional Act. It is not because it is a good and useful work—because it enriches the country, because it is essential to the existence of a railway, that it should connect with some other railway, that it is of necessity for the general advantage of Canada. The line may be difficult to draw; it may be shadowy; it may be extremely hard to say at what point we should pause and say that the railway was such that we could not honestly declare it to be for the general advantage of Canada, or of two or more of the Provinces, but there is such a point. Each railway should be taken up by itself—and the general proposition that the simple circumstance that it touches or intersects two of the leading lines of railways, and therefore, it is within the meaning of this clause, should be repudiated by this House, because if you say yes to that proposition, you practically say that the operation of the Provincial jurisdiction over Provincial railways shall be known no more. You cannot point out a railway that is not going to connect with one of these leading lines, and you take away the local stimulus, which local control, local energy, local enterprise, local subsidies, have so greatly evoked in the past. Much has been done by the Provinces, and especially by the Province of Ontario, in the way of aiding local railways, and I say it is a wrong thing to take away the jurisdiction over these properties upon—I cannot call it the principle, but I can find no better word, that the hon. gentleman proposes to apply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman states that he does not intend at this stage of the discussion to raise any objection to the second reading of this Bill, as a large part of it, I believe, commends itself to his judgment. But he takes exception to that part especially which brings under the jurisdiction of this Parliament a large part of the railways of this country. I listened to the hon. gentleman carefully, as I always do, to learn from him what possible objection could exist to this Parliament having jurisdiction in reference to any railway. The hon. gentleman says it will dampen the ardor of Local Legislatures in reference to granting charters to railway companies who apply for them. Why should it dampen their ardor? What is there in the fact of this Parliament having jurisdiction in reference to a railway to interfere in the slightest degree with the desire on the part of a Provincial Legislature to aid and assist in the construction of such a railway? I can see a great many reasons why it is in the interest of the country that the railway system should, to a large extent, be under the control of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that the attention of this Parliament has been forced to the consideration of the question by applications being made to the Government and the House to remedy known and crying evils in relation to local railways over which we have no control. He knows that that demand has come from the country—from the people; that application has been made to take cognizance over matters over which we have no jurisdiction; and, Sir, if a line of railway is chartered by

Mr. BLAKE.

this Parliament, can any person tell me any reason why all the lines connecting with that line should not be under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, so that we should have power to carry out arrangements in connection with the leading line of railway, with its branches and connections, the same as we have with the railway itself? The object of this Parliament is not to exercise control over the railways for the sake either of the Government or the Parliament; nor is it the object of the Local Legislatures or the Local Governments to retain control of those railways for any Provincial purpose. The object that is sought is the public good. Charters granted by the Local Legislatures, or by this Parliament, are not to benefit the individuals who promote these charters, but the public. We both have a common aim, a common object; we both are free from any influence that would induce us to exercise that control apart from the advantage it has for the general public. Now, with regard to railway crossings. The hon. gentleman knows that railway companies have now to come to the Privy Council to obtain authority to cross one line of railway by another; and if it is found necessary, for the protection of life and property, to throw such a safeguard around the public with regard to the interference of one line of railway with another, I cannot possibly see what injury can result to the country, or any section of it, or any railway corporation, by having the same power retained by this Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that this Parliament has never erred in the direction of restricting the efforts of parties who desired and were able to construct railways, but has always been ready to afford them every possible facility. The hon. gentleman knows that whoever approaches this Parliament with a sound practicable and desirable railway project, readily obtains the assistance of all parties in Parliament to carry out the project for the good of the country. I have listened attentively to the hon. gentleman's remarks, and I have failed to hear him make one single point. The hon. gentleman says that this measure abolishes local control. It does not abolish local interests in this matter. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware that companies who have received charters from the Local Legislatures constantly come to this Parliament and ask to be declared railways for the general advantage of Canada; and I have no hesitation in saying that it would be extremely difficult, in my judgment, to point out any railway in Canada of which this Parliament may not fairly say that it is for the general benefit and the general interests of Canada. There is no railway in the country, there is not a mile of railway in operation in this country, to-day, that is not doing something towards, and contributing to, the general prosperity of the country; and if it is contributing to the general prosperity of the country, I say it is contributing to the general advantage of Canada. And I say with the experience that both sides of this House have had of our entire readiness to take up and deal with all these questions on their merits, and to give all the aid and assistance we can to these various railway projects, there is no reason why the slightest injury can possibly flow from the proposal now made to bring the leading lines of railway and the railways that are subsidiary to them—the branches of those lines of railway and the lines of railway that cross them—under the control of this Parliament, and thus to a certain extent declare that the same power that has jurisdiction over the main trunk line should have jurisdiction over the branches and over the lines that intersect and cross them. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that many of the railways we have been dealing with to-day have charters from this Legislature, that many of them are subsidized by the various Provinces, as well as by the municipalities in the various sections of country through which they run. This is one of the subjects, I think, in which all parties in this country are interested. This railway question is one in which the Local

Legislatures and the general Parliament have a common interest; they have a pure and single desire to do everything they can to assist these railways and to advance their prosperity. As the House knows, we have been implored again and again, by the press, by the people, and by members of Parliament from all sections of the country, to take such measures as would enable us to deal with this serious question of railway management. The hon. leader of the late Government, as the hon. gentleman knows, pointed out forcibly in this House the necessity of our dealing with some serious accidents that occurred in the vicinity of Kingston, on the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, I think; and it was found that we were quite powerless to deal with them, in the absence of such legislation as I am proposing to-day. I will not detain the House, as the hon. gentleman says he has no desire to obstruct the second reading of the Bill; but in Committee we shall be able to discuss the various clauses.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I have no intention of offering any objection to the second reading of this Bill; but I desire to call the attention of the House and of the hon. Minister of Railways to an amendment which I proposed in a Bill I introduced some time ago, and which, to my mind, is of considerable importance. That Bill passed its second reading in this House, and was referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals. In that Committee it was suggested that it would be better for the hon. Minister of Railways to take up the question and deal with it, if he thought proper; but I find that the amendment I refer to has not been incorporated in the Bill the hon. Minister of Railways has introduced. That amendment provided that a railway company should be liable for accidents occurring on its track, caused by its trains and engines, in places where fences had not been erected along its line of railway—accidents to horses and cattle belonging to neighboring proprietors, whether or not notice had been given to the company to erect the fences. It will be remembered that prior to 1868, under the Consolidated Statutes of the old Province of Canada, the duty of erecting fences, without any limitations, was cast on the railway companies. 22 Vict., chap. 26, provides that

"Fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway."

There is no provision as to the adjoining proprietors giving notice; and the fifteenth section provides that

"Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made, the company shall be liable for all damages which may be done by their trains or engines to cattle, horses or other animals."

The revised Consolidated Act contains these provisions; but in 1868 the Parliament of Canada changed the clause and made it read as it does in the Act of 1879, as follows:—

"Within six months after any lands have been taken for the use of the railway, the company shall, if thereunto required by the proprietors of the adjoining lands, at their own costs and charges, erect and maintain on each side of the railway, fences, &c.: and the second sub-section of that section is exactly the same as section 15 of chapter 66 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada."

It is not for me to say what motive actuated Parliament in 1868 to make this change, but I may say that up to a recent period it was generally supposed that the duty of erecting fences was still imposed on railways where the land was occupied, and it was not till a very recent decision was given in my own county that the question of this liability was disputed. The circumstances which drew my attention to this defect, as I believe it to be, in the Railway Act, were these: Some time during last summer two animals belonging to a man named McCarthy, in my county, were killed on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At the point where those animals strayed no fences had been erected. Very few farmers throughout this country are aware of the necessity of giving notice to railway companies to erect fences, and in the majority of instances such notice is not given. There are difficulties in the way of giving notices of that kind. Ordinary farmers do not

know in what manner they should be given, and unless they are prepared to pay some legal gentleman to attend to the giving of the notice no notice is given in nine cases out of ten. In the case to which I refer an action was brought in the Division Court of Renfrew, and was brought before Mr. Justice Sinclair, who held that as McCarthy had not given notice the company were not obliged to erect fences. This contention was set up by the company in their defence, and the Judge sustained it and non-suited the plaintiff. Application was made for a new trial before Mr. Justice Deacon, and he sustained the decision of Mr. Justice Sinclair upon the ground that the second sub-section of the sixteenth section of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879 must be read in conjunction with the main section. The conclusion of his judgment, which occupies some seven pages, is this:

"After a careful and patient examination of all the authorities I have been able to find, I have come to the conclusion that the decision of the learned Judge is right and must be upheld; consequently, that the application be set aside and a new trial must be refused with costs."

If the judgment, which has not been called in question, is correct, it would be seen that under the law as it stands now, unless notice is given by the proprietors of the land taken by the railway companies, to the railway companies to erect fences, they are not liable for any damage that may be done by their trains and engines. That is a state of affairs which should not be allowed to continue, and I propose to remedy it by the Bill I have introduced, providing that:

"Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made, the company shall be liable for any damages which may be done by their trains or engines, to cattle, horses or other animals on the railway."

Another question which arises is this: Under the law the companies are obliged to erect fences if, within six months after the land is taken by them, notice is given them to erect fences. The question then arises whether, if notice is given after the six months, the companies are obliged to erect fences. The learned Judge, to whose decision I referred, held that the liability is a continuing one. But it is to my mind a question of doubt as to whether it is a continuing liability or not; and I venture to suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways that this is an amendment which would be of benefit to a large class of people and would not impose on railway companies other duty than that which the law contemplates should be imposed on them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the amendment proposed by my hon. friend should be made. The objection, as I understand, against it, is, that it would impose on railway companies an unnecessary expense. I think a little consideration will show that is not really the case. The fences are only required, of course, where the land is settled. Where it is not cleared and occupied, it is not necessary to erect fences, because there are no cattle to fence in. It is a perfectly well-settled principle of law, that unless the cattle escape from the land of the owner, the company are not responsible. But is the farmer whose land has been cut in two by a railway, to be under the necessity of going through the form of asking the company to fence off that land before he can have his land fenced, or for compensation in the event of a fence not being properly maintained? Very frequently it happens that the company put up a fence, and the very fact of their doing so does away apparently with the necessity of giving them the notice. They fail to maintain it, and when an accident happens they set up this defence: True, we have a fence there and have maintained it; but, if you would look back, you will see you never required us to put up one, and you have no claim. In the county which I have the honor to represent, and through which the Northern Railway Company runs, for many years the company were under their original charter, granted in the old Province of Canada, not liable to erect fences unless they received

notice, and many just claims were defeated on that ground. Subsequently they became liable, because they brought themselves under the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act of Canada, and I was surprised to learn that this law had been changed in reference to this question. Most of my profession were under the impression that the law had been continued as it was in Old Canada, and the company were obliged to erect fences without notice being given. The amendment proposed, therefore, ought to be introduced. I have also given notice of an amendment which I may as well now explain, though I propose to move it in Committee, I desire to substitute sub-section 6 of section 17, which is in these words :

“ All and any of the tolls may be in any by-law reduced and again raised as often as desired necessary in the interest of the undertaking; but the same tolls shall be payable at the same time and under the same circumstances upon all goods and by all persons, so that no undue advantage, privilege or monopoly may be afforded to any person, or class of persons, by any by-laws relating to the tolls.”

Now, I venture to say, the last words of this sub-section make all that precedes it unmeaning, and I would draw the hon. Minister's attention to it. The supposition is that it was intended to introduce into the railway system of this country what is known in England as the equality clause; and why not keep that clause which has proved fair and reasonable, and about which there can be no doubt? I have copied the clause from the English Act in the notice I have given, and I will read it when the proper time comes. At present it is sufficient to draw the attention of the House to the apparent absurdity of the clause I have read, and which is now law, and to ask why it is that a reasonable proposition such as the equality clause should not be placed on the Statute-book, so that all can understand it? I am obliged to my hon. friend for making part of his Bill the other clause in the eleventh section. With that clause and the one I propose to add, I think we might have a complete and fair railway law. We will then have a law, and all we will want is a court to administer it, and I think the hon. Minister will find that having granted sub-section 2 of section 11, the reasonable conclusion is that he must have a court by which that law can be carried out.

Sr CHARLES TUPPER. I will discuss the question my hon. friend has made more pertinently when we get into Committee. I may say with reference to the question of my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White), that I was not in the Railway Committee when he withdrew his Bill under the impression that it would be embodied. It is fair for me to say that when the hon. gentleman communicated to me his intention to withdraw his Bill with a view to its being embodied in the General Act, I stated to him in the most distinct terms that I could not consent to accept the proposal which was contained in his Bill. The hon. gentleman seems to be looking at this question quite regardless of the railway interest. Now, Sir, it is well known that nothing contributes so much to the improvement of the country, nothing confers such inestimable benefits upon the people as the construction of these roads; yet they are very often constructed after a great deal of sacrifice and of struggle on the part of those who find the capital and promote the enterprise. The proposal which the hon. gentleman makes is going to load every struggling company who are risking their money, and who very often never see it again; it is going to throw on those companies responsibilities, and difficulties, and expenses that I say they ought not to bear. The law as it stands now provides everything that any reasonable man, in my judgment, ought to ask for, and that is, that when parties construct lines of railway through a wilderness section of the country where there is no use of having a fence and where a fence would be positively mischievous, are relieved from the necessity of having a fence. In a wilderness fences become dry and sparks from the engine set them

Mr. McCARTHY.

on fire, and you have whole sections of country, fine timbered lands through which the road is running, destroyed in consequence of having a dry fence to act as tinder from the sparks of the engine. Now, the law is perfectly plain, and it is in the interest of the land owners, and of the persons through whose property the railway runs. The law provides, not that you shall be compelled to construct fences where there is no necessity, where they can simply be mischievous and dangerous, but the law provides that the moment the owner of the land, through which the railway runs, calls upon the company to put up a fence, from that time until these fences have cattle guards, this company is responsible for any animal that is killed and for all damage caused by the want of a fence. Now, what more can he require? What more can he ask than that the company should be compelled at their own cost to put up a railway fence the moment the proprietor says he wants a fence. He is not obliged to show any reason, he is not obliged to show there is any necessity for a fence. He may ask for it when there is no occasion for a fence, he may ask for it for a distance of twenty miles where there is no settlement, yet the law at present compels the company instantly to put up that fence, or to fail at their own peril of being responsible for all the damage and every accident that can occur. Moreover, I have no hesitation in saying that damages to life and property are involved in the proposition of the hon. gentleman. There are cases of parties who drive their cattle on to the road for the purpose of having them slaughtered and getting a good price for them. I am perfectly aware that it is provided that the animals must go on to the road from the property of the owner, but the property of the owner may be a wilderness, and all the man has to do is to send his cattle into the wilderness and let them be attracted by the grass along the line of railway on to the road, as he knows they will be, in order that they may be destroyed, and that he may send in his bill to the company, or to the Government, if it be a Government road; and very often he gets double value. That is my experience. I say he has not a right to put them on his own land unless there is a fence, or unless he has called upon the parties to put a fence there. The company then has some protection. They have got a notice the fence is required, and they are then responsible. But if there is no notice given, as the hon. gentleman now proposes, a man could purposely allow his cattle to stray on to the road and collect heavy damages if they were killed. But it is not merely the cost of the cattle we have to consider, but you probably wreck the train when it runs over an ox, and perhaps half a dozen people are killed. I believe the proposition of the hon. gentleman is a great injustice and hardship to parties who, in these partially settled districts of country where there is no necessity for a fence, are constructing railways; and it would not only be a hardship to the companies, but a fertile source of danger to the operations of the road. On these grounds I do not hesitate to say that I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's proposition, with the knowledge I have and the experience I have had in relation to this matter; indeed, the law as it now stands gives the owner of the land all the advantage. He is obliged to show no reason; he sits down and writes a letter to the company saying: “I want my land through which the road runs fenced,” and from that moment he has all the protection the hon. gentleman proposes to give him. From that time the company are warned, they are obliged to fence the ground to be in a position to protect themselves. The present law places all the power in the hands of the owner that he requires for his protection, and I think it would be extremely unjust to press it farther and to say that for miles and miles, where there is no necessity for a fence, parties, without any notice, should be in a position to send their cattle into the forest in order that they may

stray on to the track and be destroyed, and then be in a position to collect damages.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot agree with the argument just advanced by the Minister of Railways on this subject. I do not know a subject on which there is a stronger feeling in the rural districts among farmers than on this question of fences guarding railway tracks from the district adjoining. The argument which the hon. Minister advanced is that it would entail very serious loss upon railway companies to compel them to put up these fences. The cost of fencing a railway in addition to the cost of building a railway seems to be so infinitesimal, it can hardly be said to be a question which arises in discussing a question of public policy. The building of fences is a very small matter indeed. But the argument is that farmers sometimes now drive their cattle on the track for the purpose of having them slaughtered, so as to obtain a better price from the railway company than they could secure if selling them in the ordinary manner. It seems to me that the proper way to prevent this is to give public notice through an Act of Parliament to the railway companies to establish sufficient fencing to prevent people sending their cattle upon the track. I am bound to say that I think, in the interests of the railway companies themselves, in the interests of life and property in connection with railway travel, that it is a matter of the greatest possible consequence that railway tracks should be so guarded by fences on each side that by no possibility, without an act of absolute wrong-doing on the part of the farmers, can cattle stray upon the tracks. If you leave railways going through settled districts without fences on each side of their tracks, you jeopardise the lives of the people travelling by those railways. Cattle will stray upon them; and if you lay down the doctrine, as it has been laid down by the Minister of Railways, that it can be prevented by a mere notice on the part of the farmer to the railway company, that he requires fences to be put up, you at once, I think, answer the objection he made in the first instance of the cost to the railway companies. I am decidedly in favor of having a notice put in an Act of Parliament, and I sincerely hope the Minister of Railways will be able to meet the views, as I believe them to be, of an overwhelming majority of the people in the rural districts of this country, in favor of having railways properly guarded by fences on each side of them.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the amendment proposed is a step in the right direction. I cannot understand the force of the argument advanced by the Minister of Railways, that farmers and others interested have only to give notice to a railway company to put up fences. It is well known that farmers are not generally posted in the laws of the country. I have known several instances where damage has been done on account of cattle straying away. The farmers know nothing about the law until they endeavored to obtain compensation for the loss sustained, and then it was too late. If such an amendment as is proposed were made, and railway companies were compelled to put up fences, they would know what responsibility rested on them. With respect to the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, in regard to farmers driving cattle on the track, it has no great force in many parts of Canada, because, I believe, the experience of private individuals in endeavoring to recover compensation has not been such as to hold out inducements to them to drive their cattle on the railway track for the purpose of endeavoring afterwards to obtain compensation. I know in many parts of the country railways run through large pasture grounds, to the great disadvantage of the farmers, who are unable to use their wild lands as they would wish to do. They have learned by experience that if loss is sustained by cattle being killed on the track there is little chance of obtaining compensa-

tion. I would be very much pleased, in the interests of the people of the rural districts, if the amendment suggested should become law.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I desire to insert in the first clause after the word "railway" the words "except Government railways." The House is aware that there is an express Statute providing for the management of Government railways, and it will only lead to confusion if the Government railways were brought under the jurisdiction of the Consolidated Railway Act, because everything is provided for in the Government Railways Act. In the next section, I propose to give three months to make the profile, because the ground plan is deposited for the purpose of expropriating land, and leave them three months after that to deposit the profile. Then I propose to amend the third section, which provides for the avoidance of doubts touching the working expenditure, so as not to charge the company with the working expenses on the leased line, as the rental for the leased line will be borne by the returns from the leased line. This clause is for the purpose of providing fully what shall be working expenses; and for fear that anything will be omitted or left out, it is provided that the above shall be specified in all cases with relation to railway companies, regarding what is usually carried to the debit of revenue as distinguished from capital account.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not understand that this clause was for the purpose of defining working expenses except for one single purpose, and it requires a great deal more consideration, if it has the wider effect which the hon. gentleman has just implied. If I understand the section of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, it describes the statistics which railways shall return under the head of working expenses only, and this exposition affects what are deemed working expenses, for the purpose of statistical returns. It will be a very serious thing indeed to define that working expenses should be charged in a certain rank on the gross earnings of the railway, and if the hon. gentleman means that, I say it will be very objectionable. I object to the last clause, regarding all charges, which, in the cases of English railways, are usually charged to the debit of revenue as distinguished from capital account, as introducing vagueness and not precision. Why cannot the hon. gentleman, who has access to the various English railway accounts, and knows what other charges, if any, in the case of English railways, are usually carried to the debit of revenue as distinguished from capital account, state what other charges should be inserted in the Bill. He will find, when he calls upon his railway companies to supply returns, that this will be an element of uncertainty with them. Some will contend that the usual practice in England is to do so-and-so; and others, that it is so-and-so. What is the usual practice? I find that one or two leading lines adopt one, and a good many the other. Where will you draw the line? What will you put in, and what not? If there is one thing important in obtaining full returns above another, it is that all the returns should be based on the same line, and it is quite certain that for comparative purposes, the same elements should be taken into account. Each railway company should make the same returns. I submitted to the hon. gentleman that before the third reading he should cause his officer to ascertain, if he has not yet ascertained, what is usually inserted in English railway companies' returns, as he puts it, to the debit of revenue account, and add in the clause, the further items. There is one case of making the leased lines—I admit the general statement of the hon. gentleman that if a railway leases another line, it pays the toll or rent

as a rule, of course, from the receipts—but, of course, none of the working expenses of the road so leased ought to be borne by the main line. There ought to be a separate account with the leased line. But if the company which is working a leased line as one of its own, embraces all the receipts from the leased line, then I am not satisfied at all that the rental ought not to be charged. You are getting revenue and expenditure and if my hon. friend intends that the revenue, which is derived from the leased line, shall be inserted in the gross revenue, then the charge upon that revenue ought also to be inserted on the other side. Even if it is not so intended, and he intends that the revenue derived by the leased company from the leased line shall be kept separate, yet there would be a case in which the rent in part may be properly charged on the working expenses of the main line; and that is this; in which you find you have leased a line at a rent which that line does not pay, and have got to pay a portion of your rent out of the profits of the main line. In that case it is made a charge on the main line and has to be advanced out of the annual profits. It is an unprofitable investment. I invite the hon. gentleman to say whether he intends that in cases of a leased line, the company shall in making the returns, embrace the returns of the whole undertaking in the gross receipts of the leased line. If so, why should not tolls, which are substituted for the interest on the bonds which may be given for the construction of the main line, go to the benefit of the revenue account?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This matter has been carefully considered in relation to both these points raised by the hon. gentleman. With reference to the last point, the reason why interest for the leased line is taken out, is because the statistics of the leased line will appear by themselves. It would be unjust to charge this rental for the leased lines to the working expenditure of the main line, thus showing that it was working at a loss, when perhaps it would be working at a profit. As to the other point, the hon. gentleman will observe that this clause is for statistical purposes. Now, the Department has carefully considered everything that could possibly be found in regard to railway statistics and the operation of railways elsewhere, and everything has been enumerated here that we believed could be enumerated; but lest any oversight should have occurred from any cause, we wish to have the power to add the other points. We send out the forms from the Department to be filled up by the companies, and this clause would enable us the moment our attention was called to anything which should go to the heading of working expenditure, it could be provided for under this authority. It does not enable the companies to exercise their judgment as to what is the usual practice with other railway companies. The Department may, however, change the form from time to time, if we find anything which may be legitimately embraced in the working expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better to say: "all such other changes as may, from time to time, be determined by the Governor in Council," because questions may arise as to the accuracy of the view of the Department. No doubt uniformity will be one object which will be obtained, as the hon. gentleman says, by this plan. As to the mode by which the statistical return has to be made for the leased lines, there is one point remaining, and that is, if the leased line does not pay its running deficiency, would the charge then be made against the working expenses?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would appear, on the return of the leased line, that it was not paying its way.

Mr. BLAKE. But would it not appear that the deficiency really came out of the assets of the main line?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Not so as to take priority of the fixed charges, but immediately afterwards it would come out of the assets of the main line.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). With reference to the remarks which fell from the hon. Minister of Railways in the discussion upon the second reading of the Bill, he is correct in saying that he did not give me any indication in the conversations I had with him that he would adopt the amendment which I propose to make to the Bill, and of which I gave notice some time ago. I am sorry to say that in the conversations I had with him the arguments I offered did not seem to convince the hon. gentleman that the amendment should be made to this Act. I am sorry to say also that his arguments have not convinced me that there is no necessity for this amendment being made. Let me say this—that I think the hon. Minister of Railways misapprehended the scope of the amendment which I propose. I did not intend that the duty should be imposed on railway companies to erect fences in those parts of the country in which they run through wild, untenanted and unoccupied land. I presume that the amendment to the Act that was made in 1868 was for the purpose of giving railway companies power to build portions of their lines through untenanted parts of the country without imposing that duty upon them in those parts of the country where they would be practically of no use, and where the cost of erecting those fences would be added to the cost of building the railway without their being of advantage to any one. I am not conversant with the law, but those who are acquainted with it say—and I believe it is a general principle of law—that no railway company is liable for damages, which may kill cattle which have strayed upon the track from land owned and property occupied by the owner of the cattle, for the destruction of which claim is made against the railway company. But I admit that any gentleman will say that because the proprietor of the land happens to have lands in a particular locality through which the railway runs—happens, as the Minister of Railways said, to have a thousand acres of land in a particular locality, which is not cleared or cultivated—he should not thereby be prevented from putting his cattle there, and the company should not say: Unless you give notice within the time prescribed by law, we are not liable for any damage. It was properly stated by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that the duty of erecting fences is not only imposed on railway companies under the conditions prescribed in the sixteenth section, but they are also bound to maintain them. A circumstance occurred in my own county last summer which shows the necessity of imposing that duty on the railway companies, without requiring the adjoining proprietor to give notice, or, at all events, to hold the railway company liable for damages which may occur through the non-erection of these fences. The Canada Central Railway was built through that portion of the country in 1878. The fences were erected almost simultaneously with the grading of the road—in fact, before trains ran at all the fences were put up. No notice was given as required, because the railway company put up fences without the necessity of any notice being given by the adjoining proprietors. What was the result? Last summer a fire occurred; a portion of the railway fences was burnt down; a horse was killed upon the track; an action was brought to recover damages. The defence was set up that no notice had been given the company to erect or maintain these fences. Notwithstanding what the Minister of Railways has stated—and his experience is larger than mine—I think it is manifestly the duty of every railway company that takes lands and fences these lands, to put the proprietors in as good a position as if the railway had not passed through the lands. In view of that fact, I propose to move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

1. Sub-section two of section sixteen is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—
2. Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made, the company shall, whether they have or have not been required to erect and maintain the same by the proprietors of the adjoining lands, be liable



for all damages which may be done by their trains or engines, to cattle, horses, or other animals on the railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that my hon. friend is going to press this motion. I quite understand the disadvantage at which I am placed in resisting a motion of this kind. The population through which a railway runs is very much more numerous than the company who are carrying that railway on; but I do not think that is any reason why an act of great injustice, and one which I believe to be fraught with serious consequences, should be perpetrated. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to this House, if he can, how it was the law was formerly as he proposes to make it, and that after long years of experience Parliament deliberately changed it and made it as it is to-day. I think the very fact that that was done gives the most abundant evidence that the law was found to work injuriously and unfairly. The hon. gentleman said that I spoke of the farmers. I did not use the term farmers, but I said parties who were the owners of cattle; and I have no hesitation in saying, that there is no country in the world in which, in my judgment, the great mass of the agricultural and farming population possesses a higher tone of morality than in Canada. I do not believe it would be possible to find any country in the world where the agricultural population are animated by sentiments of higher principle or purer morality than in Canada; but there are exceptions to every rule, and there are among all classes of people persons to be found here and there who are not actuated by those principles. There are unprincipled persons in all sections of the country, more or less—I believe a fewer number in Canada than in most other countries—and I do not propose to give these unprincipled persons, though few and far between, an inducement to do a wrong which, I believe, the alteration proposed in the clause would give. It was for that reason that I did not feel warranted in accepting it. I believe our agricultural population are a highly intelligent population, and they perfectly understand where railway facilities have been furnished to them, all that is necessary, in order to accomplish everything they require, is to write a note to the railway company, and from that moment the railway company is liable. Now, Sir, I say with the objections I have presented, and with the facility with which men may surround them with the protection that is urged by the hon. gentleman, there is no necessity for changing the law back again to what it was before the Parliament of Canada deliberately changed it and adopted what is now on the Statute-book. I can understand how the provision got there in the first instance. What does the hon. gentleman tell us? He has had a lawsuit, or somebody he is interested in has had a lawsuit, and therefore he wants a change in the law, just as we find the members of the legal profession in this House, of whom we are so proud, coming here with Bills every Session, with some extraordinary propositions to change the law, because they have had a lawsuit and have lost it, or have a lawsuit pending, and want to strengthen their case. I do not insinuate that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has absolutely at this moment a client who is interested in changing this law; but I have known such things in this House as legal gentlemen endeavoring to change the law in the interest of a client. But I say that the Parliament of Canada having tried this provision for long years, and having rejected it, is the best reason why we should retain the law as it is; and not because the hon. member for North Renfrew has been cast in a lawsuit, and very properly so, because it is quite obvious that both of these Judges were strictly right in the judgment they gave. A railway may be losing money; the parties who have put money into it may not have got one dollar of dividend; and yet it is compelled, the instant it gets notice, to go to the further expense of putting up these

fences, without any interest perhaps in them. What more should be required I cannot see. I have no hesitation in saying that I speak from personal experience and observation in this matter. I do not want to see any greater inducements or facilities offered by making a slaughter-house of the railways of the country for old and decrepid animals.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am delighted that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has withdrawn the imputation upon the farmers of this country which I think his first observations were calculated to convey. The hon. gentleman draws a distinction between farmers and owners of cattle. He admits that the former are high-toned, high-principled men, who would not permit their cattle to go on a railway and be destroyed, so that they might make a claim against the railway company; but the man who owns cattle but is not a farmer, is a man who, the hon. Minister of Railways thinks, might possibly do so. The only argument the hon. Minister of Railways, as I understand, has used against the proposed provision, is, that we have not the law on the Statute-book to-day that existed in Old Canada. Now, I venture to say that if any person looks at the land of Old Canada and at this law, he will find that this change has not been made with any great deliberation. What do we find? We find that one clause has been taken, which was clause 19, of the old Act, which was only intended as a temporary provision during the construction of the road, and which provided, in effect, that unless a man made the demand to have a fence put up along his land after the initiation of construction on the road, he had no chance to make it at all; so that the care that Parliament has had for the people of this country has been chiefly with regard to the railway companies. If we had the history of that Act, I think it would be found to be the same as that of many other Consolidation Bills. I do not want to insinuate—although, perhaps, I would be justified after the attack the hon. gentleman has made on my profession—that one or two sections have been left out of this Bill for the purpose of getting it through the House in the interest of the railway companies. I will not say so, but it looks very like it. We have first the clauses omitted which are important, and then those clauses inserted which are wholly unimportant and certainly offer no protection to the owners of lands in the country through which the railway companies are permitted, against their will and without their consent, to carry their roads. My hon. friend says it is a great hardship. Why is it a hardship? The farmers of this country and the property owners are not sufficiently on their guard to give this notice. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred in which land has been cut by a railway and fences put up, no notice is given. When companies do as they do, put up fences, and when by accident a fence is taken down, the farmer or owner of property is completely off his guard, and has no opportunity of giving a notice, and in all these cases has no resort. Surely that is not proper. Surely Parliament is not going to be so much in the hands of railway companies, that the companies can take land from a farmer without his consent by the law of expropriation, go through it and leave it open on both sides and not be obliged to fence it. The amendment is a reasonable one, but I would ask my hon. friend to make it more complete by putting in the thirteenth section of the old Act, adding to that the fourteenth clause and following that up by the appropriate clauses. The thirteenth section thus reads:

"Fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway of the height and strength of an ordinary division fence, with openings, or gates, or bars therein at farm crossings of the road for the use of the proprietors of lands adjoining the railway; and also cattle-guards at all railway crossings, suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and animals getting on the railway."

The law says: if the fence is not erected by the person or corporation bound to erect it, on them must fall the damages. The fourteenth clause has merely a declarative meaning.

These clauses will restore the law to what I think it ought to be and would have been had the attention of Parliament been directed at the time to the changes made when the Acts were consolidated. I pass by the observations my hon. friend has thought fit to make about the members of my profession—for cases of that kind, which I deplore, do occur—but if my hon. friend ventures to assert, that in any measure I have been charged with I have been influenced in any way whatever, by any matter of the kind to which he refers, he is completely mistaken. This is not my matter, but that of the hon. member for Renfrew. He has been induced to bring it in by a scandalous transaction, so to speak, which occurred in his own riding—by an injustice suffered in the name of law; and he would have been wanting in his duty had he not brought to the attention of this House the necessity of the amendment he proposed.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A greater injustice could not be perpetrated, on a very large class of people, than will be inflicted if the hon. Minister of Railways refuses to pass this amendment. When the hon. gentleman talks of motives and reasons, they are not far to seek. From the whole course of railway legislation, from the whole manner in which the railway companies carry on their transactions, it is very evident that, if the law was altered, it was altered through the influence of the railway companies; and if the law is not changed to-day, a large section of the people will be placed in a most disadvantageous position. There are large districts of new country where the land may be said to be in common, for every man's cattle is allowed to run loose through the woods; and if this law is not to be altered, those cattle will be at the mercy of the companies. How is a man, living at the end of a township, whose cattle has strayed over a couple of thousand acres, to give notice to a company to fence any particular lot through which his cattle may pass? This would be a great injustice to the people in the new districts through which many of these colonization roads are intended to run. Look at the railways in Muskoka. In the town near which I live, there is not a day in which the safety and lives of the people are not endangered by the culpable carelessness of the companies; and it seems there is no possibility of redress. Remonstrances are frequently made, but without result. They have their crossings on the level in places where it is difficult to avoid danger. The railway legislation of the country has gone far enough, and it is about time the House interposed, and let the people understand there is a power beyond the railways. All this subsidizing of railways is very well, for they develop the country, but that is no reason why the railways should be placed above Parliament, and it is time Parliament should interfere. I trust this House, taking into consideration the remote parts of the country through which these new railways are to pass, and the practical impossibility of obtaining redress, will support the amendment of the hon. member for Renfrew.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I regret exceedingly that, after having sat with the hon. Minister of Railways for so many years, he should to-night cast upon me the imputation of having introduced any measure in Parliament for the purpose of serving my own interests.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The hon. gentleman said I brought this measure because I had been defeated in a lawsuit with a railway company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said it was because some party in whom the hon. gentleman took an interest was defeated. I should judge, from the warmth with which he spoke, and the familiarity he exhibited with all the details of the case, that he took a great interest in it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I take a very warm interest in everything that affects the interests of my constituents.

Mr. McCARTHY.

I have no personal interest in the matter. I do not happen to know the gentleman who brought this lawsuit against the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I think I would be wanting in the discharge of my duty if I failed to bring this matter before Parliament under the circumstances, knowing that a gross injustice, from my point of view at all events, has been perpetrated by a powerful railway corporation on an unoffending farmer; and supposing he is a poor farmer, unable, perhaps, to defend himself, I would be wanting in my duty, if I refused to ask this House to remedy this evil which has been brought under my notice. I refer to this case, because it elucidated the point I was endeavoring to present to the House and Committee. I have no interest in this case, nor has any person connected with me, but I refer to it simply because a decision had been rendered in it, that, from my point of view, declared the law to be that which it ought not to be. It was for that reason and none other that I introduced this amendment. Let me say in reference to the question of notice, that notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Railways may say in reference to the intelligence of the farmers of this country—and I believe with him that they are a very intelligent class, and that they know as much of law generally as it is in their interest they should know; some of them know rather more than it is in their interest they should know—there are many gentlemen who are well educated and tolerably familiar with our Railway Law who do not know this provision exists in the Railway Act, and are therefore liable to be placed at a disadvantage in not giving notice to the companies to erect fences. The hon. gentleman knows that for sixty or seventy miles through the county I have the honor to represent, the Canadian Pacific Railway has not a single mile of fence, and he knows—because he has been, I am happy to say, in that section of the country—that over a considerable portion of that district which is not fenced by the Canadian Pacific Railway, there are occupied lands. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has thrown out the suggestion that my amendment should be withdrawn and that the sections of the old Consolidated Statutes of Canada should be substituted therefor. I am not at all wedded to my proposition, and if anything else could be substituted that would effect the same purpose I am willing to accept it. But the reason the hon. Minister of Railways has adduced against this amendment is the one which induced me to put it in its present form. I admit there are large tracts of country in which there is no necessity to erect fences, but there still exists a necessity for the protection of the lands of adjoining proprietors, and the duty and the obligation of such protection ought to be put on the strong and powerful corporation.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe and the hon. gentleman from North Renfrew have suggested different modes of effecting the same purpose, I would suggest that an amendment should be framed between them which would best effect the common object they have in view. On the whole I think the hon. gentleman will see that his friends are against him on this occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that with cannon in front of me, cannon behind me, cannon to the right of me, and cannon to the left of me, I shall have to submit. But I beg the House to remember that the responsibility of this change will not rest upon me. I have discharged my duty to the best of my ability in presenting the reasons why I thought this amendment should not be accepted. My hon. friends, notwithstanding their power, have failed to change my view of the case. I think the course suggested by the leader of the Opposition is the best one, and that a clause should be framed embodying both these propositions.

Mr. BLAKE. I must protest against the doctrine of the hon. gentleman, who says he submits but he will not be

responsible. He submits, and therefore he is responsible, so far as he can be.

Mr. POPE. Of course, I do not much disagree with the sentiments of my hon. friend, but upon one or two points I cannot agree with him. As a general rule railways do fence their roads, they are bound to fence them for their own protection. They are exactly in the same position a farmer is in respect to his neighbor; and why should they not be? If I live alongside a neighbor whose land adjoins mine, the only thing I can do is to give him notice that I want a fence made. Nor can I expropriate his land without paying him for it, perhaps two or three times as much as it is worth. But let me tell my hon. friends there are cases where this law will work very great hardship. There are many cases where a railway is running through woods, and has been for years, and where there are no cattle. All at once a man settles down in these woods, near the road; the company know nothing about it; and why should that man, if he wants a fence, not be obliged to give the company notice? Some hon. gentlemen have spoken about our ignorance, saying that farmers know nothing about the Act. I can tell him we know just about as much of what we are about as the lumbermen do, and we will try to take care of ourselves. I think we will compare favorably with the lumbermen, and with the railway men, and, I trust, after a little time and a little further education, we will be able to compare favorably with the lawyers.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is my hon. friend speaking on behalf of the farmers?

Mr. POPE. I am speaking for the farmers. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there may be a hardship towards the railway companies in a case where the road runs through a forest, and a man settles down there without their knowing anything about it—why should not this man be required to give the company notice, if he wants a fence, in order that they may know of his existence? However, I think railways should build their own fences; but we must take care that in protecting the rights of the farmer, we must not do injustice to the railway companies, as there are cases where a man can take great advantage of a company if he is not forced to give some notice.

Mr. LISTER. I am very much pleased that the hon. Minister of Railways has yielded to the evident wish of both sides of the House, and accepted the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Renfrew. I was not surprised at the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Agriculture taking the position they did, understanding the subject as they do; I am not surprised they should propose to protect a company that is protected already. When the hon. member for North Simcoe stated that ninety-nine out of a hundred farmers do not know anything about the law, he stated the truth. Railway companies expropriate the lands of farmers throughout the country, and leave them unfenced until it suits their convenience. In my own county a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed some years ago, and that branch is still unfenced. The people living along the line of that road have not been able to use their pastures for some years, because if they put their cattle in the fields they ran the risk of having them killed by the railway, and the consequence has been that that land was of no value at all to those farmers. Applications have been made to the company from time to time to fence the line, but no heed has been paid to them. I do think the time has come when this Parliament should assert its power and say to the railway companies that they have been protected just as far as it is in the interest of the public to protect them; and when we seek to throw the protection about them which this Bill proposes, I think we are doing a great injustice to a large proportion of the people of this country. I think the hon.

Minister of Railways, according to the evident wish of both sides of the House, has done what is right, and I hope that when this Bill again comes before the House such amendments will be made as will protect the farmers in the way indicated by the hon. member for North Renfrew and the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the phraseology of the third section. In introducing the Bill he explained that he intended to put in a few words containing the principle of the thirteenth section of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, to cover cases where compensation might be payable to persons who had suffered by accidents on railways. It strikes me, in reading this section, that the hon. gentleman has not quite attained the object in view. Certain portions of the Act of 1879 were made applicable to Government railways. The second section of the Act applied to the Intercolonial Railway; but sections from five to thirty-four never were made to apply to any other Government railways than the Intercolonial. By the fourth section, sections from thirty-four to ninety-eight were made applicable to the Intercolonial and all other railways, either built by the Government or acquired by purchase. Section thirty of the Act of 1879, which the hon. Minister proposes to amend, never did apply to the Prince Edward Island Railway. When the Act of 1881 was passed sections two and four of the Act of 1879 were repealed, and that left the law in this position: that no section of the Act of 1879 applied to any Government railway whatever. So this proposed amendment of the hon. Minister would merely go this far—it would compel companies to make certain returns to the Government respecting compensation they paid for accidents, &c.; but inasmuch as the consolidation of Government Railways Act of 1881 repealed all such provisions of the Act of 1879 which applied to Government railways, whatever effect the amendment may have as regards returns being furnished by ordinary railway companies, it can have no possible effect as regards Government railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In regard to railways brought under the operation of the Consolidated Railway Act, the hon. gentleman knows that, under the law as it stands, compensation is obtained against the companies. The hon. gentleman will see that no amendment of the Government Railways Act is required in order to embrace—as I have stated it was the intention of the Government to embrace—accidents to persons, causing either loss of life or injury of any kind in the working expenses of the Government railways. Clause 74 of the Government Railways Act says:

"The Department shall not be relieved from liability by any notice, condition or declaration in case of any damage arising from, and negligence, omission or default of any officer, employé or servant of the Department, &c."

That clearly shows that where damages arise and are due to the negligence of the officers there is a legal liability as against the road. Then section 81 says:

"Any person injured while on the platform of a car, or on any baggage, wood or freight car, in violation of the printed regulations posted up at the time in a conspicuous place inside of the passenger cars then in the train, shall have no claim for the injury, provided room inside of such passenger cars, sufficient for the proper accommodation of the passengers, was furnished at the time."

The inference to be drawn is that if any injury takes place the party is able to secure damages, as liability exists. Section 103 says:

"All claims for indemnity for any damage or injury sustained by reason of the railway, shall be made within six months next after the time of such supposed damage sustained, or if there be continuation of damage, then within six months next after the doing or committing such damage ceases, and not afterwards."

So the hon. gentleman will see that the Government Railways Act applies to the Prince Edward Island Railway as to the Intercolonial, because in the interpretation it is declared that the word "Railway" shall mean any railway

property or work under the management and direction of the Department of Railways and Canals. So the entire ground is covered; and in introducing this Bill I took the opportunity of stating that there would be a legitimate charge against the working expenses of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, whenever injuries occurred to passengers.

Mr. DAVIES. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that I took exactly the same view of the law as the hon. Minister takes, and I presented that argument to the Supreme Court of Canada, urging very strongly that under those sections there was no possibility of doubt that there was liability on the part of the Government, provided there was negligence by their employes. But the Court held that the Government were not responsible under the Act. I would, therefore, ask the Minister, as he has expressed his willingness to consider the cases connected with the accident on the Prince Edward Island Railway, if this clause does not cover them, to consider the advisability of placing a sum in the Estimates to meet these cases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have stated to the House that the Government intend to treat damages arising from accidents as proper charges against the working expenses of the railways. The hon. gentleman does not require anything further, I presume.

On section 4,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a clause repealing sections 48 and 49 of the Consolidated Railway Act, and vesting certain powers in the Railway Committee with respect to railways crossing highways on the level; that certain works may be ordered by the Committee, and providing a penalty for non-compliance with the orders of the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. It appears to me that in this section power should be given to local municipalities to apply to the Railway Committee to act. The clause provides that:

"In any case where any portion of a railway is constructed, or authorized or proposed to be constructed, upon or along, or across any turnpike road, street or other public highway, on the level, the railway company, before constructing or using the same, or in the case of railways already constructed, within such time as the Railway Committee shall direct, shall submit a plan."

Then, of course, the Railway Committee might not act on its own mere motion, and it seems to me important to provide, that local municipalities might apply to the Railway Committee to direct the railway company to do so, and it would then proceed to give directions for the plan to be filed in any particular case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not see any objection to the suggestion, and I will make a note of it. You do not propose to make it necessary that the municipality should apply to the Committee?

Mr. BLAKE. I would not make it necessary, because there might occur a case where the attention of the Railway Committee might be attracted to it in the public interest. I would leave it in the discretion of the Committee to act, and provide that the local authorities might call the attention of the Committee to such matters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will look carefully into it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree with my hon. friend, otherwise it would be every person's duty—and, therefore, no person's duty—to call attention to the dangerous condition in which railway crossings are. I hope the hon. gentleman's suggestions will be adopted.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to indicate what railway companies are to be left out. This will be shorter than to indicate those which are brought in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in a word that the clause is pretty comprehensive, and the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition will save time. The companies excepted are: the Carillon and Grenville, Fredericton, New Brunswick and Canada, St. John and Maine, Waterloo and Magog, the Western Counties, the Grand Southern and the Windsor and Annapolis. As to the last it is in doubt, as I suppose it is embraced really by the term Intercolonial, because the title has not passed.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the bridge arrangement which it is contemplated to assist by the resolution on the paper, take in the St. John and Maine and some others?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

Mr. BLAKE. Assuming for a moment that this structure was completed, how many would that take out of the category?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope that it would take out the New Brunswick and Canada, the St. John and Maine, and the Grand Southern certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the number of railways comprehended; and if he has a list of the names I would be glad to get it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Sixty-four.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume that includes many which are so by the law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is, roads which are now and will be immediately affected by this Act, or which are now affected.

Mr. BLAKE. But it does not make a distinction between those coming in under the Act and those already in. I think that would avoid a great deal of difficulty if the hon. gentleman would schedule them separately. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends by this clause to at once term works for the general advantage of Canada all railways which may afterwards be incorporated by the Provinces and constructed under Provincial Legislatures, and which may happen to be connected with one of the main lines.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My intention is to apply it if it came within the category of this clause; but, of course, the question of whether that intention is carried out is a question of law which the hon. gentleman can answer better than I can.

Mr. BLAKE. It is difficult to judge as to the point of law, when the same phrase is used for the present and the past tense. For example, this curious consequence would follow: that the very instant a Provincial Legislature passed an Act of incorporation to any railway from a point on one of these leading lines, that instant, however short or Provincial it might be in its character, it would pass out of the Provincial jurisdiction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not until it is constructed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman proposes that the Province shall construct and he shall appropriate. I think, however, he had better consider the wording of the Act before the third reading; and I would also suggest that he should schedule those roads which are affected and which are to be affected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see no objection.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish at this stage only to say a few words in answer to the hon. gentleman. In answering me he stated that he did not see any ground at all for my position. He said that any railway at all which was constructed was for the general advantage of Canada, because it increased the prosperity of some part of the country, and the whole country is interested in the prosperity of every part. I told him before, and I repeat, that this is not the meaning of the words "general advantage of Canada, or of two

or more of the Provinces," as they exist in the clause which gives us power to assume jurisdiction over these railways. This is obviously something different from the general proposition that any railway constructed must increase the prosperity of the country, and therefore every railway is for the general advantage of Canada, or two or more of the Provinces. It indicates that the railway must be for the general advantage of Canada, that it shall be for the general advantage of two or more of the Provinces, though not for the general advantage of all. It indicates that if you establish either of these propositions, you may assume legislative jurisdiction over it, but it indicates that there may be a third class of railways under this section, which is not for the general advantage of all Canada or of two or more Provinces, but only for the advantage of one Province. There are three classes—first, those which are for the advantage of a Province, and not for the advantage of more than one Province; second, those which are for the advantage of more than one Province; and third, those which are for the advantage of all Canada; and therefore the configuration—the termini, the connections, and so forth, are what we are to consider in each case, when we are to determine whether this railway comes within one category or another. There is another point to which I wish to refer. The hon. gentleman bases his argument upon convenience. He says railways may cross and join one another. Occasionally railway companies apply to us asking for powers which they cannot obtain from the Local Legislatures. They come imploring to be made Dominion railways for their own convenience; and these things point to the proposition we have now confessed, that there is not a single railway which it would not be useful or convenient to declare to be for the general advantage of Canada. We have one kind of Constitution which has its merits and its disadvantages. You cannot combine the merits of two kinds of constitutions in the one. The hon. gentleman considers that it is simpler and more convenient that from this seat of power, this single legislative body, we should control the whole railway mileage of the country, and to that extent have a Legislative Union. Our Constitution says it shall not be so. It says there may be some railways in existence that are not for the general advantage of more than one Province—important, but in one Province, and that with those we shall have nothing to do. The Province shall have sole jurisdiction over them. There may be inconvenience in that. There is an absence of simplicity. There is a certain amount of complication which requires the action sometimes of two legislative bodies to accomplish a particular result. Such things will always be happening. It is not in the case of railway companies alone, that we have corporate entities seeking for particular further powers. How much simpler it would be for us to incorporate every incorporation—that we should do the whole business of the country—in short, how much simpler would it be to have a Legislative instead of a Federal Union. But such is not our Constitution, and the most of us believe that the advantages of our system outweigh the disadvantages. The disadvantages are numerous legislative bodies, divided authority, and increased expense. The advantages are a liberal portion of control over local affairs, and that fuller and more important and satisfactory action which exists, when, within a comparatively limited area, the people deal with their own affairs, in which the rest of the Dominion are not concerned, for themselves acting for themselves by their own power, at their own will, unimplicated with and unembarrassed by the views of others. What the hon. gentleman proposes is to revolutionize our Constitution in reference to our railway system. That is the acknowledged advantage of the other proposals of the Government which are to be matured this Session. The two or three railways remaining are to be absorbed, therefore we get only three or four railways out of the whole sixty-seven railways of the country

which are to remain within the Provincial control. I must say that I do not think the hon. gentleman can justify the proposition except by practically saying that the argument for simplicity and convenience in the management of all these roads from one centre is so great that we should practically subvert the British North American Act, and to that extent make this a Legislative instead of a Federal Union.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. gentleman omits to take note of one fact in regard to these local railways. It is true, they are local in the circumstance that they begin and end within the Province; but one cannot avoid thinking that the interest in them is a Dominion interest. The Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway may be taken as an instance. There is no one along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Ontario and Quebec Railway, when it is built, or on the line of any one of the railways that extend into the other Provinces, who has not a direct interest in the business of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. That railway is serving a district of country that finds its outlet through these other Provinces, and is, in fact, a part of the other railways. I think this provision does not at all involve the proposition that we are adopting a Legislative Union. Because we choose to say that railways which feed and are tributary to the leading lines of railway should be governed by the same laws and the same rules which govern the main railway, it does not follow that we are going in the direction of a Legislative Union at all; you cannot localize the interest of these railways if they touch the main lines of railways at all; and so far from regarding this provision as an interference with Provincial rights, it seems to me, from my stand-point, that we are simply adopting a plan which will very much facilitate the general business of the country, without interfering with any rights, in the slightest degree, wherever they are maintained in the interests of the Provinces. Those rights are only valuable as they promote the interests of the people of the Provinces; and if you can promote the interests of the people of the Provinces served by these branch lines of railway carrying their traffic to the leading lines, by placing the whole under one jurisdiction, one management, and one set of laws, I think you are promoting the best interests of the country as a whole, and the best interests of each of the Provinces that form part of the country as a whole. I think the country is to be congratulated on this particular clause of the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for West Durham has referred to the clause as virtually repealing the provisions of the British North America Act. He is, of course, aware that a doubt has always existed in the minds of the profession, and of statesmen also, I believe, as to the proper interpretation of that Act with reference to the railway-creating power, and it is considered by many that, on the true and proper construction of the British North America Act, the Local Legislatures are not invested with the power of chartering railways at all. That question was argued in the Supreme Court, in one case, at great length and very elaborately. The Judges were impressed with the difficulties of the question, but it was unnecessary for them to decide it in that case, as the judgment bore on another point; but one of the Judges, in giving judgment, referred to the question as one regarding which great doubt existed in his mind, and, if I recollect rightly, he made use of an expression showing that his mind inclined to the opinion that the power of chartering railways was vested in this Parliament alone.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I do not think that this Parliament would venture to act upon any such interpretation of the law. We have for fifteen years acted upon the assumption that there may be Provincial railways. We have acted negatively and affirmatively upon that assumption; we have recognized the existence of local charters as valid; we

have not confirmed them; we have not ventured to insult the Provinces by confirming them; but we have considered them as valid, and we have given added powers to these railways, and have declared certain works promoted under local charters to be works for the general advantage of Canada, when they are indisputably so, and when they had *bona fide* applied. So, all the Provinces, I believe, have, since Confederation, acted on the theory that they have power to charter local railways. For my own part, though I speak with deference regarding those who have entertained doubt, I do not understand how there can be any doubt about this provision of the Constitution.

Mr. McCARTHY. The observation of the hon. member for Victoria is hardly applicable to this particular clause of the Bill, because, however correct may be the doubt to which my hon. friend has given utterance, it is quite plain that we, by this sixth clause, are legislating in the opposite direction, because we are reciting and confirming the power of the Local Legislatures. It appears to me that we must deal with this clause as with all other enactments, upon its merits. Now let us see what roads this clause proposes to place under the jurisdiction of this House. The Intercolonial Railway is already subject to the laws of the Parliament; so is the Grand Trunk; so, I believe, is the North Shore, though I am not sure as to that; so is the Northern Railway; the Hamilton and North-Western, I think, is not, for it has a local charter; the Canada Southern, no doubt, is; so is the Western; the Credit Valley is not; the Ontario and Quebec is; and the Canadian Pacific is, of course. Therefore, we are simply enacting in regard to the Hamilton and North-Western, and the Credit Valley, and possibly, also, as to the North Shore. The Hamilton and North-Western is a road that, I believe, forms part of one of the main lines between Hamilton and the Suspension Bridge; therefore, it may be assumed to be as much as any other line for the general advantage of Canada, as it is, in fact, a section of a through line. So with the Credit Valley. I think these roads are properly brought within the jurisdiction of this House, and I think that it is quite plain that the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways that the leading lines, with those connecting with them, and their branches, ought to be subject to the same law, is a proper proposition. Nothing could be more unfortunate than that one part of a railway should be under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature, and one part under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. This provision not only includes branches, but the lines connecting with them and the lines crossing them.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may possibly go further than the argument I am advancing would warrant.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that a branch line should be subject to the same jurisdiction as the main line.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is my opinion; and all traffic arrangements, and the fixing of rates and tolls on all Canadian roads, whether chartered by the Local Legislature or by this Parliament, I hold, are subject to the Parliament of Canada. So far as I know, the Local Legislatures have not accepted that doctrine but act on the opposite theory. I think it will be found when the question comes up, and I have never heard it very seriously disputed, that this is the place where tolls and rates and traffic arrangements are to be settled and can only be settled. Notwithstanding what may be done elsewhere, the laws we pass here should regulate rates and tolls. That is the reason why all the important lines, at all events, ought for their own sakes, so as to be represented here in this matter of the settlement of tolls, to be subject to the laws of this House.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the hon. leader of the Opposition made out his case when he contended there was any violation of either the text or the spirit of the Union Act in this proposal. I do not go into the question at all that has been raised whether any doubt may arise as to whether the jurisdiction, in relation to railways alone, belongs to this Parliament. I take it, as the hon. gentleman does, that the Union Act provides that railways connecting one or more Provinces or connecting us with any other country, are railways necessarily within the jurisdiction of this country. It is quite true provision is made that local railways are under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, but the Union Act goes much further and provides distinctly that this Parliament shall have the power of declaring any railway, when, in the judgment of Parliament, it is felt a wise thing to do for any purpose whatever, shall come within its jurisdiction. Therefore, there is no excess of the power of the Union Act proposed here, but this is simply carrying out the provisions of the Union Act which were intended for this very purpose. As the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe has said, the doubt will be removed, a doubt that certainly has arisen to a very large extent by this proposal, because it would enable us to deal with these lines of communication that run into each other, and by this connection reach other Provinces, and will facilitate the making of such regulations for traffic as are really in the interest of the country.

On section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause will require to be recast if we consent to this proposal. It is an amendment of section 60 of the Act:

Section 60 of the said Act is hereby amended by adding at the end of the first sub-section of the said section, after the word "proxy," the words "and also to the approval of the Governor in Council."

That is all right; it is practically saying that these working arrangements of twenty-one years shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and that notice of the application shall be given for sometime in the *Canada Gazette* in order that all parties interested may be heard. But the hon. gentleman has tacked on certain other provisos, *b*, *c* and *d*, which are not at all proper to be tacked on to this clause. The main clause contains a provision for the approval of the Governor in Council for twenty-one years, or, rather, it is a proviso the company shall have power to make the traffic arrangements subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. If it is intended that if there is any purchase or lease of any railway or portion of railway there shall be approval of the Governor in Council, that should be done by a separate and independent clause: "Any purchase or lease of any railway or portion of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, &c." And that is a very extensive provision. There may, to-day, be the right of a railway company to purchase a railway. Negotiations may be proceeding, the matter may be all but concluded, yet we would certainly intercept the consummation of the transaction by interposing this new condition. I think it ought to be guarded so as to apply, if it is to apply at all, only to transactions which are entirely *in futuro*. Then this other proviso *c* is not properly a proviso to the first sub-section of section 60 at all. It is an independent proviso and ought to be a separate clause, just as *b* ought. It is a proviso of a very important character. I do not know whether it is intended to withdraw rights which were given, somewhat improvidently, to one of the great railway companies some time ago, or whether it is intended simply to deal with the case of a company unlawfully dealing in the shares or stocks of other companies. I think another of the two great rival corporations, as I am afraid we must call them, with which we are blest, has been dealing considerably in the shares and stocks of other corporations. We have read in the

newspapers of the rivalry for the purchase of the Hamilton and North-Western stocks, and of trouble between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway as to which should get the control of the Northern and North-Western, and as far as we can learn the city of Hamilton held the balance of power in this struggle. I do not remember any clause in the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway which authorizes it to invest in these stocks; but no doubt it did invest in them. Nor have I heard of any clause authorizing them to invest in St. Lawrence and Ottawa stocks, but undoubtedly it did. I, therefore, can understand the propriety of a clause which emphasizes the penal consequences to a company acting beyond its powers, meddling with others and bringing up stocks and bonds, when it is not authorized to do so. But first of all it must be an independent claim, and secondly, we must learn distinctly whether it is the intention of the Government to withdraw existing powers to buy stocks and bonds, or whether it is intended to deal only with those cases of the purchase of stocks and bonds contrary to the law. I think the clause rather means the latter, because there is a provision in which it is specially authorized to do so, and I presume an authority given by Act of Parliament, though a general authority, would be called a special authority. I could wish that the hon. gentleman had struck out "special" and said "unless authorized to do so no railway company shall," &c.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. leader of the Opposition probably recollects that this was a Bill introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. BLAKE. Only the first part.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That hon. gentleman, having given his attention to the subject, drafted these clauses and submitted them for my consideration; and having given them the best consideration I could, I have embodied them in the Bill; but they were prepared by the hon. member for North York. Now, I propose to make an amendment to sub-section *b*, by adding these words to the end: "but if such lease or purchase has been authorized as required by the special Act, and after notice as required by law to the shareholders, no notice for such application shall be required." That is to say, that where the shareholders have specially authorized it by law, this notice shall not be required.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, then, make it subject to the approval of the Governor in Council at all?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For the purpose, as stated by the hon. member for North York, of serving as an additional check to unrestrained action in such cases. Then it provides for a very careful arrangement for the approval to be given, the notice having been published in the *Gazette*, &c., but that having been done, it does not seem necessary that they should be required to do it all over again.

Mr. BLAKE. There is the danger that the purchase or lease by one railway or another may be against some public interest, and that is why it is proposed to put in this additional check of the Governor in Council. It is not an arbitrary discretion we have exercised. They are not to have power to check this if the law has authorized it; they are not to have power to give it if the Act has authorized it, and if the Act has authorized it, the question of policy would be deemed to be settled. We have refused, Session after Session, to give any railway company power to purchase or to lease in this general way; we have said: State the lines you want the power to purchase or lease, and if we think it right, we will give you authority. Now, why, when Parliament has declared, in reference to these cases, that it is not contrary to public policy, by giving special authority in the Act to purchase or lease railway A or railway B, why are you going now to say this should be subject to the ap-

proval of the Governor in Council? Parliament itself has said that the public interest will not suffer by those particular cases.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I agree with the observations of the hon. member for West Durham. It seems to me that *b* and *c*, are really unnecessary, because without special legislative authority a railway company cannot purchase or lease another railway, nor can it apply any of its funds to the acquisition of any share or securities of any other company. Those are matters which it can only do in the exercise of special legislative authority. If it has received in the past that special legislative authority, we ought not now to interfere with it. If it has not received that authority, it must come here to get it. Then it will be in the power of Parliament to impose such conditions as it pleases. It therefore seems to me that *b* and *c* are unnecessary, and they are certainly inappropriate in the position in which they are placed in the Bill. As to clause *d*, it is a pioneer clause, but I do not know that it is necessary. But it certainly should not be there, and it should be a separate clause which should simply provide that if a director of a railway was guilty of any act or any misappropriation of the funds of the company, he should be liable to that penalty. If Parliament thinks fit to make a general provision of that kind, well and good, but it should not come in in this place if it comes in at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with both my hon. friends that clause *b* should be expunged. With regard to clause *a*, I think it is a very necessary clause, but it does not go far enough. I think there ought to be a declaration that the agreement referred to in section sixty of the Act should not be ratified unless it was in the public interest; in other words, it is an attempt to incorporate in this law the powers which the Railway Commission in England has, but the powers are to be exercised here by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the clauses in the Railway Act of England by which that power is conferred. Clauses *c* and *d* are enactments which I am very glad to see in the Bill, but which I also think do not go sufficiently far. Now, Sir, if I can engage the attention of the Committee for a moment I would endeavor to draw notice to the importance of this amendment. We have, as the hon. gentleman from West Durham has told us, repeatedly refused amalgamative and leasing powers; we never did so unless we were satisfied that the amalgamation was in the public interest. But our laws are frequently evaded by the railway managers buying up stock of other companies and practically amalgamating without the consent of Parliament. I submit that that ought to be stopped, and now is the time to do it. We can put an end to that by a legislative declaration that it shall be unlawful for any railway company—I do not care what their power may be—to invest in the bonds or stock or securities of other companies whereby they may obtain control either of that or any other company. We have examples of that all around us. We know perfectly well that the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway coming to this city was made part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not by amalgamation, not by applying to Parliament, not by any power of leasing, but by acquiring a controlling interest in the stock, and, therefore, although still the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway, it is part of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and so with the Great Western Railway. An attempt was made by two great corporations to secure the Hamilton and North-Western. They dare not come to Parliament to ask for power to amalgamate, for no Parliament would give them that power, but they purchased the stock, and one of these great railway companies has recently done so openly, by advertising a meeting for the purpose of confirming an arrangement made.

Mr. BLAKE. They have the power.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** No doubt; and under that power they have acted, and one railway company has invested in the bonds of another company.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Because Parliament has allowed them to do so.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** The power does not belong direct to the Grand Trunk, but to the Great Western.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I think it was given to the Grand Trunk in 1878.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Charters have been granted to these companies on the understanding that they would be subject to such alterations as Parliament might, from time to time, think proper to enact. We have similar powers in our Interpretation Act, and we should now say that the purchase by one railway company of the bonds, stock, or securities of another railway company, which is quite apart from the ordinary business of running a railway, is illegal and should be stopped; and I propose to ask the Committee to substitute for sub-sections *c* and *d* a clause to this effect, which I drafted before I knew that sub-sections *c* and *d* were in the Bill. The clause I will propose runs as follows:—

It shall not be lawful to apply any money belonging to any railway company on the purchase or acquisition of any stocks, shares, bonds, or other securities of any other railway company; and any director, manager, officer, servant, or agent of any railway company who knowingly purchases, or causes to be purchased, or who authorises the payment or is a party to the payment or advance of any money in the purchase or acquiring of any stock, shares, bonds or other securities as aforesaid, shall be guilty of misdemeanor.

I do not think that is going at all too far. We now have an opportunity in this Railway Bill of declaring that this practice shall be stopped. We cannot prevent great railway magnates investing their own money.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** How can we reach the case of railway companies?

**Mr. McCARTHY.** By preventing the companies investing money belonging to their shareholders in the stock and bonds of another railway company. Why should the Grand Trunk, a company chartered to run a line through the Dominion, be permitted to invest the money of its shareholders in the purchase of the stock of any other road? If it is proper and right that the Grand Trunk should amalgamate with any other company, or lease its lines, application should be made to Parliament.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is just what clause *c* prevents the companies from doing, and yet you propose to strike it out.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** If it is in the public interest that some roads should be amalgamated, and I admit that there are some cases, power should be obtained from Parliament. I can see no reason for objecting to amalgamation in the case of a through line, but I can see grave objection to such a course being followed in the case of opposing lines. In the latter case they know well that Parliament will not sanction an amalgamation. Under powers which these companies never should have obtained, they buy up a controlling interest in the roads, and, perhaps, as in the case of the Hamilton and North-Western, they may retain their former names; still they will be operated and controlled by the larger company, and the competition which was supposed to be created by the construction of the railway is completely destroyed. This is a matter of great importance. I do not ask the hon. Minister to state to-night what action he will take in the matter.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Sub-section *c* provides as to investments in the stock of the companies, and sub-section *d* provides a penalty.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Sub-section *c*, however, says: "unless specially authorized." That would permit the Grand Trunk,

**Mr. McCARTHY.**

the Great Western and other companies having special authority to continue this system. I say we have power to stop it.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Would you repeal part of their charters?

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Their charters were granted subject to the general laws Parliament may impose from time to time. The hon. gentleman is compelling them by sections 48 and 49 to build bridges or make crossings under the highway as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council may think proper. It is a limiting of their charter rights, because it is in the public interest, and it is urgently in the public interest that railway companies should not be permitted to purchase stock of other railways. Can any hon. gentleman give a reason why a company authorized to build a road in a certain direction should invest the money of its shareholders in some other road? If it is proper that two companies should amalgamate, they can come to Parliament for powers. It is a matter fraught to us all with great importance. I speak feelingly, because, in my section of country, the people deem it of the utmost importance that the neutrality and independence of the Northern and North-Western should be maintained. The people are averse to its being bought up either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk. If it has to succumb, they would prefer that it should be obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway; but it is important, in the public interest, that its independence should be maintained. What is being done? Emissaries of the rival roads are acquiring the stock; we know a great contest is going on in acquiring it, and pressure has been brought to bear on the Hamilton and North-Western, as they are part of the Executive Committee controlling both roads, and it was hoped to be able to force the Northern into accepting such terms of amalgamation as the larger road thought fit. Steps of this kind, according to the amendment which I intend to propose, will amount to a misdemeanor. A fine of \$1,000 would simply evoke a laugh; these railway magnates are prepared to pay for stock ten times its actual value. If it is declared to be a misdemeanor, the Judge would have the power to inflict a fine or imprisonment, as he thought fit. I desire to have the penalty one of imprisonment, so that it may be brought within the category of crime, as in no other way can it be suppressed.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Sub-section *b* provides:

"That the like approval applied for in like manner shall be necessary in order to the validity of any purchase or lease of any railway or portion of a railway."

The only point on which I differ from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—of course I speak under correction, because it is a legal question—is as to how far the general power Parliament possesses, in regard to legislation respecting railways, would warrant the House in attacking a special privilege contained in a railway company's charter, enabling them to do certain things. It was for that reason, I suppose, that it was considered necessary to add the words in sub-section *c* "unless specially authorized."

**Mr. BLAKE.** I think, undoubtedly, my hon. friend from North Simcoe was strictly correct. We retain the power, as well as I remember, expressly, and it is expressly declared that it shall not be deemed an infringement on the privileges of the charter, notwithstanding that Parliament—I do not remember any instance when any specific provisions of this kind were removed—has a natural reluctance to act in that sense unless some great over-ruling public necessity requires us so far to interfere with the security once obtained by virtue of an Act of Parliament, on which corporations had acted; that, I think, is the general principle which has animated public men whenever a suggestion of the kind was made; and, therefore, I think that, if we infringe on that



principle, we should do so with caution, and consider the case. The hon. member for Victoria mentioned the year in which this power was conferred on railways, and it occurred to me, when he mentioned the year 1873, it flashed across my mind that there was a reason for it, because it was at that time when negotiations were commenced by the Grand Trunk for the acquisition of the Chicago connection. Papers brought down this Session show that this work was prosecuted to completion in 1879-80, largely by the acquisition of stocks and bonds in other intervening lines. It was made up of lines partly purchased and by the foreclosure of railways, and partly by what may be called controlling interests in other sections of lines. It was ultimately completed in that way, and I dare say it may have been in regard to that specific intention of theirs that this general power was conferred. I have this observation to make: I do not think that it would be consistent with the general spirit in which Parliament has acted as to the withdrawal of granted powers to act, without giving notice to the corporation, and to give it an opportunity of pointing out how its interests would be affected with reference to transactions partly completed, completed to a certain extent, and perhaps pending. Take a case in which a company may have the power to acquire the stocks and bonds of a road, to purchase a certain number of stocks and bonds, and perhaps a controlling amount. It would never have entered into the transaction, if it had not relied on legislative authority to complete the transaction as opportunity might serve to work the thing out from time to time as it might acquire the right to stocks and bonds. In what sort of a situation might be placed a corporation if intervening in the very middle of a transaction, commenced by virtue of an Act of Parliament, to get so many hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of stocks and bonds, this check came? I do not say that we have not the power to do, or that we should not exercise this power; but certainly we should not do so unless some great over-ruling public interest required it, and this with a due regard to the interests of the corporation as far as is consistent with the interests of the public. Therefore I submit to my hon. friend, whether it would be proper at this stage of the Session, and of this measure, practically to repeal a clause which may affect numerous interests. We have the North Shore case before us. I do not know whether the Grand Trunk has purchased all the interest in the North Shore or not, but it has, at all events, a controlling interest; and we have heard of it purchasing the Hamilton and North-Western and several others. I do not think that we should summarily cut off without investigation or enquiry their opportunity for stating their case as to the exercise of this power. By the way, I do not at all pronounce against the abolition of this provision; that, at the proper time and with proper precautions, I would add, does not seem to make much difference. It is pretty plain that other great rival corporations have not got the power of purchasing stocks and bonds too; and for that reason my hon. friends from North Simcoe and North York had good grounds for suggesting this clause, notwithstanding the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria. These are things which are done, though there is no legal authority to do so; and if they are to be stopped, we must provide some short, sharp penalty, and point out the risks to those who do them. There is remaining the capacity on the part of the stockholding interest—if it is a very wealthy and a great railway corporation—to purchase in that capacity with their funds the shares of a rival company and afterwards work it in harmony, assuming the proprietary, in fact becoming the owners of both lines. For that reason the general funds of the corporation itself may be devoted to this purpose, as they are devoted to this purpose without the authority of law, and which accomplish objects which

the Legislature does not desire to sanction. It seems to me reasonable that a clause in some shape or other should be inserted to enforce the law in this regard.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to the observations of the hon. Minister of Railways so far as concerns sub-section *b*, it is probably sufficient to allow leasing and purchasing to be conducted under the special provisions of special Acts authorizing such purchases or leases. With regard to the criticism of the hon. member for North Simcoe on sub-sections *b* and *c*, I understand his suggestions to be—first, he proposes to restrict their application in the relation to railways generally. When I drafted these clauses it occurred to me that it would not be proper without notice to withdraw power from any company if such power had been acted upon; for that reason, I put in that exception to the general application of the section. It was an unfortunate circumstance, I think, that this House ever granted such a power, and I am glad that, at this late date, the hon. member for North Simcoe, remembering that during all these years he has been in the House when this legislation now complained of was passed, now wishes to rescind what he sees was an oversight in that respect; but I do not think it would be a fair thing for us to withdraw power that may have been acted upon by any corporation. Again he proposes to extend the penalties of fining, as the case may be, to more than the directorate. I think that this is a move in the right direction; I agree with that portion of his suggestion. There is a precedent for it. I refer to the penalty provided under the General Insurance Act, which extends the penalties to the directors and to all agents—that is, in the case of an insurance company not entitled to carry on business by reason of its license having been withdrawn, and the agents carry on its business. In that Act, I think, the provision is made for a penalty, and in default of the payment of the penalty, for imprisonment. I do not agree with the third suggestion of the hon. gentleman, that the penalty should be criminal rather than pecuniary. His suggestion is that the directorate and their servants and employes should not be fined in their estates, but be punished in their persons. There is, then, the question as to what is the best remedy. We appear to be all agreed that a penalty is necessary, but we may differ as to what is the best remedy. My own notion is that if we follow the precedent provided in the General Insurance Act of 1875, we will provide a sufficient penalty to begin with. If the informer is to obtain half the penalty when recovered, I think there is sufficient reason to suppose that where large sums are to be recovered, informers will be forthcoming, and the directors, managers, and servants will hesitate to commit a breach of the law, when they know that their assets will be liable, and that people are ready to call them to account. As to the other suggestion, that the difference should be simply a misdemeanor, we know that the courts have discretion as to what punishment they will award in cases of misdemeanor. The punishment may be trivial, and we know that excuses may be advanced appealing to the clemency of the court. Therefore, I think the consequences of a breach of the law should not be left so uncertain, or to the discretion of the court. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, accomplish his object by adopting in its entirety the penalty provided in the Insurance Act, which is to the effect that if the fines are not paid, the party liable shall be subject to imprisonment. When I drafted the clause in question, I left out the imprisonment provision, thinking the penalty too severe, and in calling the attention of the Minister of Railways to the Insurance Act from which I took the idea, I understood that he agreed that it was sufficient to limit the penalty to pecuniary liability.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think perhaps we might get over the difficulty by combining the two punishments

which have been suggested, one by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the other by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). We might provide both for misdemeanor and a pecuniary penalty. The other difference of opinion between these two gentlemen is on a more important point, namely, as to whether the words "unless specially authorized so to do" shall be omitted or not. The hon. member for North Simcoe proposes to omit these words. The effect of putting them in is simply this, that the company to which we have thought fit in our wisdom to give power to apply their money in that way can go on doing so while other companies are to be prohibited.

Mr. BLAKE. They are now.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not know whether they are. Of course the Grand Trunk Railway is authorized to do so. Now, if it is the right thing to enact that money should not be applied by other companies in this way, it should be the right thing to repeal the clause which the Grand Trunk Company have in their Act of 1878. It would never do. It would be contrary to all propriety to repeal it in such a way as to affect inchoate transactions—transactions which are commenced or partially completed but—we should make a provision that, in future, that power should be withdrawn and should not be exercised by the Grand Trunk any more than by any other company. That power was given in 1878. At the time that they obtained that legislation it was stated that it was necessary, in order that they might acquire lines in the United States, to make Chicago connection. They put in two clauses in the Bill—clauses five and six—one authorizing them to deal with companies in the United States, the other authorizing them to deal with companies in any part of Ontario, a limitation being inserted when the Bill was before the Railway Committee—at the suggestion of the then Minister of Public Works—that these provisions should not apply to any lines running in the same direction as, or competing with the Grand Trunk, with certain exceptions. That clause virtually allows them to use the bonds and securities of any company in the United States or Canada, except those of a few roads which are mentioned in the proviso of the fifth clause. Now, they did not require that power for the purpose of getting Chicago connection, so far as their lines in Canada are concerned. I think they have exercised their power just as far as the public interest requires that they should, and perhaps a good deal further. I think the hon. member for West Durham admitted on a recent occasion that in his opinion this power has been perhaps not improperly but incautiously given by Parliament; and I think that, at the present time, while we should be careful not to interfere with or prevent anything being done which was authorized to be done by that Act, we should practically repeal that clause for the future, and I believe that in doing so we will be legislating for the public good. But the difficulty remains that, however astute we may be in trying to prevent this evil, the system of the organization of joint stock companies almost renders us powerless to prevent it, and I think that we should at least place the Grand Trunk Company on a level with other railroads in that respect.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman seems to think that by the proposed clause as it now stands, we are depriving some companies of the powers they now have.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Any company now authorized to buy the stocks or bonds of another company remains authorized, but any company not authorized can complain, because we ascribe a penalty to their doing that which they are not authorized to do. The hon. gentleman says that a company which is not authorized to buy these securities is buying

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

them; but they are buying them in contravention of their powers, because there is no particular penalty to frighten them. We want to be able to say to such a company: Gentlemen, you must keep within your charter, and if you do not, then these sharp penalties shall be imposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said; and I think it would be a pity if we were to allow this great company for another twelve months to go on acquiring other roads in this indirect manner, for then I dare say it would be too late to preserve a road which I am particularly desirous to preserve. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways, who is willing to accept the proposition, would frame a clause by which schemes which are inaugurated or incomplete might be carried out, but providing that, in future, it would be unlawful for the Grand Trunk Railway or any other road—for the Grand Trunk Railway has similar power—to invest in stocks belonging to other roads. In that way I think the views which have been so generally expressed on both sides of the House would be carried into effect. If that cannot be done I dare say the word of the hon. Minister that, if not this Session then next Session, a general law of the kind would be introduced, would be regarded as a promise of a step in the right direction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We all seem to be agreed that we may amend this clause by striking out sub-section *b*; but I think we shall have to leave sub-sections *c* and *d* substantially as they are. Not but that I agree entirely with all that has been said as to the inadvisability of allowing the funds of a company to be used in that way; but I think that Parliament, having empowered certain railway companies to do certain things, could not suddenly impose such a penalty as proposed, without giving due notice. At all events, before making such a change, I would like to allow the party to whom that power has been given, to come to Parliament and state their case; and I think the suggestion just made by my hon. friend from North Simcoe will meet the case, and I am quite prepared to adopt it.

On section 11,

Mr. McCARTHY. This is the proper place to move the amendment of which I have given notice. It is an equality clause and is intended only to make what I propose to be the intention of Parliament quite clear and explicit. It imposes on railway companies the duty of carrying goods or persons under the same circumstances for and at the same rate, and I do not think any person can object to that. It does not prevent a railway company from carrying a longer distance for less than a short distance. It simply deals with the case of carrying for different parties from the same point to the same point, under the same circumstances, and requires that the same rate shall be charged in both cases. I think it is a provision so just that I have very little doubt the hon. Minister of Railways will accept it and substitute it for sub-section 6 of clause 17 of the Railway Act as it stands.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will accept this clause, only adding the words "under the same circumstances," after the word "times."

Mr. BLAKE. I notice the eleventh sub-section is changed a good deal from the former one. The words "undue" and "unreasonable" are inserted, which do not exist in the former. Is that borrowed from the English Act? It is certainly very much more elastic than the clause as it existed in our Act. Our Act said: "any preference or advantage;" this says: "any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any advantage would be unreasonable and undue.

Mr. BLAKE. Why then put these words in? When we take a clause out of an Act and substitute another for it, the

courts might look at the old clause and the new one and ask what was the meaning of the change.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Before disposing of this sub-section 2, I wish to say that, before the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham in relation to these words "undue and unreasonable," I thought we could see reason to use them two lines below, where they would apply to the description of freight. There is a reason for discriminating in kinds of freight, some being perishable and others not so; but why there should be any qualifying phrase in relation to persons I cannot see. If these words "undue and unreasonable" had occurred before the words "description of freight," I think they would have been reasonable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They are taken from the English Act, and after careful consideration.

Mr. FAIRBANK. There is another matter which has caused great complaint, namely, the delay to local freight, and I believe it does no good to railway companies. Railway companies ought to be relieved from the bad feeling which it creates against them, particularly on the through lines. I could show the hon. Minister letters which give instances of great cause of complaint in relation to local freight having to wait for through freight. Now, it has been suggested heretofore that matters of freight should be interfered with so as to control the companies' tolls in relation to their through freight. I do not see how that can be done. I do not see how, if a railway company choose to carry freight from the western States at a losing rate, we have a right to prevent it; but I think it is unjust to the Canadian producer that our railways should virtually place a farmer in Illinois nearer the market than the farmer in Ontario. The value of products depend on their distance from market, and it is the price of transit that fixes the distance, and it frequently occurs now that the farmer in Illinois, by getting lower freight to the sea-board, is actually given the advantage over the Ontario farmers. Perhaps that is an evil that cannot be cured, but it does seem to me that the Canadian farmer or shipper, having to wait for foreign freight to be accommodated first, is not treated fairly. I think that these roads, protected by our laws, frequently subsidized by our money, Federal, Provincial, and municipal, should not have the power of holding local freight to a time to suit their convenience. They go to the western markets, where there is competition, and get freight, and make local freight wait. I think that is a matter that we ought to look to. I have letters showing instances, on these lines, where grain has had to wait for a period of two months, while empty trains were passing daily to the western States after freight and bringing it back through Canada. Of course I will not suggest the language of the clause which would cover this evil, but it is capable of being covered, and should be covered. One shipper writes me that last season, to facilitate the getting away of produce, he sold it to go over different roads, to New York, Portland, and Boston, but he did not succeed in shipping it until one month after the sales were made. A banker informs me that great disadvantage has been occasioned to his customers, owing to these delays. I do not believe it is in the interest of the railway companies themselves to cause these delays, and that Parliament should express itself on that point by Act. A clause has been introduced to prohibit discrimination in favor of persons or companies, and we should have another clause inserted to prevent discrimination against Canadian freight, and in favor of foreign freight; so far as the time of shipment is concerned, we cannot, perhaps, regulate the relative rate at which it shall be shipped.

On section 12,

Mr. BLAKE. Are there any instances where such a state of things as is here referred to have occurred?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Difficulties have arisen in consequence of an individual becoming the purchaser of a railway company, for there are no means provided by law for the operation of a railway under those circumstances. This clause is to prevent the railway being closed.

Mr. BLAKE. Under the general provisions of the charters such as we are conversant with, there is no power to sell the railway out-and-out under mortgage. In cases where this has been done special Acts have been obtained.

Bill reported.

#### PENITENTIARIES LAWS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 111) to amend and consolidate the laws relating to Penitentiaries.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill is in substance a consolidation of six different Acts connected with penitentiaries.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand why in a consolidation Bill it is requisite that there should be a special provision with regard to Dorchester Penitentiary any more than as to other penitentiaries. There is no provision regarding other penitentiaries as to what convicts shall be confined in them. Why should there be such a provision as to the Dorchester Penitentiary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is retained because the word "penitentiary" has always had a different legal signification in the Lower Provinces to what it has in Old Canada. It there has the same signification as in England, where it means a reformatory prison rather than a prison for long-term imprisonments.

Mr. BLAKE. But we are one Dominion, and the interpretation of the law should be the same in all the Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It stands thus: the word "penitentiary" is a portion of an Imperial Act, the British North America Act. This word has a very vague meaning, as mentioned in England; this clause is to be found in 43 Vic., chap. 6, and it is thought as well to leave it in the Bill until all questions between the different Provinces and the Dominion are finally settled. We have had experience of a change both in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, with respect to penitentiaries, and we thought it safer to leave it in.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that as it stands it would render it impossible for the Government very speedily to remove any persons from the Dorchester to any other penitentiary. It is mentioned not merely as a penitentiary, but as the penitentiary for the confinement and reformation of prisoners in any of the Provinces. We have occasionally removed prisoners from St. Vincent de Paul to Kingston and back again, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will look into that.

On section 53,

Mr. BLAKE. This is a very important clause, and I would like to have some explanations from the hon. Minister upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause provides for the remission of a portion of the time for which a convict is sentenced, as a reward for good conduct. It was strongly

praised in the other House. It is the practice followed in Ireland, and with very good results.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the general principle of the proposal. For a long time I was desirous to see something done in this direction and I desire to see more done, but my impression is that this proposal will lead to consequences not altogether foreseen. It may be that sentences for certain crimes will prove inadequate, having regard to a very large increase of remission. I had, when Minister of Justice, elaborated to some extent a plan and was only deterred from presenting it by one consideration—that was, the much larger measure, not in principle, but in degree of the power it gave to the warden. If we provided much longer minimum sentences than now and a greater remission than even now proposed, we would largely increase the stimulus to good behavior; but if the remission be increased, and the minimum of sentences remains the same, the result will be that the penalty inflicted will be less than the crime deserved. I would rather recommend that the minimum of sentences be increased, with the view to a greater remission for good behavior. Of course no change could be made, for it would involve the rearranging of the minimum sentences for crimes, but I merely throw out the suggestion for consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. The hon. Minister of Justice, in his consolidation does not propose to make it a mere consolidation, but will consider such amendments as have been suggested, and I will take care this suggestion be brought under his notice.

Bill reported.

#### DOMINION LANDS—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving Concurrence to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 45) further to amend and to consolidate, as so amended, the several Acts respecting the lands of the Dominion therein mentioned, said: The only amendment is a verbal one, which provides that mining regulations, instead of lying on the Table of the House for one month before they come in force, shall take effect from time to time on being adopted, but they shall be placed on the Table within the first fifteen days after the commencement of the Session. This amendment shows greater confidence in the Administration, and it was moved in the Senate at the suggestion of a leading member of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry to say that I cannot accept that amendment here. I beg, therefore, to move that this House disagree with the amendment as to the mining and coal land regulations, for the reason that it is not fitting to abandon the existing measure of Parliamentary control over such regulations.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on a division.

#### THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 95) further to amend the Interpretation Act.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

SATURDAY, 19th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the adoption of the sixth report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

### EXPIRING LAWS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In conformity with the report of the Committee on Expiring Laws, I beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to continue for a limited time the Acts therein mentioned. There are only two Acts, which are connected with the Criminal Laws: The first is an Act passed in the forty-first year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled: An Act for the better prevention of crimes of violence in certain parts of Canada, until the end of the next Session of Parliament; and the second, an Act passed in the forty-third year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled: An Act respecting the administration of criminal justice in the territory in dispute between the Governments of the Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada.

Bill read the first time.

### SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:

That it is expedient to provide:—

1. That the salary of the additional Judge of the Courts of Appeal for Ontario, for whose appointment provision is made by an Act of the Legislature of that Province, 46 Vict., chap. 6, shall be \$5,000 per annum.
2. That if the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, the Chancellor of Ontario, or the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, is appointed to the Court of Appeal for Ontario, the Governor in Council may direct that he be paid a salary not less than that he previously enjoyed as such Chief Justice or Chancellor.
3. That the third section (respecting retiring allowances to Judges) of the Act 31 Vict., chap. 33, shall extend and apply to the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario, and of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Prince Edward Island.
4. That the salaries of the Judges of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, shall be as follows:—

	Per annum.
The Chief Justice of the said Court .....	\$6,000.00
Eleven Puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed at Montreal or Quebec, each.....	5,000.00
Thirteen Puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed within districts other than Bonaventure or Gaspé, or Saguenay, each.....	4,000.00
Two Puisné Judges of the said Court, whose residences are fixed within the districts of Bonaventure and Gaspé, or Saguenay, each.....	3,500.00

5. That the salary of the County Court Judge of the Eastern Judicial District of Manitoba shall be \$2,000 per annum for his first three years of service, and \$2,500 per annum after such three years of service, and that he shall be paid such travelling allowance as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine.

6. That the salaries and allowances mentioned in the preceding Resolutions 1, 3, 4 and 5 shall take effect on, from and after the next, and shall be computed and payable in the manner provided by the second section of the said Act, 31 Vict., chap. 33, without an annual vote of Parliament, as shall also the salary of the Chief Justice or Chancellor of Ontario mentioned in the second Resolution.

7. That from and after the first day of July, in the present year, 1883, no travelling or circuit allowances shall be paid to the Judges of the Court of Appeal for Ontario.

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

(In the Committee.)

On Resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry to say that I cannot assent to this view. Of course, it is quite reasonable if Justices of the other courts are appointed Puisné Judges to the Court of Appeal that they should retain their old salaries, and it is not upon that score that I object, but I object to the principle of appointing to the Court of Appeal Judges who have practically served out their term, and who, although not at the moment at which they are appointed incapable of discharging further judicial duties, are approaching a term when their judicial usefulness is likely to be at an end. It is not necessary or fitting that particular instances should be given, but those who have practised in the Courts of Ontario will recollect instances which indicate the unfortunate results of the system which the hon. gentleman proposes to take the opportunity of perpetuating. Of course, there are instances in which the Justices of one or other of the courts may be of an age when it is quite fit to translate them to the Court of Appeal, but if they are, they are not likely to accept that translation to a Puisné Justiceship, for it is only at a period when age and infirmities are creeping on a man that he is likely to be in a condition of mind to accept. The difficulty is this: That instead of retirements and the infusion of fresh blood, which are the best things in the public interest, you have the Judges placed in positions in which they may remain for a long time, though they may not be capable of efficiently discharging their judicial duties. I have for a long time entertained these views, and having acted upon them as far as possible, when I was charged with the duty of dealing with these judicial offices, and having seen the mischief which arises under this system, I felt it my duty, though it is not a pleasant duty, to make these amendments.

Mr. BAKER (Missisquoi). I think it is a matter for regret that the resolutions do not propose a readjustment of the salaries of the Judges of the Superior Courts, residing in the principal cities of the Dominion. Since the adoption of the present scale the cost of living has enormously increased, and the general expansion of values has been such that what may have been at that time fairly adequate remuneration for their services is now manifestly inadequate to maintain these Judges in a position of becoming dignity in large centres of population. In reference to existing salaries it is to be observed that most of the Judges of Ontario receive an annual allowance from the Provincial Treasury, of a thousand dollars per annum, the payment of which in defiance of the letter and spirit of the British North America Act, which declares that the Judges shall be appointed and paid by the Dominion, has been for many years and still remains a standing scandal. The discontinuance of this payment by the Legislature, with regard to recently appointed Judges, is an admission that the payment is illegal, and should never have been made. But the action of the Legislature in authorizing that payment, though illegal, may be accepted as an expression of opinion that the Judges were insufficiently paid. If so, they should be paid more and from legal and constitutional sources. In my opinion, Judges of the same rank, other things being equal, should be paid alike in all parts of the Dominion. I sincerely trust that at the very next Session of Parliament this matter will be taken up, and that the Judges of the Superior Courts of Ontario and Quebec will be put on an equality, and the confessedly illegal payment of the former out of money from the Provincial Treasury

may be discountenanced by Parliament and discontinued by the Province.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have to express my regret that no provision has been made, by the resolutions the hon. First Minister has brought down, for an increase in the salaries of the Judges of the Superior Courts, and perhaps I might go further, and say for an increase in the salaries of the Judges of the County Courts. It is, I think, at all events by the members of the profession, generally felt, in the Province from which I come, that the Judges at present, both of the Superior and the County Courts, are insufficiently paid. It is the fact, however, the cost of living may have increased, that the emoluments of members of the Bar have very considerably increased, and it is, of course, from the leading members of the Bar that appointments must be made to the Bench. Now, if the best material is to be obtained, and I say that the best material ought to be obtained, to take positions on the Bench from time to time, leading members of the profession, in some of the leading Provinces, at any rate, whose incomes amount to perhaps three times as much as is paid to the Judges, will have to abandon these incomes and accept a smaller remuneration. It is, I think, equally plain that the Judges of the land ought to hold a position entitling them to respect, and however improper it may be, it is certainly one of the necessities of life that a man cannot hold that position, if he is out at the elbows, among the men with whom the Judges usually move; they are paid so small a salary in comparison that they practically occupy an inferior position. The managers of our banks, insurance companies, railway companies, and all large financial corporations, who, certainly, are not on the whole abler men, or possess higher attainments than the Judges, yet receive, as I suppose most hon. gentlemen know, twice, thrice, and, in some cases, four times what is paid to the Judges of the Superior Courts. I, therefore, had hoped that the hon. First Minister would have yielded to the pressure which has been brought upon the Government, and which has found vent to some extent in the press, would have brought down a resolution to increase the salaries of the Judges; and I have ventured, no matter how unpopular it may be, to be the mouthpiece here of the feeling which prevails among the members of the profession to which I belong. I will point out to the House that nothing unreasonable has been asked in this direction. If we compare the salaries of the Judges in the different Provinces of the Dominion with those paid to the Judges of other colonies, we shall find that the Judges in Canada receive less than the Judges of any other colony under the British flag that I am aware of. In the Island of Jamaica, for instance, the Chief Justice receives £2,500 sterling, or, in round numbers, \$12,500, while the Puisné Judges are paid \$7,500 each, and the District Court Judge, a gentleman occupying a position similar to that of our County Court Judges, receives \$5,500; in Bermuda, the salary is not quite so large, but still larger in proportion to the salaries of the Judges in this Dominion; in British Guiana, the Judges receive the same salaries as the Judges of Jamaica; in the Cape of Good Hope, the salary is £2,000 sterling, or \$10,000; in New South Wales, a self-governing colony, with a population of 749,000, it is £2,600, or \$13,000; in Queensland the Chief Justice receives £2,500, or \$12,500; and so on. The circumstances may be, and probably are, different in some of these colonies; perhaps a dollar there does not go as far as a dollar here; but wherever we look we find that the Judges are receiving less in proportion to the other members of society in the Dominion than I think is fair or reasonable, or sufficient to enable them to maintain that position of self-respect which they ought to hold in relation to the public at large. What will be the result if matters remain as they are? Why, any vacancies that occur on the Bench will not be filled, as they ought, from the best men in the profession. The Bench will be degraded,

compared with the members of the Bar who appear before them, and this will be injurious to the administration of justice. For these reasons I beg to express my dissatisfaction with the resolution which the hon. First Minister has asked our concurrence in. I trust that my hon. friend will withdraw the seventh of these resolutions, which appears to me to be an unfair interference with the management of affairs in the Province of Ontario. At present, the Judges, besides receiving stated salaries, also receive travelling allowances. I submit that that indirect mode of remunerating the Judges is not a satisfactory mode of paying them. They ought to be paid their salaries as their salaries, and they ought not to be deriving incidental profit from their travelling allowances. By the seventh resolution, it is proposed that some of the Judges are to be deprived of these allowances, though they may be compelled by the Local Legislature to go on Circuit, and to incur expense in doing so. The object of the resolution is a good one, but I think that the Local Legislature should deal with it, and not this House. The object is that the Judges of the Court of Appeal should not go on Circuit, and the theory of the resolution is, that if they are not compensated for going on Circuit, they will not go. For these reasons, I trust that the seventh resolution will be withdrawn, and I should like to hear my hon. friend say that at an early day the subject of the salaries of Judges, both of the Superior and the County Courts, would receive the attention of the Government with the view to an increase. I quite agree with my hon. friend who has just addressed the Committee that the Superior Court Judges in Quebec and Montreal should be placed on exactly the same footing as the Judges of the Superior Courts in the Province from which I come. So far as I know, the Judges of that Province have as onerous duties to perform, and are as capable of performing them, as the Superior Court Judges of Ontario. I do not know whether that will apply, and I believe it does not apply with the same force to the outside judicial districts of the Province. As to that I have no knowledge, but as far as I do know of Quebec and Montreal, the Judges there ought to be placed in the same position as the Judges of the Superior Courts of Ontario.

Mr. BRECKEN. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's remarks. The position of the Judges in Prince Edward Island deserves an equal, if not a greater, amount of attention. The salary of our Chief Justice is only \$4,000; that of the Master of the Rolls, \$3,200; and that of the Vice-Chancellor, \$3,200. The business which falls to these three Judges occupies the whole of their time, and the cost of living in Prince Edward Island has increased 30 to 40 per cent. This is not owing to the National Policy; and I may say I would like to see the cost of living increased still further, as it will be when we have reciprocity with the United States. I may tell my hon. friend the patriotism of the people of Prince Edward Island is such that they would be willing to pay increased prices for their bread and butter, if the general prospects would thereby be enhanced. Our Vice-Chancellor, who has discharged the duties of Judge to the satisfaction of the entire community, and against whose integrity there is not the slightest suspicion, was obliged, owing to the miserable salary he received, to fill the office for many years of President of the Prince Edward Island Bank, and was further obliged to fill the position of President of the Board of the Charlottetown Steam Navigation Company, of which I have been myself a director for many years. A year ago he retired from the presidency of the bank, but remained one of the Board of Directors, and it was during his supervision of that bank that the bank got into trouble. He was in one way responsible for this. At least, he was above suspicion, the only blame that could be attached to the Board being that they were not sufficiently diligent in watching the course of their officers. Here, therefore, was one of our

Mr. McCARTHY.

Judges brought into court and subjected to a very severe and undignified examination, and compelled to go through this ordeal, all owing to the miserable salary he receives, although he is a man of unquestionable integrity. Again, our Master of the Rolls is a man of independent means, one of the wealthiest men in our Province, and it is on that account alone he has been able to give his valuable services to the discharge of his duties as Judge; but I may say his salary does not cover his annual expenses, although he is not an extravagant man. I tell you, our Chief Justice, who is now an old man, and was, for many years, leader of the Bar in our Province, can barely make both ends meet, though very economical in the management of his domestic affairs. That is not the position in which our Judges should be placed. My right hon. friend is not responsible for this. A few years ago our Chief Justice received a smaller salary than to-day, and our Puisné Judges received smaller salaries. It was I who raised my voice in this House against this injustice three years ago, and it was then, when the Department of Justice was administered by our able and respected friend, now the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, that these increases were made. If there is one feature in the political reputation of my right hon. friend for which he gets credit on both sides of the House it is this: That no statesman in this country has been more careful to secure to Canada an independent judiciary than he, and I have no doubt that the Judges in our little Province will be placed in that independent position to which they are entitled.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In considering this question we must not forget the public who pay. The remarks of the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe may be correct as regards the putting of the Judges on a footing of equality in the two Provinces; but apart from that we must bear in mind that not long ago we raised the salaries of our Judges to such a point, I think, as is sufficient to enable them to live comfortably and not extravagant. If there is a class of citizens who should set the example of moderation and frugality it is the highest class. Because insurance agents and bank managers pile up money and live extravagantly, it is no reason why we should imitate them. I would like to see ourselves revert to the old economical customs of our fathers, and I know I will be backed by the people when I say they ought to be the guide of this or any other Government in the country. Now what are the salaries paid to men who accomplish the same duties in other countries? It has been said that when Judges are elected they are poorly paid, and that the administration of justice is weak and inefficient. Sir, the fact is the very reverse. I have had occasion personally to meet many of the Judges in the United States, and I say they are the very best men in the country. Now, what are their salaries? The Judges of the Supreme Court receive \$10,000 a year, which certainly, in a city like Washington, and occupying the high social position they do, is not a high salary. That is the only court in the United States, with the exception of two States, where the salaries equal those paid in Canada. In California, where the cost of living is very high, Judges receive a salary of \$7,500; and in Louisiana the Chief Justice receives \$7,500 a year, while the Puisné Judges have only \$2,000 a year. In the other States the salaries range from \$2,500 to \$4,000, rarely to \$4,500, and that in a very wealthy country like the United States. Certainly we ought to see that our Judges are well paid, but we ought not to give them the means of living extravagantly, nor to cut a great dash with the money we pay them. I think a Judge would be quite as well respected if he did not drive a fine pair of horses, or give balls; a Judge is respected when he gives good judgment and attends faithfully to his duties. I would also remark that the seven Cabinet Ministers of the United States, who conduct all the Federal business, are paid

**\$8,000 a year.** We have twice that number of Ministers who receive the same salary. Perhaps hereafter we may have a Minister of Foreign Affairs, a Minister of War, and others. I wish it to be understood that I am in favor of giving the Judges a sufficient salary, not more nor less, and after we have settled upon their salaries we ought to abide by it, and I think the salary fixed three or four years ago is quite sufficient.

**Mr. CURRAN.** Although a member of the profession myself, yet, as I have the honor of representing a very large commercial and manufacturing centre, I think it my duty to add a few words in reply to the observations which have been given by the first and second speakers to-day in regard to the salaries of our Judges. I think it is the feeling of the commercial and manufacturing communities in this country that the Judges in our large centres do not receive adequate remuneration for their services. I think that the Bench is no longer considered a prize by those who occupy a high position at the Bar, and that it is desirable that the salaries of the Judges should be increased so as to enable them to occupy worthily the high position they hold in society, despite the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and which have, no doubt, been made with a view to manufacture political capital in some county constituencies at some future election. Not to repeat what has already been said, I may simply make this remark, that at the time the salaries of Judges were fixed the duties of Judges were far from being as onerous, far from being as responsible as they are to-day. The great expansion of commerce, the great industries that have sprung up, our powerful telegraph and railway companies, have brought before our courts suits of immense importance; and I think it is only just that men who have to deal with millions in a single suit should receive salaries which would enable them to live as gentlemen, and to be beyond suspicion of being approachable; and I may remark in this connection that we have good reason to be proud of the high character of our Bench, and to put full confidence in those who occupy it, and certainly those gentlemen ought to be remunerated according to their talent and to the high position they occupy in society.

**Mr. DAVIES.** I quite agree with those hon. gentlemen who contend that the Judges should receive just such salaries as will enable the Government to draw the best talent from the Bar; I do not agree with those who contend that Judges are bound necessarily to be paid salaries which would enable them to live in a style befitting their high social position. I think we have struck the right test when we have to pay them such a sum as will draw from the Bar its best talent. Whether this is the result in Ontario and Quebec, I cannot say; but, so far as my own Province is concerned, I merely desire to say this: That we are peculiarly circumstanced there, and our Judges are paid about \$1,500 a year less than Judges who perform similar duties in the neighboring Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I have no hesitation in endorsing what my hon. colleague has said as to the increased cost of living in the Island—and I fear that state of things will continue if this Government remains in power for the next fifty-five years, as one of their friends has predicted; but I will go further than that, and say that with the present salaries paid to Judges, we do not get the best talent at the Bar, nor anything like it, and the Judges who are paid these salaries have to resort to outside means in obtaining a living, which is not creditable to the Judges themselves, or to the Bar, and is not conducive to the interests of justice. I hope that when the hon. gentleman does remodel the salaries paid to Judges, he will see to it that a Judge in Prince Edward Island, who has equal abilities to a Judge in Nova Scotia in the discharge of his duties, shall be paid at least the same salary.

**Mr. LANDRY (Translation).** Mr. Chairman, if I correctly understand the resolutions which are now before the House, they have not in view an increase in the salary of the Judges, and I cordially endorse them. A moment ago I heard an opinion expressed that we ought to increase the salaries of Judges resident in cities and not those living in the rural districts. I think if it ever becomes necessary to introduce resolutions as above, such a distinction will not be made. The greater part of our Judges residing in the rural districts are obliged very often to go to the cities, and to hear and try cases, and, therefore, are city as well as County Judges. My hon. friend the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), remarked a moment ago that it was necessary to return to the customs of our ancestors. I think if we returned to these customs, instead of coming to Ottawa by railway we would have to go on foot; instead of coming in here spurred and booted, as we notice some of our colleagues at times entering this House, they would appear in a much more primitive costume. The hon. member is wrong in giving us information about the United States, which is not taken from official documents, but from little almanacks which are given to little children, who buy a bottle of the good Samaritan, St. Jacob's Oil or Soothing Syrup. The hon. member is wrong in giving these documents as official, and the statistics which he furnishes should not receive at our hands more consideration than they merit. In conclusion, I think that the resolutions now before the House, inasmuch as they do not increase in any manner the salaries of the Judges, should receive our support, and when the time comes, if ever, to introduce new resolutions, they will be so rendered as to give justice and satisfaction to all.

**Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).** I regret that the discussion of this question has been confined to members of the profession, from which it might be supposed that lawyers only were interested in it, and that they were guided by selfish motives. That remark cannot apply to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), because unfortunately for himself, from the present position of political parties in this country, he can hardly anticipate within his lifetime, I presume, to be invited to take a seat on the Bench. He is, therefore, free from any motive of that kind, and, perhaps, that may indirectly account for the fact that the view taken by the hon. gentleman is totally different from that taken by other speakers. He says, in his opinion, Judges should not receive salaries sufficient to enable them to drive horses. He is selfish in that view, for we find him daily on horseback, and I regret very much that the other day he was thrown from his horse—I hope that is not attributable to bad riding on his part. But if the hon. gentleman was fortunately in that pecuniary position which enabled him to ride on horseback every day, surely he should be willing to allow Judges to be paid salaries to enable them to take equestrian exercise, if they consider it necessary for their health. The hon. gentleman referred to salaries paid to Judges in the United States, and the statement he made, was, according to my recollection and present information, somewhat erroneous and misleading. He quoted the salary paid to the Judges of the Supreme Court at Washington, at \$10,000, which, I believe, is correct; he also referred to the salaries paid Judges of Louisiana, but he did not refer to any other States of the Union. From my information, I think that the salaries paid to Judges of the highest courts in New York State are from \$10,000 to \$12,000; and that larger salaries are paid in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and most of the leading States than are paid to Judges in any part of the Dominion. But I do think the reference to the United States was a fortunate one, because every one who has had an opportunity of mixing much in American business and legal circles must have, over and over again, heard complaints that the salaries paid the

Judges there were not sufficient to secure the best legal talent. We constantly hear complaints of the unsatisfactory character of trials there, arising, in a great measure, from the want of impartiality on the part of the Judges; and the statement is constantly heard that the usual course for a leading railway or business man to adopt is to begin by buying a Judge. I think it is essential that our Judges should be placed in a position where not only they cannot be bought—which, thank God, is the case in the whole of this Dominion—but where there cannot be suggested the probability of their being bought. Until adequate and sufficient salaries are paid to the Judges of this country to obtain the very best talent, which the present salaries are not sufficient to procure, we cannot expect to have the Bench filled with the best men in the profession, who are willing to accept that position. It will necessarily result in this: That vacancies must hereafter be filled either by the old men, who are willing to be placed in comparative retirement at a period of life when they have ceased to be thoroughly qualified to perform the duties of Judges; or vacancies must be filled by young men without experience, and who have not attained such a professional position as would enable them to make the ordinary average income of leading members of the Bar. With the remarks of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as to Judges salaries in Ontario, I entirely concur; and I agree with him in the expression of regret that the leader of the House has not felt himself able, on the present occasion, to come forward with a measure that will meet the undoubted desire which exists, I think, not only in the profession, but among the public at large, that the salaries of the Judges should be increased. As I said at the outset, I would have been glad to have heard something said by the laymen of the House, because, so far as I know public opinion, there is a desire even in the country districts, to have the salaries of the Superior Court Judges in Ontario increased. I have no doubt the same feeling prevails in other Provinces. I am aware from many communications with gentlemen in Montreal, that it certainly exists there, and the general opinion among the commercial and business classes, is that the Judges in that city are not adequately remunerated. I will be glad to hear laymen speak on the subject, because, as a matter of course, a personal motive will be assigned to professional men, and whether they are open to the charge or not, they will be subjected to it, that they are advocating an increase in the salaries, because they think at some future day they may possibly occupy Judges positions themselves. There are no doubt some of us about whom such remarks will be made; but the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is far beyond any temptation to accept a Judgeship, at all events at the salaries paid them at present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of my brethren of the Bar and members of this House as to the deficiency of the amount of salaries paid to the Judges. Those remarks would have had greater relevancy if there was a proposition before the House to raise the salaries of the Judges, because as such increases come from the public Treasury they require justification as to the reasonableness of the amounts proposed. This, however, is not the object of either of these resolutions. However, as the matter has been mooted, I will say that a strong feeling exists in the Province of Ontario that the Judges of the Superior Courts are insufficiently paid, and that in the future the present salaries will not command the best talent for the Bench. Hitherto, I believe, they have been sufficient, and I think the present state of the Bench, the standing of the gentlemen composing the Bench, shows that the salaries were, at all events, sufficient to induce them at the time to accept office. There is a feeling among the Bench and Bar in Ontario that the incomes

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

of leading counsel have so much increased in consequence of the increased wealth of the country, that the salaries at present paid to the Judges are insufficient to induce leading counsel to retire to the quiet and dignity of the Bench. I believe, also, the same feeling prevailed in the city of Montreal, among the professional and commercial classes there, that the Judges are not sufficiently remunerated to secure the best talent for the Bench. I do not hear the same complaint from other parts of the Dominion, except to-day, when it was mentioned by hon. members from the Province of Prince Edward Island. The difficulty the Government have in dealing with this question is, that the moment they deal with the salaries of the Judges in any one Province, there arises a corresponding demand, although the same necessity may not exist, from all the other Provinces. This is the difficulty which the Government felt, and this together with other circumstances of a temporary nature, with which I need not trouble the Committee, prevented the Government coming down with any measure during the present Session. They must carefully consider not only the position of the Bench in Ontario and the district of Montreal, but the position of the Bench in all the Provinces, and reasonable requirements; and this forces the Government, whenever it deals with this question, to consider the whole question as affecting the Bench of the various Provinces. With reference to the Province of Ontario, a similar demand is made for the increase of the salaries of the County Judges, who are very numerous. That also will be taken into consideration. In answer to the suggestions of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) I will say that the Government intend to address themselves during Recess with the view of studying the pressure and the reasons of the pressure that exists in the Province of Ontario and Montreal, that is brought to bear on the Government in this relation, and will come down with some general scheme at the next Session. I will, however, say one thing more: That I think the Prince Edward Island Judges ought not to complain so very much, because it was not so very long since it came into the Union, and I think that the salary of the Chief Justice before it came into the Union was £100 sterling.

Mr. DAVIES. It was £600.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. £400 currency; and it was raised to \$3,000, which is a very considerable advance within ten years. The Government will, as I have already said, be ready to consider the matter, and are prepared to consider the matter. My hon. friend and colleague the hon. Minister of Justice has directed special attention to that subject for some time, but has not been really able yet to work out a scheme which he could submit to Parliament. However, if he is spared, and the Government lasts until next Session, we will be prepared to submit a measure on this question for the consideration of the House.

Mr. BRECKEN. Will the right hon. gentleman allow me one moment. I think that, as the law now stands, there is no provision for the superannuation of our Judges.

Mr. BLAKE. It is provided for in this clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the remarks of my hon. friend opposite regarding the appointment of Chief Justice to the Court of Appeal. Of course at times the Chief Justice or the Chancellor, or the head of the court, may linger too long, the veteran may linger superfluous on the stage; but if that happens it is known, and no Government would transfer a Chief Justice because he was worn out, the head of one court, and put him into the other court, when it was no advantage to him in point of salary, and would be an injustice in the public interests. This resolution provides for the contingency of a retired Judge, evidently and obviously in full possession of



his judgment and faculties, and who from age is not so rigorous and active a Judge in the courts of first instance as to go on Circuit, which is the fatiguing operation, and to stand the every day worry of a Justice in first instance, but who may have within their judgment sufficient vigor and health to give a sufficient portion of his time to act as an efficient Judge of the Court of Appeal. We all know that this is the practice in England, where retired Judges are taken and made members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and where retired Judges from India are made members of that Committee. Some of the best Judges we have had in the Judicial Committee have been retired Judges, such as Sir James Caldwell, and Sir Barnes Peacock. Innumerable others have been transferred, in the full plenitude of their judgment, though not of physical strength, to the Court of Appeal, which should be simply a Court of Appeal in my opinion. There they are not subject to be pressed continually, and are not obliged to decide on motions summarily, nor to undergo the continual worry of long and fatiguing jury trials, &c., but to hear arguments in matters of appeal. They have plenty of time to form their judgments on these matters in appeal, and bring to the Bench all their matured judgment for that purpose. At the same time I readily agree with the hon. gentleman, that there may be cases where an inefficient Judge is transferred from one court to another. The worst that could happen in such a case would be that an inefficient Judge would be put into court, while his place would be supplied, I suppose, by an efficient Judge as Chief Justice or Chancellor; but the responsibility of the Government of the day would be very great if they transplanted an inefficient and worn out Judge from one court to the other, when he should be pressed, if he should be worn out, to accept a superannuation. I move the adoption of the second resolution.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I was very glad to hear the right hon. the First Minister say that the Government intended, at another Session, to bring down a Bill for equalization, as I understood him, of the salaries of the Judges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the equalization, but the readjustment.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I trust that it will tend towards equalization as far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. Readjustment means increase.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Well, I am satisfied. I know the mind of legal profession who come here from Nova Scotia, of the members who represent the different constituencies from there, who are members of the legal profession. One of them happens to be in the Chair as Chairman of this Committee (Mr. Richey); the other member for Halifax (Mr. Daley) is troubled with a very bad cold, so that he cannot raise his voice at all, and my hon. friend from Cape Breton seems to be out of the House at the moment. However, I am sure that I am expressing their views, which I know very well, when I say that there are no Judges in the Dominion of Canada that are harder worked, and who have harder work, than the Judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. They are obliged to live in the city of Halifax by law, and everybody knows, who has lived in the city of Halifax, and who has been there for any length of time, that there is no city, perhaps, in the Dominion where the cost of living is greater—or, perhaps, as great. It is a naval station, and as such a great many visitors from the Old World come there; a large number of Her Majesty's ships lie there for the most of the year, and entertainment has to be given by the Judges to the notable persons who come there from abroad. When the cost of living is taken into consideration, and they have to keep up the dignity of their office, they had better stay

at the Bar, and practice at the Bar, than take seats on the Bench. The late Minister of Justice, then the hon. James McDonald, now the Chief Justice of the Province, I think got a salary as Minister of Justice, of \$7,000. He was placed in the position of Chief Justice, and has a salary of \$5,000; and yet he has more to do to keep up the position of his office now, than he had when he was in Ottawa, and Minister of Justice. This is really an injustice to the late hon. Minister of Justice, to place him in that position. The Judges are at work constantly, on Circuit or *in Banc* at Halifax, and yet the salaries of their respective offices are not at all sufficient to keep up the dignity of their positions. I am quite sure that the members of the legal profession, on both sides of the House, and the laymen, are as much interested as the members of the legal profession in seeing the dignity of this office kept up—

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. And wish that these men should not get the starvation salaries which they are now receiving. I have heard it said—but I do not believe it can be seriously said—that because the profession in Ontario is more lucrative than it is in Nova Scotia, that, therefore, the Judges, who are made out of this profession, and elevated from the profession of law, should not receive equal salaries where the grade of office is the same. I do not think that there is any force in that argument at all. They have to go to the same fountains for their law. They have to make the same searches to base their legal opinions upon. They have to go back to the same sources of information that any barrister or any lawyer in Ontario would have to do, except as concerns the Statutes of the different Provinces, which, of course, are different; but I am now speaking of the principles of common law and of precedents. They have to go back to the same authorities, and it might just as well be urged that their salaries should be less than the salaries of corresponding Judges in Ontario, or of any other profession in the Dominion, as to say that because the profession is not as lucrative there, that there is not as much gained from it, or of income from it, as to say that a Minister from Nova Scotia should not receive the same salary as the other Ministers. But we all know that no matter from what Province the Minister comes he receives the same salary as the others, excepting, of course, the Prime Minister. If the argument were true it follows that a Minister from Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, or Manitoba, or British Columbia, would have to take a lower salary, give fewer dinners, live at home and bring his lunch here, or take his tea at a second-rate boarding house. I am reminded by one of the ablest members of this House, and a former Minister, that we have as good material in the Lower Provinces as elsewhere—perhaps better, though the hon. gentleman's modesty did not allow him to say so. I am sure the leader of the Opposition, who is known to be at the head of the Bar of his own Province—and justly so from his eminent ability and high legal attainments—will not refuse to equalize the salaries, as I understand that is to be the result of the consultation between the hon. First Minister and himself. I am sure that from his *esprit de corps* he would not favor giving a brother member of the profession who might be elevated to a Judgeship, a starvation salary, while his brother Judges are placed at a higher figure.

Mr. BLAKE. Both inside and outside of this House, I have always advocated the principle which has been supported by the hon. member for Queen's county (Mr. Woodworth), that we owe it to the country and to the highest interests of the State to have the salaries of the Judges at such a point as will secure men in the first rank of the Bar—I do not say the very first men, because you cannot always get the first men at any salary—but men in the first rank. I do not advocate the equalization because circum-

stances may be different; but I advocate, in each Province, such a salary as may be necessary for that purpose. I am sorry to hear of the state of things in Nova Scotia. I know that six out of seven Judges who adorn the Bench of that Province have been appointed within the space of seven years, and three of them within about two years. I believe these appointments were all of them from amongst the leading men of that Province, and that they were the best men who could have been chosen. I am sorry that the terrible sacrifice which the hon. gentleman has described was forced upon them. I am sorry that they were obliged to make such an immolation of themselves upon the altar of their country, that he has described in his affecting account of their condition, and I hope that between now and next Session no such calamity may occur as a vacancy in the Bench of Nova Scotia, because I am sure my hon. friend will be utterly unable to fill it:

Mr. WOODWORTH. If rumour be true—and I do not always believe it—the hon. member who has just spoken and who was Minister of Justice in the late Government, had no such complaint from Nova Scotia, and was not under the necessity of forcing a Judgeship upon anybody. Indeed, I think it was he who was approached, and that many telegrams and letters and so on were written, to which he yielded, and he got some of the very best material that could possibly be got for the Bench. But he must not take these instances as proof of the general conduct of the Bar to get on the Bench. In the case of the last three Judges, I know that these appointments were offered to the gentlemen who now fill them without solicitation, and were almost forced upon them from the very circumstances of the case. This is true, as members of the profession know, at Halifax and other parts of the Province.

On Resolution 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase of one under this item in accordance with the Act of last Session. If the hon. gentleman looks at the last paragraph of this resolution he will find that there are two Puisné Judges with salaries of \$3,500 each. At present there are three, and it is proposed to have these two do the work now done by three, so it will be a saving of \$3,500, leaving on the whole an increase of \$1,500 for one additional Judge at Montreal.

On Resolution 5,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a great want of another County Judge in the eastern district of Manitoba, who is provided for by the local law, and there is a great pressure that he should be appointed at once. The salary is the same as the present County Judge. There is a printer's mistake in the third line of the fifth Resolution. Instead of \$2,500, it should be \$2,400.

On Resolution 7,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This resolution is that from and after the 1st of July, 1883, no travelling or circuit allowances shall be paid to the Judges of the Court of Appeal for Ontario. That, by some error, does not carry out the intention of the hon. Minister of Justice; therefore, I move that it be made from the 1st of July, 1884. We provide the salary, and if the allowance is part of the salary, we should have something to say about it. I know the hon. gentleman opposite held that opinion very strongly when he held that we should supervise the action of the Local Legislatures in appointing new Judges, that as the salaries come out of the Dominion Treasury, the Local Legislatures have no motive in limiting the number of Judges. Being myself strongly of the opinion that the Judges of the Court of Appeal should not go on Circuit, and learning from leading members of the Bar that the business of the Court of Appeal has been allowed to get into arrears, because the Judges of that court went on Circuit, I think it is well that

Mr. BLAKE.

the opinion of the Federal Parliament, which votes the money, should be known on the point. But in order to prevent any immediate discomfort or surprise to the Judges of the Court of Appeal, the hon. Minister of Justice intended that the resolution should not come into effect until the 1st of July, 1884. If there be, as I am satisfied there will be, if no accident arises, comprehensive legislation on this subject next Session, this clause may never come into operation.

Mr. BLAKE. I feel bound to observe that this resolution makes positive provision—delayed in its operation certainly; but if the contingency which the hon. gentleman refers to does not take place, will be put into operation—for a reduction in the salaries of the Judges in the Court of Appeal. It is well known that the Circuit allowances are not consumed on circuits, and considering that very inadequate salaries are at present received by the Judges, it can hardly be wondered at that the Circuit allowances are to a certain extent economised, and this resolution provides practically for cutting off \$400 or \$500 of the existing salaries of the Judges of the Court of Appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so; but I think the hon. gentleman will agree in the opinion that if the salaries of the Judges of the Court of Appeal are insufficient, the proper course would be to increase them and keep the Judges in their court; that even if we did not add to the salaries of the other Judges, the Judges of Appeal should get an additional salary in lieu of the Circuit allowances they give up.

Resolutions reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 134) to provide for the salaries, superannuation, and travelling expenses of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.

Bill read the first time.

#### MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that on Monday next the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:

That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to raise by debentures in the manner prescribed by the Act 36th Vict., chap. 60, (except as to the rate of interest which shall not exceed 4 per cent. per annum), a further sum not exceeding \$900,000, to be advanced to and applied by the Montreal Harbor Commissioners from time to time, in meeting the expenses to be incurred by them in completing the dredging and deepening of the ship channel of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, to the depth of 27½ feet at low water; subject to the payment by the said Commissioners to the Receiver-General of interest on the sums so raised and advanced, at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum: Provided that the said Commissioners shall not commence the said work unless nor until the Governor in Council shall be satisfied by such examination and report as shall be deemed sufficient, that the said work can be completed for a sum not exceeding that above mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

#### FIRST READINGS.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 135) relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in the Province of Prince Edward Island.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Law respecting Lotteries.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 342,

For purchase of building and property situated on the east side of the Rideau Canal Basin, required for Military Store purposes at Ottawa ..... \$8,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. This vote is inaccurate. The purchase price is \$11,000, not \$8,000, the difference, \$3,000, being

rent due the Government; and I do not see there was any proper valuation of this property before purchase. The vote should be for \$11,000, and the \$3,000 be placed to the credit of the Ordnance Department for rent received.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring down a supplementary vote for \$3,000.

On Resolution 366,

Canals..... \$251,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring down, on Monday, the information which I suppose he possesses on the proposed enlargement of the Williamsburgh Canal. These proposals came down somewhat late in the Supplementary Estimates, and I have had no opportunity of communicating with any localities, or receiving that information I would like in order intelligently to discuss them. But I have received information which I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of answering, relating to this matter. It is stated that Mr. Page had always objected to the extension of the pier for the purpose of forcing more water into the canal, because it is not necessary in order to raise the water in the canal, as the canal will fall to the full capacity of the locks at present, and that it will increase the head-fall for certain manufacturing companies. Of course, I know nothing about the matter, but having received that suggestion I thought it due to himself to inform the hon. gentleman of it, and to ask him to bring down the report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the report and the estimate were submitted at the instance, and on the advice, of the Chief Engineer of Canals. I will bring down the report.

On Resolution 336,

Collection of Revenue—Excise..... \$1,815 02

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to two of these votes, payments of the claims of P. Durnford and R. Bellemare, \$636.67 each, the hon. Minister was good enough to hand me papers which we have perused. I am unfortunately unable to agree with the papers which are there, although there may be statements which are deserving of consideration. But the Head of the Department, who was in charge of it during all these years, does not seem to have been consulted, although he must have rejected, or advised the rejection of, claims upon former occasions. I can only repeat my opinion, that claims so old as these, fifteen years old, ought not to be voted except upon the clearest evidence. My own view of the evidence is that it is not such as to warrant the payment of this money.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving the consideration of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the resolution respecting subsidies to certain railway companies therein mentioned, said: In presenting papers in connection with railway matters, I will take this opportunity of laying on the Table a copy of a letter to which the hon. gentleman made allusion. It will be seen that what purported to be this letter was a garbled version, and that it was not correctly stated in the newspaper from which the hon. gentleman read. The letter was as follows:—

“OTTAWA, February 24th, 1883.

“MY DEAR SIR,—Mr. Starke, C. E., has returned, but has not yet had time to complete his report respecting the Napanee Railway. I am satisfied, however, that a very strong case will be made by him for assistance to that railway, and as soon as the Estimates for this Session are taken up, I will submit an appropriation for the favorable consideration of the Government.

“Yours faithfully,  
“CHARLES TUPPER.

“ALEXANDER HENRY, Esq., Napanee.”

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved to strike out the words “Miramichi Valley” and insert the words “Northern and Western,” as the name of the company had been changed from the former to the latter by a recent Act of the New Brunswick Legislature.

Amendment agreed to; and Resolution reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 137) to authorize the granting of subsidies for the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Bill read the first time.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY AMENDMENT ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment:

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend the clause transferring Provincial railways to the legislative jurisdiction of the Parliament, by striking out the general provisions affecting independent lines intersecting or touching other railways; and the provision affecting lines hereafter chartered by a Provincial Legislature.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

- |                     |                   |                        |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Armstrong,          | Fisher,           | Mulock,                |
| Auger,              | Forbes,           | Paterson (Brant),      |
| Bain,               | Gillmor,          | Pickard,               |
| Béchar, d,          | Gunn,             | Platt,                 |
| Bernier,            | Harley,           | Rinfret,               |
| Blake,              | Innes,            | Robertson (Shelburne), |
| Bourassa,           | Irvine,           | Ross (Middlesex),      |
| Burpee (Sunbury),   | Keefer,           | Somerville (Brant),    |
| Campbell (Renfrew), | Kirk,             | Somerville (Bruce),    |
| Casey,              | Landerkin,        | Springer,              |
| Caugrain,           | Lister,           | Sutherland (Oxford),   |
| Catudal,            | McMillan (Huron), | Thompson,              |
| Davies,             | McCraney,         | Trow, and              |
| Fairbank,           | McIntyre,         | Vail.—42.              |

NAYS:

Messieurs

- |                      |                                    |                       |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Allison,             | Dugas,                             | McMillan (Vaudreuil), |
| Amyot,               | Dundas,                            | McCarthy,             |
| Baker (Missisquoi),  | Dupont,                            | McDougald,            |
| Beaty,               | Farrow,                            | McNeill,              |
| Benoit,              | Ferguson (Welland),                | Mitchell,             |
| Benson,              | Fortin,                            | Montplaisir,          |
| Billy,               | Foster,                            | Orton,                |
| Blanchet,            | Fréchette,                         | Paint,                |
| Blondeau,            | Gigault,                           | Patterson (Essex),    |
| Bowell,              | Girouard (Kent),                   | Pinsonneault,         |
| Brecken,             | Grandbois,                         | Pope,                 |
| Cameron (Inverness), | Guilbault,                         | Reid,                 |
| Campbell (Victoria), | Guillet,                           | Richy,                |
| Carling,             | Hackett,                           | Robertson (Hamilton), |
| Cimon,               | Hall,                              | Robertson (Hastings), |
| Cochrane,            | Hawkins,                           | Shakespeare,          |
| Colby,               | Hay,                               | Small,                |
| Costigan,            | Jamieson,                          | Tassé,                |
| Coughlin,            | Kinney,                            | Taylor,               |
| Coursol,             | Kranz,                             | Tilley,               |
| Curran,              | Landry,                            | Wallace (York),       |
| Cuthbert,            | Langevin,                          | White (Hastings),     |
| Daly,                | Lesage,                            | Williams,             |
| Desaulniers,         | Macdonald (King's),                | Wood (Brockville),    |
| Dickinson,           | Macdonald (Sir John),              | Woodworth, and        |
| Dodd,                | McDonald (Cape Breton Wright).—78. |                       |

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the Bill be read the third time?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was arranged last night that the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Pembroke should be put in the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it was understood that it was to be inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. It was to be framed properly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have done so.

Mr. BLAKE. You have made it as harmless as possible, I hope.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not undertake the responsibility of it. I move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to; and Bill reommitted, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think I neglected to state, when I moved the resolutions relating to the expenditure on Lake St. Peter, that the assent of the Crown had been given to them.

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

#### After Recess.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 132) respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors and the issuing of licenses therefor, said: The objects of this Bill are accurately prescribed in the preamble, which I will read:

"Whereas it is desirable to regulate the traffic in the sale of intoxicating liquors, and it is expedient that the law respecting the same should be uniform throughout the Dominion, and that provision should be made in regard thereto for the better preservation of peace and order."

The Bill, as the House knows, is the result of a report of a Special Committee appointed by this House to consider this all-important question. While the subject was before the Committee the general line of the Bill, of course, became known to the public more or less through the newspapers, and the Government has received an infinity of representations, some complaining of the undue stringency of the measure, and others, especially the Licensed Victuallers, desiring some alterations and modifications in some of the clauses of the Bill, as they regarded it as unduly oppressing on their branch of the trade. All these matters will be fully discussed in the Committee I have no doubt. The general system is this: That in each license-district, which districts are specified in the Bill, there shall be a Board of three License Commissioners. The first Commissioner shall be: In the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, the County Court Judge, or the Junior Judge of the County, as may be selected by the Governor in Council; in the Province of Quebec, the Superior Court Judge of the Judicial District, and in the Judicial Districts of Quebec and Montreal, such one of the Judges as the Governor may appoint, except in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, where he shall be the Judge of the Sessions of the Peace; in the Province of British Columbia, such one of the Judges as the Governor in Council may appoint. I may say *en passant* that I have received some representations from the Province of Quebec, pointing out some practical difficulties in getting a Judge to be a member of the Commission. They have not the County Court system, as it is understood in the other Provinces, and it is alleged that the jurisdiction of the Superior Court Judges is over such a large area that it would include several, and, perhaps, in some cases, many districts, and that, perhaps, they might not be available. But it has been suggested to me by an hon. member that if you want to get independent men, men of standing and of position in those cases where Superior Court Judges are not available, the Registrar of Deeds, who is an officer holding office during good behavior, might be appointed as a substitute, but of course that will be a matter for discussion in the Committee. The second Commissioner shall be the Warden of the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

county or Mayor of the city. When there is both a Warden and a Mayor, having jurisdiction within the license district, the former shall be second Commissioner. In the cities of Montreal and Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, the Recorder, and in the Province of Prince Edward Island, the Sheriff of the county shall be the second Commissioner, inasmuch as they have not a municipal system as is known and obtains in the other Provinces. Then as this is a Government measure, and the Government are responsible for the carrying out of the objects stated in the preamble, it is proposed that the Government shall have the appointment of one Commissioner who shall hold office during good behavior. This is the governing board which rules the whole system, the whole plan of license regulations, the whole plan of restrictions, the whole plan of punishment. The Inspectors who are to act as the executive under this quasi-legislative body of Commissioners are to be appointed by the Commissioners. The Commissioners being an independent body, being a body of which two members are quite independent of any Government influence or supposed Government influence, it is thought better that the Inspector should be appointed by such a Board, rather than directly by the Government, as in other places, and should act under their general direction. As will be seen by the Bill, the license fee is nominal, the object of the Bill not being for revenue purposes or the increase of the revenue, but for the purposes of good government and the regulation of this trade. Though it is not expressed in the Bill, perhaps it will be provided during the progress through Committee, that, so far as we have the right to assert it, the right of the Provincial Governments shall be asserted to make such legislation as to all such licenses as may be necessary in order to bring in revenue for Provincial, local or municipal purposes. These are the principles of the Bill, and the rest of the measure consists of the machinery. The gentlemen who composed the Special Committee were carefully selected from the different Provinces. There has been, of course, a necessity for a good deal of give and take, because people are very naturally inclined to prefer the system to which they are accustomed, and which has been in force in their own Provinces. Of course, as with every new measure, time will show its imperfections, and it will be the pleasant duty of the Legislature, from time to time, as experience shows the necessity of it, to correct any errors in detail which may be revealed. With these few remarks, I shall move the second reading. Unfortunately, I am not in that state of health to be able to discuss this matter at great length at present, but I have no doubt I shall be ably assisted in the discussion by hon. members on both sides.

Mr. BLAKE. We have now arrived at the hundredth day, I think, of the Session; and it is a curious commentary on what might be supposed to be the improved condition of public business which would be presented by an Administration which had just been invigorated by contact with their source of power, the people, that we should have arrived at that stage of the Session before it is proposed to read for the second time a measure which was promised in the Speech from the Throne as one of the most important measures of the Government. We have already heard of the fate of the other two measures of importance which were promised to us. In order that hon. members may appreciate what the circumstances are under which we are called upon to legislate at this time on this important matter, and remembering that it is only a day or two since the Bill was printed and distributed, and that we have had but that brief period for the consideration of its clauses, I would just draw attention to the duration of our Sessions for some years back. The Session of 1874 lasted 62 days, the Session of 1875, 68 days, the Session of 1876, 63 days, the Session of 1877, 80 days, the Session of 1878, 93 days, the Session of 1879, 84 days, the Session of 1880, 80 days, the Session of

1880-81, 103 days, and the Session of 1882, 98 days. I need not remind those who were members of the late House that the Session 1880-81 was the Session in which the Pacific Railway Contract came under discussion, when we met before Christmas, had a Christmas Recess, and resumed afterwards; and we are now within three days of the duration of that Session. Taking the whole of these Sessions together, the average is under eighty-one days. Taking the last four Sessions together, including that exceptional Session, the average is ninety-three days. Omitting the exceptional Session, the average is eighty-nine days, and we are now called upon to discuss the measure on the hundredth day. The hon. gentleman announced to us in the Speech from the Throne, that this measure was a necessity forced upon the Administration by a decision which had been given some six or eight months previous. No step was taken to carry out the view expressed in the Speech from the Throne until the 16th of March, some few weeks or more after the commencement of the Session, when the hon. gentleman moved the reference of the whole subject to a Select Committee. I need hardly point out, Sir, that had that been the course originally designed to be pursued in reference to this measure, the hon. gentleman would have—ought to have—moved for his Select Committee immediately, so that its labors might have been prosecuted and its results arrived at and submitted to this House within a reasonable space. But, as I said, no step was taken until the 16th of March, when the Committee was moved. Now, Sir, I do not know in what manner, and with what amplitude of discussion, legislation upon this important question of licensing, involving, as it does, so many considerations of various descriptions and so much matter of detail, has been conducted in the Legislatures of the other Provinces than that from which I come; but I do know that in that Province a License Bill, even an amendment to a License Bill, embracing a few particulars, has always been understood to be a measure likely to give rise, and has always justified the expectation that it would give rise, to very ample discussion. That is natural in a measure of that description; and it is the more to be regretted that we should be called upon at this stage to legislate in this regard, because we labor under difficulties very much greater in respect to such legislation, than any Provincial Legislature possibly can in dealing with the legislation of its own Province, because we have to deal with the legislation of the different Provinces, and to consider how far it is possible, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, to harmonize the various views, ideas, and opinions which have been in vogue in the different Provinces, and the various laws to which the people have been accustomed, in one mould, in such a way as to suit us all. I do not propose, at this time, to enter upon a rediscussion of the positions I took at the earliest stage at which it was possible to take them on this matter. It will, I believe—particularly after the announcement of the hon. gentleman that an infinitude of suggestions have been made to the Administration on behalf of various interests, and that improvements will be submitted for the consideration of the Committee, arising out of these suggestions—be for the convenience of the House that I should interpose as little as possible until the Administration can announce these improvements which they propose to make. I am inclined to believe, Sir, that the discussions which have taken place, and the difficulties which have been evolved, have indicated the importance of the view which has been pressed from this side of the House upon the attention of the Government and the House, that this question, above all questions, is one eminently of a local character, and one to be dealt with by the Local Legislatures. But I shall not enlarge upon that either, convinced as I am that we shall advance a decision upon that, as well as upon other points, by as rapidly as possible getting into Committee, so as to

understand what it is proposed to do with this Bill. Its merits shall ultimately depend, as it is submitted to this House not upon the form in which it at present appears, but upon the form into which the hon. gentleman will propose to mould it. Maintaining, therefore, the objections which I have expressed to the House on a former occasion as to the impropriety of our interfering at all at this stage with this question; maintaining the position that if there be a doubt cast, as there has been, by a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, upon the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, the best interests of the Dominion and the spirit of our Constitution would be best consulted, not by our legislating here, but by taking steps to remove that doubt. I shall not interpose longer between the House and the question, but proceed to facilitate the giving of that information at once which I had thought the hon. gentleman would give on the second reading, as to the alterations which he proposes to make in the measure.

Bill read the second time on a division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, said: I would suggest, in order to expedite the Bill as much as possible, that we should take the clauses as to which there is no dispute, and leave over those on which there may be discussion.

Mr. BLAKE. Some of these clauses may be depending on the other clauses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not take up any of the depending clauses.

Mr. BLAKE. We must know what the disputed clauses are first. You cannot deal with the clauses in that way.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to add in the eleventh line after "shall" the words: "unless such interpretation be repugnant to the subject or inconsistent with the text," then the word "board" should come before "district" so as to get it in alphabetical order. It will be found in the third enumerated clause of the interpretation.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This provides:

Nothing in this Act shall apply: 1. To manufacturers of native wines from grapes grown and produced in Canada, and who sell such wines in quantities of not less than one gallon or two bottles, if not less than three half-pints each, at one time at the place of manufacture.

2. To any person who holds a license as auctioneer, selling liquor at public auction in quantities of not less than two gallons at any one time.

3. To any person selling liquor in any refreshment room at the Senate or House of Commons, or the Legislative Council or House of Assembly of any of the Provinces, by the permission and under the control of the Senate, House of Commons, Legislative Council or House of Assembly respectively.

Mr. BLAKE. As we are passing a most stringent law to the rest of the world, why should we permit anybody to sell here?

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not give permission.

Mr. BLAKE. It recognizes the principle of permission.

Mr. FORBES. With reference to the first sub-section, if it would be well to do something which would prevent drinking on the premises, we should insert the words, "not to be drunk on the premises."

Mr. BLAKE. Does that apply to the liquor or the man?

Mr. FORBES. The one follows the other.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why is an auctioneer to be exempted from the restriction of this Act?

Mr. McCARTHY. He holds a license as auctioneer.

Mr. BLAKE. From the local authorities—but local licenses to sell liquors, it cannot be possible.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It is absurd to allow an auctioneer to sell at not less than two gallons. It will give him an opportunity to distribute liquors among those attending the auction in order to induce them to rush business.

Mr. McCARTHY. An auctioneer has frequently to sell general goods, amongst them general liquors, and it would be absurd, because he may happen once in twelve months to be called on to sell liquors that he should have to take out a liquor license. He is not permitted to sell in quantities less than two gallons.

Mr. McMULLEN. Supposing a grocer, who has no license, employs an auctioneer to sell for him twice a year. He may sell a large quantity of liquor that way, and allow his customer to take it away in half a gallon at a time. The customer can plead that he bought that under the auctioneer's hammer, and can remove it when he likes.

On section 5,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think the fourth sub-section should be omitted, which says that in the event of a tie the chairman shall have an additional or casting vote. As there are only three Commissioners, assuming they are all present, there never could be a tie. If there are only two present and they differ, I think they should be required to let the subject lie over until the third Commissioner was present. It seems to me improper to give one man the votes when on any special occasion one of the Commissioners happens to be absent.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not agree with my hon. friend. The scheme of the Bill is that these Commissioners should form a court to hear applicants for, and complaints against, the granting of a license in open court. If, from any cause, one of the three is unable to attend, through sickness or otherwise, it would practically render it impossible for the court to adjourn the matter. I see no great objection to a Judge, in a case where a Judge sits, having a casting vote.

Mr. CAMERON. I have a strong opinion on the subject and should like to take the sense of the Committee. It seems to me, in a tribunal composed of only three members, absurd to give one of them two votes in the case of the absence of a third; if there is a difference of opinion there can be no great detriment in letting the matter lie over until the third one is present. I move that sub-section four of section five be omitted from the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Judge be one of the two Commissioners sitting in the absence of a third, it would be very inconvenient for the Judge to go back, more especially if, as in some of the Provinces, he may have to attend from a long distance. In the Maritime Provinces and Quebec one Judge sits for more than one county, and possibly may have to sit on two or three License Boards.

Mr. CAMERON. If the matter was of such importance that the two Commissioners could not agree, they could do their ordinary business and wait until the third one was present.

Mr. AUGER. Have we a right to force an officer, acting under authority of the Local Legislature, to act on this Board? The Warden is an officer of the Local Legislature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; he is elected by the people.

Mr. AUGER. Yes, but he acts under Provincial laws. He is elected by the people, but that election takes place by virtue of a Provincial law. Suppose he refuses to act?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).

Mr. HALL. That refers to a subject to which I intended to call the attention of the Committee, and not only to the case of one of these persons refusing to act, but also to the case of the death or absence of one of those consenting to act. There should be some provision for filling vacancies caused either by refusal to act or by absence or death. I quite agree with the suggestion that a Judge of the Superior Court in Quebec ought not to be pressed to act as Commissioner on this Board. I think the Government should retain a certain discretionary power in making appointments. It would not be wise to enact that the Registrar in any case should be selected as the Chairman of the Board. I can easily conceive a case where a Judge might decline to act, and where the Registrar might not be a suitable person; and I would suggest that in the Province of Quebec a discretion should be allowed to the Governor in Council to select either a Judge, if the Judge is willing to act, or the District Magistrate in those counties where a District Magistrate resides, or the Registrar acting in the county. The Government then could exercise a wise choice in filling vacancies.

Mr. CURRAN. A suggestion has been made that the Prothonotary, of whom there is only one in each judicial district, should be the person selected instead of a Judge of a Superior Court, or even the Registrar. In judicial districts there are frequently several Registrars, and the Government in making a second appointment would have to decide which Registrar it should be. Therefore the Prothonotary, who is invariably a man of education and standing, would be an excellent officer in that respect. There is another small change that would need to be made, in Section a where the Judge of the Sessions of the Peace is referred to. In the city of Montreal there are two Judges of the Sessions, while there is only one in Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill provides that one of the members of the Board should be the Judge of the county. We know that the electoral districts and the counties do not correspond. The Judge must be Judge of a county of which no part of the district, if it be an electoral district, is composed. The same observation applies to the provision as to the Warden of the county. The Warden of which county is to be president of the Board?

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no necessity for having a license district for every electoral district. Take the county of York in which there are several electoral districts, one Licensing Board would be quite sufficient for the whole county—I do not mean including Toronto—and so with respect to other counties.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is it not a mistake to appoint a Judge as one of the Commissioners. We hear many complaints about Judges being overworked, and having many duties to discharge. They have to revise voters' lists, do Surrogate Court work, and discharge other duties; and, besides, I notice by this Bill a Commissioner is disqualified, if a Justice of the Peace, to sit on any license trial. A Judge who may be one of these Commissioners, may have a case on appeal tried before him. He will then be sitting on the trial of a person whom he has licensed to sell intoxicating liquors. He will therefore be called on to act in two capacities, which is in violation of the principles of the Bill, and it will be a mistake to overload the Judges with extra duties. I do not think, moreover, it will add to the dignity and influence of the Bench to be so overloaded with these duties, and the Judges are not exceedingly anxious to have these duties imposed on them. I do not mean to say that the Judges are not competent to discharge the duties, for they are very well qualified, if they have time and opportunity, and the circumstances would permit them, to attend to these duties. But there are other officers of high standing and good

repute, such as Sheriffs and Registrars, whose duties are not so onerous as those of the Judges, on whom this task could be imposed,—and I would prefer the Registrar to the Sheriff. His time is more at his own disposal, and it would not be at all in conflict with the high position of trust which he occupies, that this additional responsibility should be imposed upon him. I do not object to the Judges *per se*, but on the ground that they have many other duties to perform, and, further, that they would necessarily be brought into conflict with those parties as License Commissioners, which might, to a certain extent, interfere with the freedom of action of the Judges when called on to exercise their judicial functions.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** It is most desirable that the Judge should be one of the Commissioners. What we wish to secure is an impartial tribunal, a court which will give to a man a license because he is entitled to it, not because of his politics, and which will refuse licenses in the same manner. I know no person more competent to discharge that duty and who will reflect more credit on the Board of License Commissioners, than the County Judge, and therefore I would like the principle carried out in all the Provinces, and I trust our friends from Quebec will bear this in mind. In outside districts of that Province, I understand, the Judges although Judges of the Superior Court, do not perform duties very dissimilar from those performed by the County Court Judges of Ontario. I have also heard it said that they are not overworked; and, therefore, I hope the hon. members from Quebec will be willing that, outside of the great centres of the Province, Quebec and Montreal, the Judges of the Superior Court shall be appointed Commissioners. In the Province of Ontario, at all events, I think it would be a great misfortune if the Committee should substitute any person for the County Judge.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I cannot sympathize with the view that it is any degradation to a Judge to accept the office of License Commissioner, which is one of the highest possible consequence to the community. It is quite true that, as regards Election trials, they are open to suspicion of partiality, and so forth; but that has to be met. The office of Commissioner, being one of very high importance and responsibility, I do not sympathize with the view that County Court Judges of Ontario will be degraded by performing the duty. One of the Superior Court Judges of Ontario voluntarily accepted the office of License Commissioner there, and held it for three years; and although it was a very laborious and unthankful task, I believe very considerable good was accomplished in the locality where he discharged the duties of the office. I cannot, therefore, at all agree with the sentiment or view which has been expressed upon that part of the subject. At the same time I must say that I received this morning a letter from a gentleman who has considerable knowledge of the working of the License Law of Ontario, who stated that while it is quite correct that the Judge would be a very proper person to be one of the Board, it had been found in practice that the Board has a good deal to do with directing the instituting of prosecution, not personally, but in connection with the Inspector. They obtain information as to whether the Inspector is slack in the performance of his duties, and people tell them that prosecutions should be instituted against different parties. The machinery is worked through the Licensing Board; and if that is the way this law will be worked, if the Commissioners will have to do, though not by formal order, but still practically with the institution of prosecution, I must say a Judge, if he has afterwards to take appeals, will be placed in a very invidious position.

**Mr. HALL.** It is true, unfortunately, that the Judges of the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec are obliged to perform the duties imposed on County Court Judges in the Province of Ontario, but these are not their primary duties.

They occupy, in the first place, the position of the highest Judges of our Province; and hon. members from Ontario would be unwilling, I think, to see the Judges of the highest Court of that Province placed in the position of License Commissioners, for that will be the result if they consent to accept those positions. That is the position these Judges occupy in Quebec, and I say, first, on the point of dignity, and secondly, because these duties are added to their other duties, thereby increasing their work, these additional duties should not be imposed on them. Therefore, as regards Quebec, the Committee will see the force of the request which is unanimously made by hon. members from that Province, that our Superior Court Judges should not be asked to take that position. I therefore move:

That in place of the words "Superior Court Judge of the Judicial District" in the seventh line of the first sub-section, the words "District Magistrate, Prothonotary or Registrar holding office in such License District as may be selected by the Governor General in Council," be adopted.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** I do not think it is any degradation to the highest Judges of the land to sit on a Board of this kind. This Board is formed for the purpose of establishing order, and regulating and restricting the excessive use of intoxicating liquors. It is a duty connected with the general idea of what a Judge should be—to endeavor by his example, and by putting the law in force, to conduce to good government and good morals. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) just said, it is not considered a degradation in Toronto for a Judge, and an eminent Judge in the Court of Chancery to sit of his own choice as a License Commissioner of Ontario—and I believe a most successful and active Commissioner. I should be sorry that it should be said it was an infringement of the dignity of any man, however high in official or other rank, or in personal rank, to sit on a Board of such a valuable and efficient character as this; and I would be very sorry also to see any additional power thrown upon the Government in this selection of Commissioners. I think that the Government ought to have one man there. As they are responsible for this legislation they are responsible for its being carried out, as they establish the licenses and license fees, and therefore they must see that such an important portion of the machinery and of local administration should be carried out. They cannot shake off this responsibility, and therefore they should have one person, but only for that purpose—for that reason; otherwise I would be very glad to see the whole Board of Commissioners appointed independent of the Government. If, however, they are not only to have the appointment of their own man, but also the selection of half-a-dozen men, they, in fact, control the Board, and then what would be the consequence—all kinds of political insinuations would be used that the particular selection of a particular individual had been made for political reasons, in order to get control of the Board. I hope that my hon. friend will not press this just now. I hope that he will allow it to pass as it is at present. I intend, as I said a while ago, with the consent of the Committee and of the House, to give every opportunity to hear what hon. members of both sides have to say on an important measure of this kind, and to deal with it in the widest possible spirit of united action in order to produce a good Bill. Whatever may be thought by any hon. gentleman as to the expediency of bringing in the Bill, the bringing in of which the House has sanctioned and which is certain to become law, I invite hon. gentlemen on both sides to go in earnestly in making it as good a Bill as possible, reserving their own opinions as much as they please as to the expediency of introducing the Bill at all; and with that view, I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion just now. Hereafter opportunity will be given hon.

gentlemen to move for reconsideration on these important points; and this is an important difficulty, because it affects the successful working of the Bill in the Province of Quebec. As regards the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria, I think that, on the whole, we had better accept his suggestion. They are inconveniences, certainly, which my hon. friend who sits near me (Mr. McCarthy) pointed out, and business may be obstructed by the absence of one of the Commissioners. This is one of the few cases where there is such a condition of things; but they can be postponed until these parties can be got together; and, therefore, I shall move to have this struck out. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not press his motion in amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON. I feel strongly in favor of retaining the provision for the appointment of County Court Judges. I was a Chairman of a Board of License Commissioners for several years, and perhaps I can give some idea as to the labor which is involved in the discharge of these duties. I think that perhaps half-a-dozen hours in a year would be sufficient—at least that is the result of my experience.

Mr. HALL. As we understand that the matter is to be referred to again, of course I accept the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman and will not press my motion. I think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion made by him, that it would not be wise to trouble the Government with a selection from a number of different persons, and, therefore, to meet that view, I am willing to strike out the names of all the officials with the exception of the Prothonotary—who is an official of high standing—to remove that difficulty. Even as to that, however, I am willing to defer it for the present for further consideration. I think, however, we should not pass over this branch of the subject without consideration of the retention by the Government of the power of filling vacancies, if any occur.

Mr. AMYOT. It must be well understood that the Province of Quebec is unanimous in demanding that the Registrars should be substituted for the Judges. We want it; and I do not see why the Bill should be passed otherwise.

Mr. AUGER. I rise to say that we are not unanimous, because I think that the Judge is the proper person for this position. As to the Prothonotary the member for Montreal Centre said that by appointing the Prothonotary there would be no trouble about the Registrar, as there was only one, but in the District of Bedford we have two Prothonotaries.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister's observations, in moving the second reading of the Bill, had the merit of brevity, but not in the definition of this clause, of accuracy, because he stated that the Commission appointed by the clause was to hold office during good behavior, whereas I find that it is for one year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. You said during good behaviour.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not intend to say so. It was a *lapsus*. I read the clause as it stood.

Mr. VAIL. Can the Governor in Council make two districts of one county, as in our Province some counties are divided into separate municipalities?

Mr. BLAKE. It is not elastic enough for that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it is.

Mr. BLAKE. You cannot under the Bill take two counties and make one district out of them.

Mr. GIGAULT. In the Province of Quebec, the Judge chosen as one of the Commissioners, has to go through three or four counties in a district. The meetings of the Board take place in March, when he would have to visit three counties to attend the meetings. In some districts, there are five counties, and if the suggestion of the member for

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Victoria is accepted, I am sure that in our Province, the Judge will be absent from the meeting in some counties, and it will be almost impossible to obtain some decisions as to the granting of licenses. I think that this sub-section four is absolutely necessary, chiefly in the Province of Quebec, because the Judge has there to visit many counties.

Mr. CURRAN. I do not think that the last objection holds. If we retain Judges of the Superior Court, the sittings of the different Boards can be arranged and each particular Board can meet at a fixed time, so that one will not interfere with another. My idea in suggesting a Prothonotary was merely this: that it met to a very great extent the idea of the leader of the Opposition with regard to persons having proper relation to the other members of the Board and community at large. In most judicial districts of the Province of Quebec, in the country parts, the Prothonotary is at the same time Clerk of the Peace and Clerk of the Crown, and gives him the position that has been suggested as the proper one for that office. However, I take this opportunity to say that there is no such thing as unanimity among the members from the Province of Quebec, that the Judge of the Superior Court should be set aside. We would prefer, if possible, Prothonotaries, but no decided principle is at stake.

Mr. BLAKE. The measure seems to be declared inadvertently with reference to the second Commissioner, to be without due regard to the condition of things in Nova Scotia, where many counties are divided into more than one municipality, into two municipalities; and according to the municipal system there, there is a Warden for each municipality, and no county Warden. Take Queen's, there is one Warden; Shelburne has two districts, Barington and Shelburne each having a Warden; the county of Guysborough is the same, and also Digby and Hants, as I am told, so that when you say you will make the district coterminous with either the county or the electoral district, and you find two Wardens in the county, now which is king?

Mr. LANDRY. I think the nomination of Judges for this office in the Province of Quebec will be impossible. If you take our electoral or judicial districts, there are five or six counties, L'Islet, Montmagny, Bellechasse, part of Levis, Dorchester, and Beauce, and the Judge would be compelled to assist in the criminal court so that he could not be available. He would be a member of six Boards during that time.

Mr. RICHEY. With reference to the observations made by my hon. friend opposite, I suppose it could be arranged so that where there are two Wardens, one of the Wardens might be appointed.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you would have a Board consisting of different men for each district.

Mr. RICHEY. The Government in Council have the power reserved to them of defining the district.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it amounts to this: that there should be a division of the district smaller than the county, smaller than the electoral district, simply because you have two Wardens. In Ontario we have counties and electoral districts, with twelve or thirteen municipalities, and you are putting them all into one district. There must be some method of defining what Warden shall be a member unless the district is coterminous with the area over which there is a Warden.

Mr. RICHEY. The responsibility is thrown upon the Governor in Council of defining those districts, and they are to be as nearly as possible coterminous with the existing bounds of the county and electoral districts, and if this amendment is made so that either of the Wardens can be appointed, or the district is so divided as to include only one of the Wardens, the difficulty would be met.



Mr. BLAKE. It will be met by giving the Government the nomination of two members of the Board by one way, and in the other way it will be met by cutting up the license districts into a smaller form than is intended by the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards sub-section b, I propose to let that stand over.

Mr. AMYOT. We cannot allow that sub-section a to pass without putting in a protest. We do not want our Judges to be degraded by taking municipal offices. We are on our side unanimous on that point. The Government complains of the burden of nominating those officers. Let them take those who are nominated by the Local Governments, and they will be relieved of that duty. We have one Registrar in each county; why not take them? Why impose on the Judges the obligation of nominating these parties—of being pressed daily and nightly by the petitions of those who want licenses? We want our Judges to remain above the people. They occupy a high position, but that position has been lowered by making them Election Judges. That was a step too far, and we do not want to take another such step. I do not see why the Government, when we all ask that they should not be appointed, should press this system. The Registrars have in their hands the interests of ourselves and our families. They give ample securities for the faithful discharge of their duties, and why not appoint them? Is there some political interest?—some interest of any kind, which will force and press us to appoint them? Therefore, I ask the Government, in the name of my friends, and in my own name, not to press the nomination of the Judges to these positions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman was listening to what was said or he would not have made these remarks. He says the gentlemen from Lower Canada are unanimous, but some of them have risen to say that they do not agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. AMYOT. But he is a Grit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, in the second place, the hon. gentleman did not hear the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) taking an exception somewhat like the hon. gentleman has done, and though the clause has been adopted there will at the same time be afforded every opportunity for reconsideration before it goes through the Committee.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman explain why, in the counties of Chicoutimi, Saguenay, &c., the Government may appoint two Commissioners? I suppose it is on account of the size of the counties.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, that is the reason. It will be impossible for the Judge to perform the duties of the office in those large counties.

Mr. BLAKE. Although he resides in those districts?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be impossible for him to do so in the earlier seasons of the year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would ask the Government if it is the intention, in those counties in Ontario which extend over a large area of country, and comprise many municipalities, to divide them into districts, or allow the whole county to remain under the control of one Board of Commissioners? The county of Grey is a very large county. There are three ridings in it, and the distance from one end of the county to the other is very great; and if people from different parts of the county should be obliged to go to the place where the Board meets they would be put to a great deal of inconvenience and expense. Under the present system, the Boards are in the different districts, and no difficulty is experienced. I should like to ask the Government if it is

their intention to form districts uniform with the electoral districts as they now exist?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the Government can establish as license districts, either counties, electoral districts, or cities. If a county is too large, each electoral district may be made a license district.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the electoral districts are made license districts, who will be the Commissioners in them? The same Board as the county?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Judge, as I take it, will belong to the Board, and so will the Warden. The Government may appoint one or more Commissioners, if experience should require them. I have no doubt that the County Judges or the Superior Court Judges can make arrangements so that their ordinary judicial business will fit in with their license business. There need be no difficulty about that, and the Judges, I have no doubt, will gladly accept the appointment. It will be one means of giving them a substantial addition to their income; which is something. We have just had a discussion to-day that shows that in the Province of Ontario, even the Superior Court Judges think so much of the allowances they receive for going on Circuit, that they are very anxious to retain them. So I take it that the Judges will be very glad to accept this appointment. I do not mean to say from sordid considerations alone, although that is an element in all such matters, but from patriotic motives. I judge that they must be travelling over the electoral districts in their counties, so that they will be able to make their ordinary business work in with the special business.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's statement raises a new question altogether. I did not understand that these were to be paid officers. There is no provision in the Bill for their payment that I know of. I would ask if the hon. gentleman proposes to make the acceptance of these positions compulsory, because there is no penalty provided in the Bill? I would also ask, in case of a vacancy or of absence from any cause, whether he proposes to provide for a succession to a vacant office during the year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose to suggest a penalty just now, because I think it is quite out of the question to suppose that a Judge will refuse to accept; and if a Judge dies, his successor will be appointed. If a Warden dies, his successor will be elected.

Mr. BLAKE. Suppose a Warden declines to act, as I think it is very likely many will do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very likely, from what some of them have said.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I wish to ask if the hon. Minister has assurances that the Judges will accept. I have reason to believe that some of them will decline—not because they do not sympathize with the object of the Bill, but because they have already, to my personal knowledge, refused to act in a similar capacity.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Out of what fund are the salaries of the Inspectors to be paid?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the first place out of the fees, and possibly also from the penalties.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I would like to be informed whether Commissioners will be appointed in counties or districts where the Scott Act is in operation?

Mr. McCARTHY. Provision is made that where the Scott Act is in force there will still be Commissioners and Inspectors to see that the Scott Act is enforced.

Mr. BURPEE. In that case there will be no fund for the Inspectors.

Mr. McCARTHY. Unless from infractions of the law.

Mr. BRECKEN. I take it that there will be no duties for them to perform. While the Scott Act is in force this Act will be inoperative.

Mr. BLAKE. But if the Inspectors are to be appointed to see that the Scott Act is enforced they will not act unless they are paid.

Mr. BRECKEN. In the Province of Prince Edward Island the Scott Act is in force—nominally; and I can say that it has not had the desired effect that the advocates of temperance looked for. I think I am correct in saying that although the Act is in force from one end of the Island to the other, from all the information I can collect there is as much drinking as there was before the Act came into operation. I believe that in the town of Summerside alone, a small town of about 3,000 inhabitants, there are some thirteen places where intoxicating liquors are openly consumed; and I believe the effect of the Scott Act in Prince Edward Island has been to engender a feeling of disregard for the law, and to create deception and hypocrisy. It is true that the Act has been fairly brought into operation under the provisions of the law; but I believe that not one-half of the electors of the Island have recorded their votes, either against or in favor of the Act. The fact is there are many men, fathers of families and respectable men in society, who do not believe in the Scott Act, but at the same time have a feeling of reluctance about going to the public polls to vote in favor of the use of intoxicating liquors, when they remember the misery, the crime, and the trouble that flows from the too free use of that beverage. But I do not hesitate to say, from the experience we have had in Prince Edward Island, that the Scott Act has proved a failure. I may say that my partner in business is a stipendiary magistrate for the city of Charlottetown. I can say he has used every effort to carry out that Act strictly, by imposing fines as far as the provisions of the Act would permit. The advocates of teetotalism established a system of spies, but found it did not work, and I must say I do not believe the vice of intemperance has diminished in the Island, but that, on the contrary, the license law, or the system of local option, we had in operation before the Scott Act, worked much more efficiently in the cause of temperance. One of the effects of the Scott Act is, that respectable people who kept roadside inns, which were absolutely necessary for the accommodation of travellers, have left the business, and to-day you can travel distances of thirty or forty miles on the Island without finding a roadside inn at which you can water your horses or find shelter or receive a meal. Perhaps many who solicited me to return to Parliament may think I am going too far in expressing these views, but they are those I conscientiously hold and which are derived from an amount of information that few men in the Island have had an opportunity of obtaining. This Act will practically be unproductive in the Island. There will be no necessity to have Inspectors there, at any rate to supervise the carrying out of the machinery of the Act. From the experience we have had, I may say that whoever the Inspectors may be, whatever may be the mode of appointing them, whatever class of men they may be elected from, they will have a very difficult, if not impossible, duty in carrying out the Scott Act in its integrity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope we will not be drawn into a discussion of the merits of the Scott Act, but keep within the merits of the Macdonald Act.

Mr. FISHER. That portion of the remarks of the hon. gentleman which bear on the working of the Scott Act, is certainly to my mind, the strongest reason that could be adduced that this Act should also include those districts or

Mr. McCARTHY.

counties in which the Scott or Dunkin Act may be in force. It is very necessary that in those districts a Dominion law should be enforced by some Dominion officer, and I am glad to see that, at the end of this Bill, there are provisions by which it will come into force in those districts. When those provisions are before the Committee, I shall say a few words in reference to that matter; but certainly the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken are confirmatory of the necessity of the clause.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The question of the salary of the Inspectors is an important one inasmuch as it affects the success of the law when in operation. The last part of the clause says the salary of the Inspector shall be fixed by the Board, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. As the duties of an Inspector are considerable and he is invested with a great deal of responsibility, it is desirable provision should be made fixing his salary beyond doubt. If he is to depend on the fees he will be placed in a very invidious position. They are not much—\$5 on first application and \$10 subsequent, or \$15 in all for the granting of licenses, besides a share in the fines which contribute to the license fund. There is another point. The power given to the Board of Examiners of regulating the salary of the Inspector, subsequent to the approval of the Governor in Council, may involve a serious charge on the public treasury. Can the Government give us any idea as to what the salary will be?

Mr. BLAKE. I understand there can be no charge on the public Treasury, or the clause will be out of order. I understood it was simply a salary to come out of the funds provided by the Act. These are of two kinds: the fees for the issuing of licenses and the fines. The Inspector will be placed in an invidious position if his salary will depend on the number of persons fined. The whole *morale* of the Act will thus be shaken.

Mr. McCRAVEY. Where the Scott Act is in force and no fees coming to the Inspector, he will receive no salary, and I trust the hon. Minister will see that provision is made to meet this point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place this Bill will come into force the 1st January. The Government have not made any approximate calculation of the amount of fees, but between now and the 1st January it will be easy to ascertain the number of tavern licenses, for instance, that are issued, as well as the number of shop licenses that are likely to be issued, so that they can ascertain approximately what sum will be at the disposal of the Commissioners to pay expenses. If it is found insufficient, the Government would not hesitate to come to Parliament next Session—and I may here say, that in accordance with the anxious wish of the House, it is the intention of the Government, if possible, to meet not later than the 15th of January each year—so that we may be able, shortly after this Act comes into force, if there is not sufficient money to work it effectually, to come to Parliament and ask them to supplement any deficiency in that regard either by a direct vote, or by increasing the license fee. With respect to the observation of the hon. member for Halton, I quite agree with him, and the Government will take care that the whole machinery should be appointed in those sections of the country where the Scott Act is in force as well as elsewhere.

On section 7,

Mr. McCARTHY. This defines the number and the kind of licenses. They are divided into hotel, saloon, shop, vessel, and wholesale licenses, and the sub-sections of this section point out what the privileges conferred by these licenses are to be. Hotel and saloon licenses are the same, the only difference being in the accommodation. The shop license authorizes the licensee to dispose of his liquors, not to be drunk on the premises, differing in that respect from saloon

licenses. A vessel license permits the supply of liquors only at regular meal hours, and only to passengers. Then I may mention, that in order to carry out the provisions of the British North America Act, which permit the imposition of a duty or a tax upon licenses, I propose to add as a sub-section to this section seven, the following clause:—

All hotel, saloon and shop licenses, and such other of the licenses by this Act authorized to be issued, as to which a Provincial Legislature may impose a tax in order to the raising of a revenue, shall be subject to the payment of such duty as the Legislature of the Province, under the power conferred on it by the ninth enumerated class of subjects in section 92 of the British North America Act, may impose for the purpose or in order to raise a revenue for provincial, local, or municipal purposes.

In other words, the license shall authorize the sale of liquor in the manner pointed out, but in the event of the Local Legislature imposing a duty, the license shall be subject to the payment of that duty before it becomes operative.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest that the words "saloon licenses" should be struck out of the Bill altogether. By the present Ontario Act saloon licenses are not granted in incorporated villages, but by this Act they may be granted.

Mr. DAWSON. I think the clause with regard to vessel licenses is hardly strict enough. In the waters of Algoma steamers at one time used to sell liquor, but, fortunately, of late years they have given it up almost entirely. Although the law does not now prohibit them from selling liquor on board boats, still the owners in many cases find it to their advantage to do so. Fortunately, the Beatty's, who have a line of steamers running from Sarnia, are strict temperance men themselves, and they have adopted the principle of prohibiting the sale of liquor altogether on their boats, and with such good results that others have extended the principle to their lines also. I think this clause gives a little too much latitude. It says:

A "Vessel License" shall authorize the master of the vessel, being a vessel by which passengers are conveyed from one place to another within or beyond the Dominion, to sell or dispose of liquor during the passage of the vessel between such places, to any passenger on board such vessel: Provided always, that it shall not permit the selling, or disposing of any liquor, except at the regular meals served on board such vessel, and then only to actual passengers: and provided further, that it shall not authorize the opening or keeping of a bar or place on board such vessel, where liquors are sold or drunk.

The concluding paragraph I quite approve of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we can well proceed much further than this clause. It is a considerable advance on the Crooks Act. Here liquor is only to be sold to parties as a portion of their regular meals. Instead of being too easy a clause, a relaxing clause, it is really a restrictive clause, and so restrictive that there is a very strong protest entered against it by steamboat owners and licensed victuallers, and there is a good deal of force in their argument. The steamers carry immigrants, who, as a rule, do not sit down to table regularly, but carry their biscuits and sandwiches with them on board; and if a lot of English immigrants want a glass of beer at their dinner—and to them it is not dinner without beer—you ought to allow them to have it. Although a man may not sit down to table, if he takes a sandwich out of his pocket and commences to eat it that is a regular meal. The objection to the clause is that it is much more stringent than the Crooks Act and ought to be relaxed.

Mr. DAVIES. A difficulty arises here which will partially repeal the Scott Act in Prince Edward Island, where the Scott Act is in force in three counties. We have a large number of steamers engaged in carrying farmers to and from the city on market days. They pass out of the county, and if licenses are granted on these steamboats it will have a very bad effect on the passengers. That is the very time, above all others, when it is desirable that liquors should not be obtainable, and if licenses can be granted to allow the sale, under such circumstances, any benefit arising

from the existence of the Scott Act will be nullified. I do not know whether the Committee had Prince Edward Island in contemplation at the time they introduced this clause; but it certainly will act, to a certain extent, to repeal the Scott Act, and that in a very bad direction. When 100 or 200 passengers are returning home on a market day, and are on board one of the steamers from 6 o'clock to 12 o'clock at night, the effect of the vessel having a license will be very injurious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If a vessel leaves a port where the Scott Act is in force, they cannot sell within that locality. The moment they get away they are not bound by the law of the locality, and unless there is a clause of this kind providing for taking out a license, they can sell free, without restraint of any kind.

Mr. DAVIES. I refer to vessels going from one part of the county to another where the Scott Act is in force, the vessel being during its progress outside of the bounds of the county.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the case of a vessel going from one county in Prince Edward Island to another, or from Prince Edward Island to Westmoreland county. The license must be granted either in Westmoreland or Prince Edward Island; but all of those places are under the Scott Act, and it is a special provision that no license of any kind shall be granted. So they can obtain no license.

Mr. BRECKEN. This clause will not place us in a worse position than we are now. The Scott Act is in operation in the Island. But any man may import liquor in any quantity from any place where the Scott Act is not in operation. There is nothing to prevent the captain of a vessel, so soon as he gets beyond the jurisdiction of the county, from giving passengers as much liquor as he pleases under the law as it now stands.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. This Act only prohibits a license being granted within a county where the Scott Act is in force.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not see why, when passengers are on board a steamboat on a river, that they should not be able to go to a bar as if they were on land. It is allowed at meals; but we do not say how many meals there are to be, or how many drinks at a meal. It is perfectly absurd in limiting licenses on board of a vessel. There is no use in being bigots. We know perfectly well what is going on, and if you prevent an ordinary and well-regulated bar on board of a vessel you will have a bar in every state room. That will happen, so we had better allow a properly licensed bar on board of a vessel.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman want the passengers as well as the ship to be half-seas over?

Mr. AMYOT. I do not catch the meaning of the hon. gentleman; but I am ready to move an amendment asking that licenses on board of vessels have the same liberty as on land.

Mr. AUGER. I have been called a good Grit, but I approve of most of the Bill of the First Minister. I desire to call his attention to the following sub-section:—

An "hotel license" or "saloon license" shall authorize the licensee to sell and dispose of any liquors in quantities not exceeding one quart, which may be drunk in the hotel or saloon in which the same is sold.

This would place the licensee in a very awkward position. Suppose a man went there and obtained a quart of liquor, the proprietor could not prevent him from drinking it there. Having consumed the first quart he might buy another quart, and the proprietor could not refuse to allow him to drink it there. I would suggest that all the words after "quart" should be struck out, because, otherwise, the

licensee would not be able to keep order in his house. I think when the liquor is drank the man will be drunk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a clause which appears in all Acts of this kind?

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I desire to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this case, and members from New Brunswick will understand it. The county of St. John is not under the Scott Act. A steamer leaving St. John would pass through three or four counties up the river which are under the Scott Act; she might travel 120 miles up the river, and be under the Scott Act all the way to her destination. The vessel having obtained a license in the county of St. John, will those on board have liberty to sell liquor after they pass outside the boundaries of the county of St. John and through the counties where the Scott Act is in operation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think they will not have that liberty. They are within boundaries where the Scott Act is in force, and the Scott Act does not permit any license to be granted.

Mr. JAMIESON. I want to call attention to sub-sections *a* and *b*. It is not, I suppose, the intention to make this Act conform to the Crooks Act; but I desire to point out that the definition of hotel license in that Act is somewhat different from what it is here, and the definition of shop and hotel licenses in the Crooks Act is somewhat different from what it is here. This permits the sale of liquors in quantities not exceeding one quart, while in the Crooks Act, if I recollect aright, the quantity is less than one quart. Why the change should be made, I do not know.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is the difference?

Mr. JAMIESON. It may be said to be a distinction without a difference, but still there has been some object in placing it in the Crooks Act in that way; and I think it really ought to be amended. As far as shop licenses are concerned, in the Crooks Act holders are allowed to sell in quantities not less than three half-pints. I observe that here the quantity is reduced to one imperial pint. I confess I do not like the change; and I think we ought to adhere to the Ontario law. I do not know how the law is in other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman why the change was made?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was made at the suggestion of a member of the Committee, who thought that liquor ought to be sold in bottle this way, as it is put in bottles in that quantity, and that consequently it would not be improper to so authorize its sale. For instance, a pint of Bass' ale, a pint of claret, &c. It is not to be drunk on the premises, and there seems no particular reason why this should not be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Ale and claret are the principal liquors to be dealt with.

Mr. CASEY. This will prevent a man, holding a shop license, from selling an ordinary pint bottle.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is as near as we can get to it, at all events.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me, if the hon. gentleman framed a clause with reference to ale and claret, he was looking after the anise and cumin, and was not taking charge of the weightier matters of the law. It is the stronger liquors which are sold in different measures, and not with reference to imperial pints; and where a considerable diminution is thus made in the quality saleable under a shop license.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, there is not much difference; and the hon. gentleman knows that, whether wine, beer or spirits, they are now put up in Imperial quarts

Mr. AUGER.

and pints. The old provision in the Crooks Act relating to three pints means the old wine measure. This is not quite so large a quantity, but is considerably more than one pint, though less than three half wine pints; but it is a convenient measure both for wine, beer and spirits.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think that this facilitates or rather encourages the sale of small quantities in shops, which I think the Bill should not do. The Ontario law permits the sale of three half-pints; the Quebec, of one pint; Nova Scotia, one gallon; Prince Edward Island, one pint; and Manitoba, one quart; and in British Columbia, the quantity is defined by the Commissioners. I prefer the old law of the Province of Ontario certainly. It is nearer the average standard described by the various Provinces, and I think that it is a retrograde movement to allow so small a quantity as one pint to be sold in shops, encouraging the running to shops for a small bottle on every conceivable occasion, whereas a larger quantity would not be purchased so readily; and perhaps not so much would be drunk, if a larger quantity was the standard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In other words, we should not allow a person to buy a one-pint bottle of spirits, in a shop, but compel him to go to a tavern, where he can get it.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman will observe that under his Bill, a man has two chances for getting a pint bottle, while, in the other case, he can only get it at the tavern. Here he can get it at the tavern and shop both. I do not want two temptations to be presented, but only one temptation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that three half-pints are afterwards defined in the Crooks Act to be five quarter-pints; so we are fighting over one-quarter of a pint.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A small pint, that.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean anything else than an Imperial quart; one quart in *a* and one Imperial pint in *b* make it rather ambiguous. If he means the Imperial measure in both, he should put it so in both, or omit it in both.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the law in this respect applies to our standard of measurement, which is Imperial; and it must be meant, as it is the only legal measure. The quantity of three half-pints was stipulated before, I think, because ordinary bottles generally contained three half-pints; but the Imperial measure is twenty ounces in pints, and three and a half wine pints make twenty-four ounces; so there is only a difference of four ounces, and as bottles are usually now made to conform to the Imperial measure, I think it would be better to leave it as it is.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Committee saw the pint clearly. Really, none of the ordinary pint bottles contain an Imperial pint, and if the words "Imperial pint" are left in, it forces a man, who only wants to get a bottle, to buy two, or a quart, which holds about three half-pints. I do not think there would be any objection to altering it to a so-called pint bottle. There is no object in compelling a man to buy more liquor than he wants. If it is taken off the premises to be drunk, temperance men, at all events, ought to reduce the limit as far as possible, and not oblige a man to buy more than he really wishes. It will give rise to a great deal of difficulty if the words "imperial pint" are left in.

On sub-section *c*,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I desire to support the motion regarding this proviso. I think that instead of doing any good even to temperance, it will possibly do harm, if it

is left in. The result no doubt will be that instead of having drinking going on on steamboats confined to one place as now, at the bar, it will be spread all over the ship, into every state room, into the saloon, and into every place else. People who want to drink, and who now only buy a glass of liquor on steamers at meal hours, will, under this proviso, take a bottle with them, and drink in the state rooms, and in the public saloons, in the presence of ladies; and instead of benefiting the cause of temperance and propriety on board of steamers, it will do positive harm. Moreover, I think it will have another effect. If enforced I have very little doubt that on our lakes and on the St. Lawrence, for instance, where there is competition between American and Canadian steamers, if this rule is applied it would drive the great portion of summer travel, a very important element, and which now comes to a great extent through Canada, to the American steamers, where there is no such restriction. In every point of view I think the proviso should be admitted, and I shall support the amendment.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I trust the Committee will not consent to this amendment, for I think it would be a very great mistake to do so. I think experience should teach every hon. gentleman in this House to have a bar on steamboats is certainly a great nuisance, and an encouragement of intemperance to a very great extent. It would not perhaps matter so much if men when drinking would only behave themselves, but unfortunately they drink too much, and when they have drunk so much they scarcely know what they are doing. The result is that in the presence of ladies their conduct is certainly very unbecoming, and the language they use in the presence of ladies, on many occasions, is not fit to be heard. We have decided not to allow liquors to be sold in groceries, the reason being that ladies and children visit these establishments. I think the same rule should apply with regard to steamboats. On these boats there are usually as many ladies as gentlemen, and apart from that how many vessels have we heard of being wrecked or sunk and the passengers lost, and according to report on some occasions through intemperance by the captain himself, or other officers of the ship, becoming intoxicated after leaving port. Probably this would not occur if bars were not allowed on these boats. It seems to me it would not be a very great hardship for persons to abstain from drinking intoxicating liquors for a few hours. It is not very far from one port to another on these river boats, and if travellers were permitted to have intoxicating drinks at their meals that should be sufficient. This system has worked injuriously in the past and I have heard no argument to show that it will not work injuriously in the future.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B. C.) I am sorry to dissent from the views of my colleague (Mr. Shakespeare), but I have travelled pretty nearly all over the world in vessels, and I have never seen the master of a vessel drunk on board ship.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I have seen many of them.

Mr. BAKER. With all due deference to the hon. gentleman, I think I have had better opportunities of judging than he has. I suppose this clause is intended to apply to vessels trading on the lakes and rivers, because it stands to reason that once a vessel gets clear of the jurisdiction of Canada, gets outside one marine league, its officers can snap their fingers at the whole business and open a bar at their pleasure. I would like to see an amendment providing that the license should be issued to some person under the direction of the master. I do not like the idea of its being issued to him, so that a master mariner is permitted the privilege of peddling these drinks. I think this proviso should be eliminated from the clause, for there is really no good reason for putting it in, because if people want liquor they will get it. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron)

stated that it would be offering a premium to smuggle liquor into all sorts of places on board ship, so that instead of lessening the ill effects of intoxicating liquors on board ship it would have the contrary effect.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the Committee will not strike out that proviso unless better reasons are given than any which have been adduced so far. One reason given for striking it out, is, that if you do not allow people to go to the bar they will be drinking all over the ship. Another reason is that on our lines of competing travel the Americans have bars on board their vessels, and it is so nice for ladies and gentlemen on these pleasure trips to be where people are drinking, that they will patronize the boats which have the bars instead of the others. There are two things which have not been taken into account. A large majority of persons who drink do not start out with the set purpose of drinking so much as from this cause that they come in contact with constant temptation. One says to the other when they are just in sight of the place where they can get liquor: Let us have a drink; and one drink leads to another. You will find that probably five out of every ten persons who go on these excursions and who drink, would remain perfectly sober all day long but for the constant temptation, and they yield to the temptation by taking advantage of the facilities afforded them for getting liquor. There is another side to the question. I remember, not many months ago, that some very disgraceful and dangerous circumstances took place on a vessel plying between Toronto and Niagara, where large numbers being on the excursion, and the bar being open, persons got drunk, some very disgraceful scenes took place, and the passengers were in the utmost danger. I hope this clause will not be eliminated of what I think is its chief virtue. It may be said in amplification of this, that where you have not bars you take away the possibilities of those who are navigating the vessel, those who have the management of it, and the crew from being in a position to be tempted now and then, and so becoming unfit to manage the vessel. You will find that the great steamship companies which ply between the Old Country and the new, have every year, more and more of them, been cutting off the supply of grog to their crews; and the Cunard, one of the largest and best, has followed in the track of the others. I think there now remains but few of the large lines of ocean steamers that have not adopted that principle, and they adopt it on the ground of safety, rather than another ground.

Mr. CURRAN. I think the great object, with regard to this and every other clause, should be to make it practicable. Now, it is stated here that liquor shall not be sold except at the regular meals served on board such vessels. How is that law going to be enforced? Suppose they keep a table on the vessel, and people sit down to take a meal whenever they feel disposed, is there anything in this law that says that a man shall not eat more than twice or more than three times a day? He can sit down and take his meal as often as he likes.

Mr. BLAKE. I think there is something in the observation of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker). I do not know what is customary, but it does seem to me that it would not be at all a bad thing if some person other than the master of a vessel should serve the liquor to the passengers at their meals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that would do. The master of the ship would escape the responsibility.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section d,

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Why reduce the quantity to be sold by wholesale to two gallons? In the old Statute, the minimum is five gallons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two gallons is better.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it better?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason is this: that if a person wants a supply for his own house, it is better that he should go to a wholesale house where there would be no chance of tippling, as it is alleged there is sometimes in a retail store, and where he would get better and cheaper liquor.

On section 8,

Mr. McCARTHY. This clause is copied from the Ontario Act, and it provides under the authority of what Board licenses shall issue.

Mr. ROSS. If a license is issued to a vessel from any port to which the vessel calls, it will be good for the whole voyage, although she may go into a district where the Scott Act is in force.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the clause declaring that this Act shall not prevent the operation of the Scott Act, will prevent liquor from being sold in a Scott Act territory.

On section 9,

Mr. McCARTHY. This is to give power to the License Commissioners to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining a license, to limit the number of hotel, saloon, and shop licenses within the maximum prescribed by the Act, to declare the number of licenses that may be issued in any year, and to regulate the hotels, saloons, and shops to be licensed.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). This provides for the defining of the conditions and qualifications requisite to obtain hotel licenses. Why not saloon licenses as well?

Mr. McCARTHY. We will add the words "or saloon."

Mr. CASEY. Are the Commissioners to be allowed to prescribe additional conditions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; not contrary to or inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In limiting the number of licenses, are hotels and saloons to be equally considered?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; the Board will decide that so many hotels and so many saloons will be allowed, or no hotels or no saloons.

On section 10,

Mr. BLAKE. Clause 9 provides the Board of License Commissioners may at any time before the 1st of May in each year pass resolutions for regulating and determining the qualifications and so forth. Clause 10 says the Board shall meet some day in the month of March, for the purpose of taking into consideration all applications for licenses. Should not the regulations be determined and made known before considering the applications? The applicants ought to know what conditions and qualifications the Commissioners may impose before making their application, and the Inspector should know them also, so as to make a proper report. The inhabitants of any locality should also know how many licenses will be granted in their locality, so that they may have a voice in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman puts a strong case, and we will hold clauses 9 and 10 over to settle the point.

Mr. AUGER. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to one feature in section ten. It says the Board shall meet "some day in the month of March." In Quebec the Wardens are elected on the second Wednesday of the month of March, and if the meeting of the Board in the Province of Quebec could be held after that date, there would be a new Warden. This license question interests the public generally, and very likely the election of the  
Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

Warden might turn on that question. If the meeting of the Board for granting licenses took place after the second Wednesday in March, then there would be a new Warden.

Mr. McCARTHY. Practically that must be so, because the meeting cannot take place until after the 14th March.

On section 13,

Mr. McCARTHY. This section requires the applicant for hotel, saloon, or shop license, when he himself has not already had a license, or where he is applying for premises that have not been already licensed, to obtain a certificate signed by one-fourth—but the Committee made that to one-third; one-fourth is a misprint—of the electors in a particular polling sub-division in which the house is situated; that is, he must obtain one-third of the electors in order to be entitled to have his case considered before the Board.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would suggest that we insert the word "resident" before the word "electors." Those who are resident in the district are those who are particularly interested in the issuing or non-issuing of licenses, and I see that the Bill is framed with a view to meet the wishes of those who will be affected by the issue of licenses. There are quite a number of non-resident electors, and this point should be considered.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that as the Bill has been printed and distributed with the words "one-fourth" in, it ought to stand that way, because those interested in the matter have had the Bill before them with that number in it. It seems to me that one-fourth is an adequate number to require the applicant for license to obtain the signatures of.

Mr. BLAKE. It is certainly an extraordinary reason why we should keep it at one-fourth because a mistake has been made in printing the words "one-fourth." I suppose it would be a very much stronger reason for not making any change in the Bill in any respect in which the intention of the Committee has been carried out, if the hon. gentleman says that because a mistake has been made in the printing of the Bill, therefore it should stand.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member has mistaken and perverted what I said. I said because it had been published in that way, not because the mistake had been made.

Mr. ORTON. I would ask if there is any provision for granting licenses after the 1st of March, as clause 12 states every petition shall be filed on or before the 1st of March. There are many reasons why some provision should be made for granting licenses after that date, particularly in new counties.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice by this clause that all who at present have licenses on making their application, on the coming into force of this Act, are exempted from getting the signatures of one-third of the electors. Now, if one-third of the electors are to exercise a controlling power over the issuing of the license, I think they should have control over the existing licenses as well as the new ones. The very same regulations should apply to all licenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the licensee is a licensee under this Act, and not a party who has held a license under some other law.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what it should be in my opinion but on reading over the clause I was not sure it was so.

Mr. McCARTHY. We intended that those already licensed and able to obtain the Inspector's certificate, should not be put to the trouble of securing that certificate; but that those who never had a license, and whose houses had never been licensed, should obtain the certificate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be out of the question to require old-established hotels to get certificates of good character. This Bill will come into force

on 1st of January, and applications for licenses will not be considered until March. If this clause was not inserted, or one to the same effect, the Rossin or Queen's at Toronto, and the Windsor hotel at Montreal, would be shut up. From 1st January to 1st May, there would not be a single licensed house in the country open, and all those in the trade would be compelled to commence *de novo*.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That has nothing to do with this provision. The simple question is, whether in an application for a license under this Act, in the first instance, you will regard the license which has been issued under another law altogether as a license under the meaning of this clause; or whether you will require everyone to furnish this certificate of the willingness of the proportion of the electors named to the applicants obtaining licenses. It is perfectly clear that if the latter view is not the correct one, this Act will not be efficacious, and will not apply to ninety-nine out of one hundred of the licenses to be issued under this Act until after the lapse of a number of years when the old licensees will have retired from business and new parties will have come in. As I have said, ninety-nine out of one hundred of the licensees will escape the operation of this clause by the interpretation which, to my surprise, the hon. gentleman has placed on it.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** It must be remembered that all licenses have been granted under some form of Licensing Board. In Ontario, for example, they have been granted by a Licensing Board. It is true objection has been taken to the Board's action, but not by members on the hon. gentleman's side of the House, but the objection taken was not on the ground urged by him. There has been some decision given by a Licensing Board in regard to the qualification of the parties and with respect to the houses to be licensed. A change having been rendered necessary by the decision given in the case of Russell and the Queen, why should all the people carrying on business, having proved, under the Provincial laws to be proper persons, be compelled to undergo the trouble of securing certificates of character. It does not seem to be reasonable, and although it was discussed in Committee I thought the members were almost unanimous in their decision, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman did not so understand it.

**Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).** If that was the intention of the Committee it seems to me that such words as "under any existing Provincial license law" should be inserted, because the clause, as it now stands, would apply to everyone.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That is my reading of the clause.

**Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).** This Act was passed on the theory that the existing system of licenses is illegal; consequently this word "licensee" should mean a licensee under this Act.

**Mr. BLAKE.** It is now made clear that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) was right as to what the effect of the clause was.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** It was my fault; I intended it the other way.

**Mr. FOSTER.** We may misunderstand each other, but I think we know now what we mean. I cannot see why all should not be placed on the same footing. I spoke of this matter in the Committee and I assented to this as a fair proposition: when once a person had complied with the provisions of this Act and had been licensed for a year and no complaint had been made, then he should not be put every year to the inconvenience of obtaining the signatures of one-third of the electors. But I think it is reasonable and fair that at first all should come under this Act. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said that licenses have been granted under some conditions by all the Provinces. So they have; but the only Province with a system of inspec-

tion is the Province of Ontario, and Manitoba to a certain extent; but in some of the Provinces there has been no Inspector, and the system has been remarkably loose as far as inspection is concerned. An hotel like the Rossin House, or any respectable hotel, will have no difficulty in getting the one-third, and if the house has not been well kept but is a disreputable house, the fact that it has been open for a certain number of years should have no weight.

**Mr. GIGAULT.** There was some discussion on this provision in the Committee, but at last it was understood that it should not apply to licensees or licensed premises under the present laws. I think we should keep this section as it is; but it would be a good thing to insert one-third instead of one fourth of the electors for all new licenses. In many other countries, the signatures of a larger number of electors are required for new licenses than for licenses for houses that have been inspected and reported upon.

**Mr. AUGER.** I hope the hon. gentleman will leave the clause as it is. Licenses have been obtained in Quebec on the signature of twenty-five persons, not in the electoral district, but all over the township. It is nothing but right that applicants should be obliged to secure the consent of one-third of the electors.

**Mr. McCRANEY.** I should be sorry to see any alteration in this clause, for the benefit would be nullified if any change were to be made. I trust no change will be made on it whatever.

**Mr. McCARTHY** moved that the words "or licensee under any Provincial enactment" should be inserted.

**Mr. BLAKE.** I think it was published the other day.

**Mr. FISHER.** I think we ought not to make this amendment. The clause as it stands places all who obtain licenses under the Act on the same footing; but if we adopt the amendment moved by the member for North Simcoe it will give an immense advantage to those who now have licenses in the various Provinces, as they are not forced to go through this crucial test. I believe that in Ontario at present no signatures are required to the certificate of the applicant; in Quebec only twenty-five signatures are required, and those may be obtained in any part of the municipality in question. Under this Act the licensee is obliged to obtain the support of one-third of the resident electors in the polling sub-division where he wishes to carry on business; and it can easily be seen what a very great advantage this amendment would give holders of licenses. The hon. member for North Simcoe has said that these licenses have been granted by competent authorities. No doubt this is true; but at the same time we know that these authorities have in the different Provinces exacted very different pledges; and by the new Act the hon. gentleman seeks to place all the Provinces under the same rules, but all present licensees are not on the same footing. What he wishes to do with this clause will not accomplish what he himself says is the object of the Act. I think that for these grounds, and for others maintained by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), it will be very unfortunate if the wording of the clause is changed in the direction proposed by the hon. gentleman.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** Whatever may have been the original law under which these people got their licenses and the liquor regulations, the licenses were granted by competent authority, and those people who have invested their money in this trade, as soon as they come under the operations of this law, are under its regulations. They keep their houses under it; if they offend against it, they lose their licenses as a matter of course. They come under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, and under the stern eye of the stern Inspector; and the moment that they come under this law, they then, when it is in force, have their licenses. They have a right to commence business, having behaved properly and not broken the law. They

have invested their money in the business, and come under the regulation of the law, and they are liable to all the regulations established by the Commissioners, who must carry out the Act under the eye of the Inspector. Therefore, so far as those hotels are concerned, they are under the same restraints against improper conduct, whether a petition is presented in their favor or not; and, as they were not obliged to get any such certificate of character when they so invested their money, I think that it would be a cruel and a bad thing if, by a change of opinion in that particular locality, all their gold should be turned into stones, and that they should lose all their property. I really do think it would be very improper and very hard to do so; and that it would operate against individuals, without at all promoting the cause of temperance.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know what the reason for this Bill is, after the hon. gentleman's declaration, for he has first stated that the different regulations under which the licensees obtained their licenses were issued under competent authority?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; the hon. gentleman did say under competent authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said, issued under Provincial authority.

Mr. BLAKE. No, competent authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman understood what I said, or he ought to have understood me. We are not here to catch at words, and show our wit; although that is not the particular accomplishment under which the hon. gentleman shines. We come here seriously to discuss this matter. The hon. gentleman understood me, unless he has resolved not to understand me. Every hon. gentleman who heard me, understood me to mean Provincial authority under which these people, believing it to be a competent authority at the time, paid their money and established their business.

Mr. AUGER. There is a good deal of truth in what the Premier has said, as to certain cases; but I know municipalities where they have five and sometimes more licensees. Suppose the Commissioners decide to diminish the number of licenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have that right.

Mr. AUGER. Yes; and suppose they decide to issue only three licenses, how are they to decide what three shall be chosen from the five? But if these persons are obliged to get the support of one-third of the electors in the polling sub-division, then the people can choose three. This difficulty can be met by leaving the clause as it is.

Mr. JAMIESON. As a temperance man I would be quite satisfied with this provision in its present shape. One hon. gentleman has stated that it would give parties who at present held licenses, an advantage over those who wish to procure them, if it is changed as proposed. Perhaps there is something in that; however, I have no doubt, that inasmuch as this Bill will become law in the interest of peace and order, and to some extent for the promotion of temperance, I think that the provision as here is in the right direction; and I really believe that the temperance people of the country will be satisfied with it in its present shape.

Mr. FISHER. The right hon. gentleman, I think, misunderstood the drift of my remarks when he seemed to consider that I thought that the present holders of licenses were less orderly than, and of an inferior character to, those who may obtain licenses under this Act. This was not the intention of my remarks. What I wished to infer was, that as one of the most important parts of the Bill consists in the restriction put on obtaining

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

licenses, those who now have licenses will escape those restrictions, and in that way have an advantage over those who have not now licenses. The hon. gentleman seems to be afraid of interfering with the vested rights of certain individuals; but as my hon. friend from Shefford stated, he is bound to interfere with vested rights in municipalities where more licenses are held than are allowed under this law. How will he be able to decide who shall retain and who shall be debarred from licenses? But if they have to get the support of their electors the matter will be more easily decided. As the regulations of the Commissioners will be declared beforehand, the electors in question will know how many licenses are to be issued, and will only sign the applications of the most deserving. For these reasons, I think that it would certainly be only fair and right to the whole community to leave the law as it now is.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that the hon. gentleman seems to forget that after the applications are in the Board has to select those to whom they will grant licenses. All that this clause does is to say that a man who holds a license is *prima facie* supposed to be a fit and proper person to get a license for the next year. He has not a vested right, but comes armed with that position, so to speak; and therefore he is endowed with that title which a man applying for the first time has not. The Board after all has to say to whom they will grant licenses; and they are not bound to grant a license to one person more than to another. It will be granted if they think that the man's house has been properly kept, and if the Inspector so reports they will refuse the new applicant. Here are people, 90 per cent. of those who will apply, put to the trouble of asking their neighbors to sign a certificate in their favor, although they have carried on their business assumedly in a respectable manner, and that does not seem to me to be reasonable.

Mr. McNEILL. It does seem rather curious that it should be an objection to this clause that those persons who have invested money and property in the buildings they have erected, should have an advantage over those who have not invested their money. It seems to me that to a certain extent they have actually a vested right in this property, because while their licenses are renewable, there is a certain tacit understanding that so long as they keep their places in a proper manner, their licenses shall be renewed.

On sub-section 3, section 17,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think this sub-section should be amended by inserting the words after the word "school," "in existence before the license was granted to the house for which the license was applied for." I think in the event of an institution of that kind being built after the license was granted, the objection should not apply.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not necessarily prevail. It is only a ground of petition.

Mr. CAMERON. It should not be a ground of petition.

Mr. BLAKE. To amend it, as the hon. gentleman suggests, would be to recognize that the license should go to the house. It would be practically saying that no neighborhood should be improved by buildings of this description being erected upon them, without their being informed that there was a tavern there which they could not get rid of for all time to come.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It would practically be admitting that taverns would be of more importance than a place of worship, a hospital or a school.

On section 19;

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think ten days should be substituted for four in this clause, as four days is not sufficient in the case of a large county, like my own, to go from one end to the other.



Mr. AUGER. The hon. gentleman must remember that four days' notice is sufficient to the licensee to know that a petition is to be presented against his license, but if you give more time to him you just take so much time from those opposed to him, because they have only fourteen days, and they are the ones who have to make the proof.

Mr. McCARTHY. Besides, no injustice can be done, because the Board may adjourn.

On section 25,

Mr. McCARTHY. This clause provides the accommodation required in a hotel for the public. The Committee thought that in cities and towns there should be six bedrooms, and in country places three. The present law in Ontario provides for four bedrooms in cities, towns and country places. I do not know whether the Committee approve of the provision as to six bedrooms. Some gentlemen think the minimum should be four.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FISHER. In a good many cases the hotels have regular boarders, who take up the whole accommodation, and leave no room for casual travellers. I certainly think it would be not advisable to reduce the number.

On section 26,

Mr. McCARTHY. Sub-section 2 of this clause is to meet the existing practice at sea-board towns. It was represented by the members of the Committee from the Maritime Provinces that both at St. John and at Halifax there were houses where there were no appliances for eating. Of course, we have none such in our part of the country, and we promised we should leave it to the Board to say when this accommodation would be dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as St. John is concerned, unless some other person objects, I should be happy to dispense with this. Where you allow saloons to be kept without those accommodations they degenerate into shebeen shops. Although they may be found in some of the Maritime cities, it cannot be argued they are of any great benefit to the persons who frequent them. One of the great dangers to sailors is these tipping shops. I should rather by far they would be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the view of the hon. member will be accepted. I view with great alarm this clause. I believe the saloon is one of the worst features of the whole business even if it is a well-appointed eating-house, and I do not think we should give discretion in this matter to the Board, with the varying views of its members and the varying pressure that will be brought to bear on them.

Mr. RICHEY. As regards Halifax, I have already presented to the Committee the views which animate me in adhering to this clause. We have heard a good deal about vested interests, and anxious as we are to promote the cause of temperance, it will not do to play fast and loose in a matter of this kind. In Halifax some years ago, ardent temperance men told us we should separate the sale of liquor from the sale of all other things, and we did so, and granted what are called tavern licenses, under which nothing but liquors could be sold. It was supposed in this way that the cause of temperance was promoted. Our experience in Halifax is that those places are not so injurious to the cause of temperance as saloons, or shops where persons go ostensibly for other things, but really to obtain liquor. Judging by my experience, I feel that I would not be justified in surrendering this clause. It would work great injury to persons who had abandoned all other business, and gone wholly into the business of selling liquor. As it is, there will be a very large reduction in the number of licenses now granted in the city of Halifax. On this point I feel it my duty to say that, in relation to liquor legislation, Nova Scotia has been in advance of every other

Province, inasmuch as we have required, before any person could obtain a license for the sale of liquor, he should present a petition signed by no less than two-thirds of the electors.

Mr. BLAKE. While great respect is to be paid to the views of the citizens of Halifax, I do not see why we should bow down and worship the idol of uniformity to that extent that we should accept this, which we do not want in the West. It may work well in Halifax, but it will not work with us.

Mr. RICHEY. This Bill is a matter of compromise, and this section is supported by hon. members from various portions of the Dominion. The hon. member from New Brunswick, who was on the Committee, and the representatives of British Columbia, are in favor of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will allow this clause to stand over.

On section 27,

Mr. AUGER. In some of the municipalities the hotels have boarders who occupy all the bedrooms, so that there are none for transient travellers. They should be forced to give accommodation to travellers.

Mr. BLAKE. This difficulty exists, and some provision should be made prescribing so many bedrooms for transient travellers.

Mr. FISHER. County municipalities ought to be placed on the same footing as cities and towns. I do not see that any arguments applying to these may not also apply to county municipalities.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I would like to see it read "the Council of any municipality—may by by-law—to be passed before the 1st day of March, &c." I do not see why the Councils of cities and towns should be specially privileged in this respect.

Mr. JAMIESON. A municipality may mean a county.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see that any reason has been given for this discrimination.

Mr. McCARTHY. It has been adopted from the Ontario Act, and I suppose it has been found to work well. Speaking generally, I fancy the accommodation that is required by the Bill is quite sufficient, and more than sufficient. However, we will make it read: "the Council of any city, town, incorporated village, township or parish."

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:55 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 21st May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 137) for authorizing subsidies for the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I would like the hon. gentleman to make a brief statement with reference to the great American and European Short Line Railway Company's system. I observe, in looking at the papers which have been brought down, that the company's statement is, that considerably the larger portion is already built—some 417 miles. I also observe, on looking at the map which the company have appended to their proposal, that the eighty miles owned by the Halifax Extension Company, from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, is among the parts which they expect to acquire. I would like the hon. gentleman to state in what position that line now stands, and whether he is aware with whom the negotiations have taken place, and in what state the negotiations are which the company referred to as having made such progress as to justify them with going on with the links.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Committee are aware that, under the legislation which has already taken place, the Government of Canada agreed to hand over the branch from Truro to Pictou for the purpose of securing the construction of the line eastward. The Government of Nova Scotia, with an additional subsidy, secured the construction of the line of railway to the Strait of Canso. Under the existing legislation, the whole of that property is, therefore, the property of the Eastern Extension Company; but the Government of Nova Scotia made a contract with that company, which bound the company—in case the Government, by a certain time, paid them their actual expenditure, irrespective of the subsidy which had been given to them—to hand over to the Government of Nova Scotia the whole property. The arbitration provided for in that contract between the company and the Government of Nova Scotia is now taking place. It is expected that in a few days that road from Truro to the Strait of Canso will be in the possession of the Government of Nova Scotia, and the Government of Nova Scotia are anxious to utilize that for the purpose of securing the extension of the railway system to Sydney or Louisburg, in Cape Breton. I understand that negotiations are pending between the company and the Government of Nova Scotia for the acquisition of that line, upon terms that would secure, in connection with the subsidy provided for in this Bill, the prompt execution and completion of the line to Sydney or Louisburg. That is the position. The charter of the Great American and European Short Line Railway provides for running powers over that portion from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, independent of its acquisition in another way.

Mr. BLAKE. The Pictou and Truro branch cost about \$2,300,000 irrespective of rolling stock, and the Halifax Extension subsidy from the Nova Scotia Government amounts to \$600,000; so that the Eastern Extension Company have received generally in money and cost \$2,900,000. Do these negotiations on the Great American and European and Short Line Railway embrace the surrender of the Pictou branch as well as the eighty miles, or simply the eighty miles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it covers the whole.

Mr. BLAKE. The idea is, that thus, by the machinery through the acquisition by the Nova Scotia of the Pictou and Truro branch and the eighty miles, we will be able to accomplish that for which we formerly agreed to give up the Truro branch, a line through the Island. With reference to the last subsidy, that for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, there is not in the papers brought down a single scrap with reference to the application, or claims, or position of the Northern and North-Western Company, except a letter from the hon. member for North Simcoe, written some time last year, which indicates that a memo-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

randum was sent down by the hands of Mr. Brown. That is not down, nor any other paper in that connection, although the engineer's report states that the other company made application for a subsidy of \$12,000 per mile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That must be an oversight. I ordered all the principal papers to be copied and sent down.

Mr. BLAKE. I can only repeat that unless practical, real independence and equality of right over the link be given to the two systems of railways, the interests of Toronto and the West will not be served as effectually as they ought, even with the subsidy of \$6,000 per mile, and still less with a subsidy of \$12,000 a mile, which embraces so large a proportion of the whole cost. What the hon. gentleman is doing under his scheme is to give \$12,000 a mile for the construction of the link. If he puts that in the practical control either of the Midland or Northern and North-Western system, he will not secure the practical competition of these two roads.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What would you suggest?

Mr. BLAKE. I have already given my suggestion. By combining with the Local Government, which has already offered a subsidy, the road might be built by the Government itself and made a neutral link.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The only ground on which we would be warranted applying to Parliament for the additional subsidy would be the necessity for providing a thoroughly independent line of communication. I see the force of the observation the hon. gentleman has made, and I can only say they will receive the fullest consideration. The Government at this moment are not committed to any person—we are entirely free, and our object is to carry out exactly what the hon. gentleman himself aims at, and to do it in the best possible manner.

Mr. BLAKE. The Local Government, when it implemented, to a certain extent, this provision for railway aid some years ago, made a provision which it seems to me would be a useful one to be inserted in this Bill, and that was, that inasmuch as these local aids were largely based upon the same theory as the hon. gentleman's is, namely, to supply steel rails for roads, but steel rails supplied in this way were not to be taken off except for the purpose of replacing them, as when improvements were being made. We know there have been dismantled roads, and inasmuch as we put the rails on we ought to take care they are left there, or replaced as soon as they are taken off. On the third reading of this Bill I will move an amendment in this sense.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot accept that suggestion at the present moment. However, if the hon. gentleman will let me have this memorandum it can be dealt with in another place if found practicable. I am afraid it will militate against the success of the aid that is being offered.

Mr. VAIL. I think one alteration should be made in the provision saying that the road should be commenced within a certain time and completed within a certain time. Four years is a long time, and three years may elapse before any of these works are commenced. We know that railway contractors are very likely to put work of that kind off, and they may put it off for three years so that they may complete the whole thing in four years, and that may prevent another company taking hold of the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see no objection to accepting that suggestion. Of course, the short lines could be completed, but the important lines could not be completed in four years unless they were commenced in two, and for that reason I did not fix the date of commencing. I have no objection to an amendment like this: "shall be commenced within two years from the 1st of July next, and

completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from and after the passing of this Act."

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment :

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same by providing that in order to secure as far as may be the continued operation of the railways towards which it is proposed to grant subsidies for the purpose of supplying them with steel rails, it shall not be lawful to remove the rails from any of such railways, save for the purpose of replacing them with the other rails as occasion may require.

Amendment negatived, lost on a division; Bill read the third time and passed.

#### THE ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution (May 15th) respecting a loan to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, said: This proposition is one which I am satisfied, judging from the opinions expressed by hon. members in discussing the railway resolutions, will meet with the general approval of both sides of this House. It will be remembered that in the discussion of those resolutions there was a general opinion expressed in favor of completing as soon as possible the railway system from one end of the Dominion to the other, and that we should shorten the distance and cheapen the cost of transit. That seemed to be the unanimous feeling on the part of the House. Now, the difficulties that exist at the present moment are very great indeed, arising from the absence of the competition of the link which this proposition is about to accomplish. It is well known that one of the objects of the promoters of the Intercolonial Railway or European and North American Railway was to induce travellers coming from Europe to America to make Halifax the landing point; and it will be remembered that the project which is spoken of so favorably in the House, the Great American and European Short Line Railway, is a bid for this particular line of business, the conveyance of passengers and mails between Europe and America by the shortest route possible, and in the shortest time possible. That being the case the proposition of this company is that, by the completion of their line, between forty and fifty miles in distance would be saved. The company will be in competition with any line that may be established at Halifax with the same object; but I am led to believe that one of the obstacles to the Great American and European Short Line Railway in going round by Woodstock and Houlton, in the State of Maine, and to the sea-board is the want of a bridge at St. John. They have already a bridge at Woodstock, and, therefore, no delays occur there from such a want. Let us suppose that the company have constructed their railway line and have established their line of steamers, one of the difficulties will be crossing at St. John. To cross by ferry will probably create a delay of an hour and a-half, and that will be practically equivalent to reducing the distance between extreme points of the route by from sixty to seventy-five miles. No portion of the Dominion is more interested in having a direct line from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick to the United States or Montreal than the eastern and northern part of New Brunswick. The fisheries of the northern part of that Province have been very largely developed by the construction of the European Railway, and their value has been largely increased by the company's ability to transmit fish in ice to the American markets. But a difficulty exists there, as will be seen by reference to reports made on the subject, and it is referred to in Mr. Schreiber's report. Suppose a train with a quantity of fresh fish in ice arrives on the western side of the harbor of St. John, and it

proves to be too late to be taken across by ferry and make connection with the western road, a day is lost which is of the utmost importance to parties interested in that line of business. Under these circumstances all the eastern and northern parts, and all parts of Nova Scotia, which desire to send fresh fish to the United States as well as to Montreal by a direct line of railway, are materially interested in the completion of the proposed bridge at St. John, because every one is aware of the difficulty, the increased expenditure, and the delay that occurs for transshipment. The importance of building this bridge was brought before the Government of Canada as far back at 1871-72 by the Western Extension Company. That company subsequently got into difficulties, and of late years the trustees of the road have been working the lines, but two years ago a gentleman obtained a charter from the New Brunswick Legislature for the construction of a line and bridge. That company came to the Government and applied for assistance. They have obtained financial assistance from roads running west from St. John, the European and North American, and the Central Maine, equal to \$5,000 a year, in addition to payments for freight transmitted. The company approach the Government, having obtained this assistance from roads going west, which is equivalent to \$100,000 towards the completion of the work, and asks for a Government grant in aid. The matter was submitted to the hon. Minister of Railways. He asked for a report by the Chief Engineer, and that report was obtained, in which the importance of the completion of the link was pointed out. The Government decided that they would not give the company a money subsidy, but they would give them an equivalent, which, at the same time, would cost the Dominion nothing; that they would grant them 80 per cent. of the cost of the work at 4 per cent. interest, thereby giving the company the benefit of 2 per cent., as they would probably have to pay 6 per cent. interest in the open market. The company have accepted that proposal, and the Government now come to Parliament and ask permission to grant the loan on a lien of the line, and if the bridge is not completed within the time specified, the Government will have the right to take it out of the company's hands and construct it. It has been a question as to whether it would not be proper for the Government themselves to build the bridge, and there is a good deal to be said in favor of that suggestion in view of the importance of the work. But the company have the charter, and the Government could not interfere without constructing it at some other point than the Falls. It can be constructed there so far above the water as not to interfere with navigation. There is a suspension bridge there already, and it is proposed to build this additional bridge a little higher, and the result will be, as I have said, not to interfere with navigation. There is an objection to this proposal on the part of a portion of the inhabitants of St. John, especially those residing on the western side of the harbor. These some years ago took \$40,000 worth of stock in the Carleton branch road, which leads from the present terminus of the European and North American into Carleton. Having that amount invested in that branch, they urge that connection should be made by their branch crossing at Navy Island, in the harbor of St. John. When the charter was obtained by the company two years ago, a Committee of the Local Legislature was appointed to enquire into the desirability of granting the charter. The representatives of the western side of the harbor presented all their arguments in favor of their plan, but a large majority of the Committee reported in favor of a suspension bridge as against a bridge at Navy Island. In 1874, a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Pickard), to construct a bridge at Navy Island. At that time a protest was entered—it is on the Table now—on the part of the Corporation of St. John, against it; and the river counties, as a rule, protest against it, because it

interferes with the navigation of the River St. John. This is a port, I may say, of the River St. John, where a very large number of vessels ply, conveying to market deals and firewood, and produce of various kinds; and they are very tenacious with reference to interference with the navigation. Therefore, there has been in the past, to the proposition to build a bridge to Long Island, great objection on the part of the people residing in the river counties, and as a result of them it has been occasionally abandoned. I know that as far as I am concerned I would be delighted, because it would gratify a portion of my constituents very much indeed, and a portion to whom I am greatly indebted, if the scheme was not completed; and if, perhaps, in this case if I were only a member of Parliament, individually affected by the proposition, and were I to look solely to my own position towards my constituents, I would hesitate to support it. But public men sometimes have in the public interest to take up propositions and submit them to Parliament in the public interest, though against the views of a portion of their constituency—and that is my position to-day. It is because I feel as a member of the Government, and the Government feel, that our property, the Intercolonial Railway, will be largely benefited by this project—because it gives inter-communication between the different Provinces which is very important, and because our connection with a portion of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and with not only the United States, but all parts of Canada, will be facilitated by its completion—that the Government submit this measure. It will cost us nothing, but will give to this enterprise the assistance which they require and which was asked for in another form; and we feel it is in the interest of the Government and of the country that it should be acquiesced in. Under these circumstances the Government have felt themselves justified in asking that this advance be made of 80 per cent.—the cost of the road not to exceed \$500,000—to a company incorporated with a capital stock of \$200,000. It had the right, until the last Session of the New Brunswick Legislature, to issue a larger amount of bonds than it has at present. This power has been reduced to \$125,000; they have aid given by railways in the West, and they expect they will be enabled to complete the work within the space of time specified in the resolution before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the question which has arisen as to the inhabitants and the city of St. John, I ought not to presume to offer an opinion, as it happens that there are various considerations which, of course, I am not master of; but it certainly seems unfortunate that after having incurred an expenditure, which a portion of the city has, in order to procure access by another route, that expenditure should be practically thrown away; or so it seems to me to a very large extent if this plan be adopted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What other route?

Mr. BLAKE. The route suggested by the petition of the County Council by Navy Island—that is the route by which they suggest to cross. At the same time, we will all concur in that, and, of course, we equally concur that what is paramount, are great engineering considerations, and amongst them considerations with reference to railways in the first place; and navigation in the second. Upon these I do not feel competent to offer an opinion, but merely to say, that the responsibility of the measure, in so far as it involves these results to that portion of the hon. gentleman's constituency to which he has referred, must, of course, devolve upon him and the Government in coming to that conclusion, for reasons which I dare say are just, but on which I am unable to express an opinion. I think it, however, tolerably clear from my point of view that the mode, assuming the bridge at the Falls to be the proper route, which the Government is about to adopt is not the most advantageous.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

I have already indicated, in the course of the discussion with reference to the Gravenhurst and Callander line, my view on this subject; but I will add a word now with a brevity due to this period of the Session. The hon. gentleman says that there is considerable difficulty with regard to the Government executing this work. There was a difficulty in the way. This company had a charter, and they could not interfere, but the company has a charter which they cannot carry out without the assistance of the Government. Unless the Government comes to the aid of the company, the charter is of no use; the bridge would not be built. The charter has existed for a good while, but by virtue of the Government's grant alone is vitality to be breathed into the chartered rights of this company. If the company cannot build the bridge without your assistance, they are unable to go on, and if they cannot build it without your assistance and are able to go on they do not want your assistance. If they cannot build the bridge, having a charter which is not living without your aid, would that be a reason why anything, opposed to the public interest, should be done with reference to this particular work? What does the hon. gentleman propose? He proposes to aid this local company which is the creation of the Local Legislature—a bridge company, which, as I understand it, is not now to become a Dominion work; at any rate it is not proposed to make it so by this measure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; we will bring in a Bill to make it a Dominion work.

Mr. BLAKE. Which Bill?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will introduce a Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know anything of that. There is no such resolution before us at this time, and as far as I understand it—I have not seen the Acts of incorporation—this company is under the control of the Local Legislature, and it would have no authority to borrow money to the amount proposed. The Legislature has reduced the borrowing power to \$125,000, and the hon. gentleman proposes that the company shall be lent \$442,000, if the estimate of the Government Engineer as to the total cost of the work is correct—\$552,000, on which is lent \$442,000, and there is no provision as to the security for this amount under their charter as it now exists. Then what does the hon. gentleman do next. Irrespective of whether it is a local or a Dominion work, he proposes to advance four-fifths of the whole cost, while the company shall obtain the profit. If the company spend \$552,000, which the Government Engineer estimates it will spend, they will have spent of their own money about \$110,000. It is true you can buy it of them; but to buy it, you must pay 10 per cent. of the money expended, \$55,200, or \$55,000; so that as a reward for the expending of their own money, \$110,000, you will pay them \$55,000, or 50 per cent. advance on their own expenditure. According to the hon. gentleman's proposal, this is the sum which the Government is to pay, if at some future time they take possession of this work. Now, 10 per cent. is an ordinary provision for an advance on the payment of a work; but this is when the company has paid the money or raised the money; when its own money is put into the work, or money borrowed, and so made its own. But here a loan is made; four-fifths of the money the country itself provides, and in order that the country may get the work ultimately, it must pay 10 per cent. advance on its own money, and the fraction which the company provides. In a word, as I said before, you vote 50 per cent. on what the company provides, instead of 10 per cent. Well, now, this work is a work which, probably, from what the hon. gentleman said with reference to connection with a railway spoken of, will fall either directly or indirectly under the control of one or more railway companies, of which there are no less than four or five I think which are supposed to be feeders to the

railway company on the one side—the Maine, Central, the Eastern, the St. John Line, the Grand Southern, &c., and the Intercolonial on the other side. Now, it seems to me, that the provisions for the equality of tolls and for keeping down the rate of toll on the toll bridge, which is to be a link in connection with important railways and important travel on the one side and the other, are of the last importance, and this provision should not merely be for equal tolls and rates, but for moderate tolls and rates, and it should be a provision not merely for moderate tolls and rates, but for equal advantages for all. I happen to know a little as to the results of one company which owned a bridge over which other companies have to pass; and I am aware that the control, the practical control of this bridge means a very great advantage to the company, which possesses such practical control over all other companies. There must be some priority—some precedence. Somebody has to give way, and that person, somehow or other, does happen to be the person who has not control of the bridge, and if you make it possible that one of the competing companies shall have control, that company will have preference or advantage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the case here—this is a bridge company.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware that this is a bridge company, but I know it is quite competent for a railway company to purchase the stock of a bridge company from its directors. The stock is moderate and it is easy to acquire it, and I know that one of these companies has arranged to pay a special preferential amount of \$5,000 a year over its tolls in order to assist the enterprise. I foresee the possibility and the probability of some one railway company obtaining control over this work, and I foresee that there will be preference to one railway company over the other even if you provide for equal arrangements as to traffic. These are matters with which we have occasionally grappled before; but if private enterprise is going to construct the work we take the precaution of seeing that there is fair play, and the rest is as it happens. Here the country is going to four-fifths of the whole expense, and, what seems proper under these circumstances is, that if this work is of the character and importance which it is said to be, you should secure, first of all, low moderate rates, and, secondly, through equality of rates and preferences to all companies, by undertaking the work yourselves instead of handing it over to a company. We are practically building this work, we are paying four-fifths of the cost, and it seems to me it would be very much better that we should build the work altogether, control it, own it, manage it in the public interest so that moderation of tolls, by that means, and perfect equality of advantages might be secured to the various companies that may seek access to the bridge or seek to carry their traffic across it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a good deal to be said, of course, in favor of the Government taking control of this work. I may say, however, that a Bill which I purpose introducing makes this a Dominion work, and so removes the difficulty of which the hon. gentleman has complained. It is, of course, of the utmost importance—and the Government has appreciated that importance—that this company should be under Dominion control, and, therefore, it is that by the Bill we have placed it in that position, so that it is in the power of the Government to regulate the maximum rate of the freight. I may mention here that the fact of a large portion of the expenditure to be made upon this railway has to be paid in land damages had its weight upon the Government. There is no doubt whatever that the difference between the Government constructing such a road and a private company constructing it, is very largely against the Government on this question of land damages; and it was felt

that even if the Government should find it necessary, in the interests of the public and our own railways, to take possession, the probability is that it would take the company \$50,000 less to build that road than the Government, a large portion of the difference being in the shape of land damages. But the Government have taken full precaution in that respect, as the hon. gentleman will see. The hon. gentleman says they will have 10 per cent. profit. Well, during the first four or five years after the opening of a road of that kind, before we have opened our connections with the North-West, before these links are completed between Canada and the United States—before the expiration of five years, the company cannot expect the rate to be as profitable. It is, therefore, just possible that during the first five years they may not be able to pay expenses, and that, therefore, they are open to the chances of loss during that time. If there is a loss of 2 per cent. during the first five years, there is no profit, and, therefore, it was that we provided that it should be open for us to purchase the property, and control it entirely with reference to the through business.

Resolution considered in Committee and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 138) to provide for advances to be made by the Government of Canada to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

Bill read the first time.

#### NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS IN MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in introducing Bill (No. 140) to legalize proceedings taken for the naturalization of certain aliens in the Province of Manitoba (from the Senate), said: This Bill is as follows:—

Whereas in a number of cases, in the Province of Manitoba, proceedings for the naturalization of aliens have been taken under the Naturalization Act, Canada, 1881, under a misapprehension that the said Act was in force, and whereas the procedure and requirements of that Act are in substantial conformity with the laws of naturalization now in force in Canada, and it is proper to legalize and confirm the said proceedings: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. All proceedings for the naturalization of aliens heretofore taken or had in the Province of Manitoba under the Naturalization Act, Canada, 1881, upon which certificates of naturalization have been issued, and also all certificates issued upon such proceedings shall be held to have been and to be as valid and effectual as though the said Act had been and was now in force.

This Bill is intended to apply to the Mennonites. They were promised their patents at the end of three years; but as the law provides that patents shall only issue to subjects, and as they took all necessary proceedings to obtain them under the impression that the Act of 1881 was in force, this Bill is introduced for the purpose of legalizing those proceedings.

Bill read the first time.

#### MANAGEMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in introducing Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter four, intitled: An Act to provide for the establishment of the Department of the Interior, and to amend The Indian Act, 1880 (from the Senate), said: This Bill is as follows:—

1. The third section of the Act passed in the thirty-sixth year of [Her Majesty's reign, chapter four, intitled: An Act to provide for the establishment of the Department of the Interior and the third section of The Indian Act, 1880, are hereby repealed, and the following section is substituted for each such section respectively:—“3. The Minister of the Interior or the Head of any other Department appointed for that purpose by order of the Governor in Council shall be the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, and shall as such have the control and management of the lands and property of the Indians in Canada.”

“2. So much of any Act or law as may be inconsistent with this Act, or make any provision on the matter provided for by this Act contrary hereto, is hereby repealed.

By these two Acts it is provided that while the Department of Indian Affairs should be a special Department, the Minister of the Interior should be an *ex-officio* Indian Superintendent-General. The duties of the Minister of the Interior have become so heavy in consequence of the opening up and settlement of the North-West, that the Government desire to take the power to transfer, if it is thought requisite, to some other Minister the Superintendency-General of Indian Affairs.

Bill read the first time.

#### CONTINUATION IN FORCE OF CERTAIN ACTS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 133) to continue to a limited time the Acts therein mentioned, said: The Acts referred to in this Bill are the Act 41 Vic., chap. 17, for the better prevention of crimes of violence, and the Act respecting the administration of criminal justice in the disputed Territories. They are to be continued in force for one year.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the reason why the first-mentioned Act is proposed to be continued. It was originally passed as a very temporary Act, but it seems to remain on our Statute-book all the time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it may be continued for another year without dispute, and with the assent and support of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no. I always thought some reason should be assigned for it.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THIRD READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 134) to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 131) to encourage the manufacture of pig iron in Canada from Canadian ore—on a division.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 119) to further amend the Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

#### RAILWAY TRUST AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, introduced Bill (No. 141) to amend the Act of the present Session, intituled: An Act to incorporate the Railway and Construction Company of Canada, limited.

Bill read the first time.

On motion for second reading,

Mr. BLAKE. This measure has been explained to me privately. It seems that an amendment was made in the Senate to the Construction Company's Bill, by which all the clauses of the Joint Stock Companies' Act are made applicable to this Act. Our Joint Stock Companies' Act contains a clause requiring directors of companies to be resident in Canada, and this clause was applicable to this company. We have given up, practically, this restriction, and I have more than once directed the attention of the Government to the importance of remodelling the Consolidated Joint Stock Companies' Act in points in which our new policy differs from the policy of that Act.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

#### DEEPENING THE CHANNEL OF THE RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

Resolved,—That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to raise by debentures in the manner prescribed by the Act 36th Victoria, Chapter sixty, (except as to the rate of interest which shall not exceed four per cent. per annum), a further sum not exceeding nine hundred thousand dollars, to be advanced to and applied by the Montreal Harbor Commissioners from time to time, in meeting the expenses to be incurred by them in completing the dredging and deepening the ship channel of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, to the depth of twenty-seven feet and a half, at low water; subject to the payment by the said Commissioners to the Receiver-General of interest on the sums so raised and advanced, at the rate of four per cent. per annum: Provided that the said Commissioners shall not commence the said work unless nor until the Governor in Council shall be satisfied by such examination and report as shall be deemed sufficient, that the said work can be completed for a sum not exceeding that above mentioned.

Mr. COURSOL. I cannot allow these resolutions to pass without congratulating the Government on introducing them. They will be received with pleasure, not only by the trade of Montreal and the country at large, but by the various navigation companies which ply between foreign ports and Canada. They will be welcomed, because the further deepening of Lake St. Peter channel to 27½ feet is a measure of the greatest concern for the interest of the Dominion. This question must be considered from a high stand-point, and I am glad the Government of the day have done so. They recognized the principle that Montreal must be the port of exchange from river to ocean vessels, not because Montreal thinks this should be the case, not because Montreal asked the deepening of the channel, but because even foreign navigation companies have always made the harbor of Montreal what it is to-day, the port of exchange. As soon as the channel was deepened, large vessels followed in the trail of the small ones which alone years ago could visit our harbors. If these vessels had not considered this inland voyage to be of advantage to them, they would certainly have gone to other ports. The fact of the matter is they would have proceeded further inland, had not nature placed insuperable obstacles above Montreal. These large companies indicate the policy which should be followed—they are not interested in the different harbors of the Dominion; their sole object is their own commercial interests, and as they choose to come to Montreal, putting aside, Sir, all sectionalism, we must admit, and we are forced to come to the conclusion, that Montreal should be in the future what the spirit and enterprise of her citizens have made it now, the discharge harbor from ocean to river navigation, the great port of distribution of trade over a large tract of land. Great sea-ports are not built up simply because some people desire it, but because some powerful general interests require them, just as railway enterprise will go in the direction nature and the want of commerce call them. I hope, however, these resolutions will be carried out, and the works be proceeded with at once. The resolutions state that the work should not begin until the Government engineers have satisfied themselves of the cost of the deepening of the channel, and have been found correct. I hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works will instruct them to report within as short a time as possible, as it is of the utmost importance. The plant is ready, the staff experienced, and, no doubt, under the supervision of the Harbor Commissioners, presided over, as they are, by a gentleman of great ability and energy, this great work will soon be accomplished. Nothing should be allowed to jeopardize the granting of one of the greatest possible boons to the country, an undertaking which is a national one in every respect. I hope these resolutions will pass, and that the work will soon be completed.

Mr. CURRAN. I feel it my duty to add one word to the remarks and congratulations offered by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol). When we take into consideration the vast strides made by the port of Montreal since 1850, when the total number of sea-going vessels entering that port was 210, aggregating 46,156 tons, while last year, 1882, the number reached 645, aggregating 554,692 tons, I think this work should be recognized by the people at large as one of national importance, as one involving the interests, not merely of the city of Montreal, but of the whole Dominion of Canada. This is a step, I think, in the right direction; it is acknowledging the principle which later on, no doubt, will be carried on to its full extent. There is a condition attached to these resolutions, namely, that the money shall not be expended until a report shall have been made upon it by certain engineers. I have no intention at this late stage of the Session, when hon. members are naturally anxious to reach their homes, to detain the House at any considerable length; but I think hon. members will allow me to read the concluding paragraph in the report of Mr. T. C. Keefer, whose eloquent words should not be allowed to lay buried in the pages of the Harbor Commissioners Report, but should find a place in the public records of the country:

"If what has been undertaken, in the past, was warranted by the then condition of things, *a fortiori*, present prospects and necessities make it imperative that the chief Dominion seaport should be placed upon a par with any American one, as to its accessibility by the largest ocean vessel. Montreal, a fresh water seaport, 250 miles above salt water, and nearly 100 miles above tide, is nearer to Europe, the market, and nearer to the great grain and provision areas of this continent, the sources of supply for that market, than any of her Atlantic competitors in that trade, not excepting New York, the great emporium of the export and import trade of the United States. She is the terminus of the longest inland water communication between the Atlantic and those areas, and has two distinct railway systems of the first magnitude, to supplement and perfect her communication with the interior—the Grand Trunk in full operation, and the Canadian Pacific, an assured reality in the near future, besides the more than probable future extension of the Northern Pacific Railway to tide water by its shortest route, Sault St. Marie and the Ottawa Valley. Nor is it improbable that a Trunk line on the south side of the St. Lawrence will sooner or later connect northern and western New York, Western Pennsylvania and Ohio, and points beyond with the coolest route for grain and provisions and the most favorable one for live stock by reason of the extent of river and gulf navigation and the minimum of ocean transit. With such a position and prospect nothing but poverty can warrant any delay in making the Canadian New York accessible to the largest ocean steamers. I fully recognise the grave objection to burdening the commerce of the port with an expenditure for a work which is as much a public one as the canals and harbors above or below it. The rivers and harbors of the inland waters of the United States are recognized as Federal works, and this is the case in Canada with respect to the St. Lawrence at all other points, the navigation of which is exclusively under Dominion control. I believe, therefore, that the entire assumption of this work by the Dominion is but a question of time (and that a very short time), and there is certainly no national expenditure to which the surplus revenues of the Federal Government can be more usefully devoted than that which brings the largest ocean vessels within the greatest possible proximity to the heart of the continent."

"I remain  
"Your obedient servant,  
(Signed) "THOS. C. KEEFER."

I fully endorse the sentiments expressed in these practical and patriotic words. I hope the day is not far distant when the debt will be assumed by the Dominion of Canada, and then the last link in the great National Policy of this Government will be completed, and our trade and navigation will receive the full benefit and impetus which this act of justice to the great radiating centre of the commerce of the Dominion is certain to ensure.

Mr. OUMET. I shall certainly vote for these resolutions on the principle that one-half a loaf is better than no bread; but I must protest against the assumption in them, that this work from Montreal down to Quebec is a local work which ought to be paid for by the city of Montreal, or by the city Harbor Commissioners. I say that it is not fair to single out that part of the St. Lawrence, and say that it does not form a section of the great highway of the Dominion; that all the remainder of the St. Lawrence River is to be im-

proved at the cost of the Dominion Treasury, but that because this part touches Montreal, or seems at first sight to be more in the interests of Montreal than of the rest of Canada, it must be paid for by Montreal's citizens. This portion of the St. Lawrence, in the same way as the balance of it, belongs to the great highway of the Dominion; and I must protest against the pretension conveyed by the resolutions that this must be viewed as a local work and so encouraged. It was first begun at the expense of the late Province of Canada. Later it was abandoned as a Government work on account of certain circumstances; and I think that the sooner we return to a reasonable position, and consider it as a national and Dominion work the better, because otherwise a flagrant injustice is done to Montreal and to the whole Dominion.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). At this late hour in the Session, I will not take up the time of the Committee further than to say I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal Centre, and my hon. friend (Mr. Ouimet), to pass without an answer. I certainly would feel it incumbent on me to vote against these resolutions if they were not in their present shape, and did I not understand that a Bill in this shape will be introduced—I refer to the granting of a loan; because I think that a great injustice would be done to the western part of the Dominion were we to allow so large a sum as \$900,000, in addition to the large amounts already expended there, to be spent for the benefit of Montreal. We, of course, have a very great interest in that city and in its progress; but when a ship reaches Quebec, as far as the rest of the Dominion is concerned, I submit with great humility, of course, that so far as concerns Western Canada, the great object is gained; and, therefore, I merely rise, not to take up the time of the Committee, but merely to enter my protest against any such idea as has been suggested by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, that this work shall hereafter be assumed by the Dominion, or in any way be regarded as a Dominion work.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I have only one remark to offer—that one point conceded by the Government is that the deepening of the channel between Montreal and Quebec is of necessity to be continued to 27½ feet. This is a great concession, but it is the only concession made; in response to the demands of those who are interested in the navigation and trade of the St. Lawrence. In my opinion all the progress is made with regard to what has been the view hitherto, and we have not obtained all that we had the right to expect. The question at issue does not concern competition between Hamilton, Quebec and Montreal, but whether we can compete on fair terms with the American ports? Will the changes imposed along our system of navigation on the St. Lawrence enable us to compete with those ports? I think that according to the authority of those who have studied this question, if we are so placed that the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal will be forced to levy tolls on the vessels coming into that harbor, this competition will be rendered impossible, and, moreover, Quebec will then lose the benefit arising from the stoppage of steamships there, and the whole western traffic of the St. Lawrence route will be lost, passing to American ports. That is the great question at issue, and it ought to interest and attract the attention of those who wish our great national highway made the means of securing the traffic of the best ocean steamship lines which ply between European ports and this continent. If we continue to charge the harbor of Montreal with the cost of improving the channel between Montreal and Quebec, it will, combined with other disadvantages, have a disastrous effect on our trade. The propositions made to the Government on the part of Montreal were very fair. The communications stated that Montreal was ready to pay their own debt and the cost of improving the harbor; but what they

considered unfair was, that the cost of the improvements made and to be completed between Montreal and Quebec in the channel, was charged against them. This ought to be viewed as an undertaking of public utility, and not as a mere local undertaking; and it was in this light that they expected the Government would approach this important question. However, at all events, it was concluded that Montreal was to be the head of navigation; and, in common with the member for Montreal West, I hope that the day was not far distant when the Government would see the necessity of taking up the whole work and finishing it at its own expense.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Although I am not a representative of the city of Montreal, I feel somewhat interested in the object of these resolutions, as they concern the Province of Quebec. I rise only to proffer one observation. I have just heard it stated since this debate opened that this should not be considered a Dominion work. It seems to me, however, that this is as much a Dominion work as is the deepening of the canals. Nobody will pretend that the Lachine Canal is not a Dominion work; and the question now before us relates to the dredging of the channel between Montreal and Quebec—which is not deep enough for a certain class of vessels. This dredging is necessary to give greater capacity to the St. Lawrence as a navigable river, and is as much a Dominion work as would be the deepening of a canal. Supposing there were rapids which had to be overcome by deepening the bed of the river, that would be considered a Dominion work; and I cannot see why dredging this channel, thereby making it navigable for a certain class of vessels should not be regarded as a Dominion work.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation). Mr. Chairman: As a member from the Province of Quebec, I think it is my duty to make a few remarks on this question. They desire to represent me as representing exclusively the Quebec district, because recently when a deputation came to Ottawa, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Quebec, I had the pleasure and the honor of accompanying this deputation, firstly to the Ministers who represent in the Cabinet the interests of the Province of Quebec, and afterwards before the Privy Council itself. On that occasion, as in the present, I took this stand, Mr. Chairman, which I am happy to make known to the House and to the public. Quite recently one of the hon. members of this House, on a question of privilege which he raised, was disposed to treat us as narrow-minded men, at a time when we had not an opportunity of defending ourselves. This being the first chance I had of protesting against the appellation of the hon. member, I avail myself of it with pleasure, and I say, for his information and that of the public, that if they wish to scrutinize the motives which influenced me, they must, in the first instance, establish whether the question which is now before the House, is either a national or a local question. If it is a national question, all local or parish questions must be secondary, and the public good must take precedence of local interests. If it is a local question, then it is our duty as representatives from the Quebec district, to consider the interests of our district, as is likewise the duty of the members from the Montreal district, to first consider the interests of their district; and on this assumption of an accord to the members who represent in this House the interests of Montreal, the right to take the position which they think they should take; on the other hand, they should concede to the representatives from the district of Quebec, the right to take the position which we deem best. With us, this is the question: Is it a national or a purely local question? At the present time it is hard to say. We have not been furnished with all the data necessary to elucidate this question. The Government is likely in possession of all necessary documents which can throw light on this question,

Mr. DESJARDINS,

and place it correctly before us. On this point we have every confidence in the Government. We know that what they do will be in the general interests of the country and not in the purely local interests of either Quebec or Montreal. I wish to take these grounds and have them made known to the country. When we were admitted to an audience with the Privy Council, we discussed the question from this stand-point: we considered it in a comprehensive light, so much so, that one of the hon. Ministers, who is in the House to-day, and who can give his testimony in corroboration of what I say, stated that he was most happy to observe that, although the deputation came from Quebec, which might excite a certain amount of apprehension among some members that had taken the correct course, to establish a basis for our most equitable demands. If this is a Montreal question, we desire to establish the dredging of the channel between Quebec and Montreal, to obtain means of communication from the West to Montreal; if we really wish to have the commerce of Montreal, I think it is also important, in a national point of view, to continue and complete as soon as possible the dredging of our channels—for what is commerce if not the interchange of our products; if we wish to enable the large vessels which come from the East to ascend to Montreal, we must also enable the large vessels which are able to carry all the products of the West to come to Montreal also. All these vessels, all the large barges from the West, must be able to start from Lake Superior, and arrive at the port of Montreal without being obliged to stop at way ports and unload their cargo in from five or six vessels of smaller tonnage. It is in this light that we ought to consider this a really national question, and that we should open up to commerce not only a part of the St. Lawrence, but the whole country from the extreme West. From this point of view I congratulate the Government on the line of conduct they have adopted, as expressed in the resolutions now proposed. But, Mr. Chairman, we must not in a question of this kind forget the subject of acquired rights. And if I understand the question rightly, it seems to me that when the Quebec Harbor Commissioners loaned from the Government the sum necessary to carry on the works, which are now being constructed at Quebec, and for which it has become necessary to impose certain dues on vessels coming to Quebec, it seems to me that at that time it was agreed between the Quebec Harbor Commission and the Commissioners of the Montreal Harbor, that in future the works which should be undertaken to deepen the St. Lawrence, should not be built at the expense of the Government. If that Convention which was made at the time no longer exists, I think the rights of Quebec will not be forgotten; and if at some future day the Government be disposed to assume the debt of Montreal; if they wish to take off the duties from vessels which might prevent them coming up to Montreal, it will be only justice to place Quebec in the same position, and that they assume also the debt of Quebec, so as to permit vessels to come either to the port of Quebec or to the port of Montreal, and to find in both ports like favorable conditions.

Resolution reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 142) to make further provision for deepening the Ship Channel of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec.

Bill read the first and the second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### EVIDENCE IN RELATION TO CRIMINAL MATTERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 125) to make provision for the taking of evidence in relation to criminal matters pending in courts of justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions, or before foreign tribunals, said: Since the Imperial Ex-



tradition Act ceased to be in force in Canada there is no provision for obtaining the testimony of witnesses in relation to any criminal matter pending in any Criminal Court or tribunal in a foreign state in like manner as may be obtained in relation to a civil matter. Our attention has been specially called by Her Majesty's Government to this omission from our Extradition Act. The Bill provides as follows:—

The testimony of any witness may be obtained in relation to any criminal matter pending in any court in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions or before any foreign tribunal in like manner as it may be obtained in relation to any civil matter under the Act 31 Vict., chap. 76, intitled: An Act to provide for taking evidence in Canada in relation to Civil and Commercial matters pending before courts of justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions or before Foreign Tribunals, and all the provisions of that Act shall be construed as if the term civil matter included a criminal matter and the term cause included a proceeding against a criminal: Provided that nothing in this Act shall apply in the case of any criminal matter of a political character.

Bill read the second time; considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 135) relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in the Province of Prince Edward Island, said: This Bill explains itself:

Whereas it is desirable to assimilate the laws of the Province of Prince Edward Island to the laws of the other Provinces of the Dominion, as regards the maturity of and the protesting of bills of exchange and promissory notes: Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The Act passed in the thirty-fifth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter ten, and intitled: An Act relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, shall, on and after the passing of this Act, extend and apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

2. From and after the first day of July next after the passing of this Act, all bills of exchange and promissory notes payable at any place in the Province of Prince Edward Island for the sum of forty dollars and upwards, may, on default of the acceptance or payment thereof, be protested by a Notary Public; and such protest shall, in any action on such bill or note, be *prima facie* evidence of presentation and dishonor, and also of service of notice of such presentation and dishonor as stated in such protest; for which protest there shall be charged a notarial fee of fifty cents for protest and twenty-five cents for each notice.

#### LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 136) to amend the law respecting lotteries, said: It has been recently decided by a magistrate in Ontario—I suppose properly—that our present law on lotteries will prevent the Art Union, an association of artists, from holding its annual distribution of paintings and drawings. By the payment of an annual subscription fee, a person becomes entitled to draw for the right of first choice from among the pictures contributed by the members. This cannot be held to be an evil, by the most strained interpretation of the law. The Bill is as follows:—

1. Nothing contained in any Statute, relating to lotteries, now in force in Canada, or in any Province thereof, shall be read or construed as making it an offence:—

(a) For any incorporated society, established for the encouragement of art, or for any officer or agent thereof, to distribute by lot among its members or ticket-holders, any paintings, drawings, or other works of art, produced by the labor of the members of, or published by or under the direction of such incorporated society; or

(b) For such member or ticket-holder to share in such distribution.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

#### After Recess.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 132) respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors and the issuing of Licenses therefor.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 29,

Mr. FISHER. With reference to sub-section 7, I should say that the signing of a memorial ought to be sufficient without its being necessary to find the applicant. It might be difficult to find the applicant.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is not too much to ask those who sign the memorial to find the applicant.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be quite impossible to find him.

Mr. McCARTHY. This only says a notice shall be given.

Mr. BLAKE. What kind of a notice?

Mr. McCARTHY. A reasonable notice served at his house for instance.

Mr. BLAKE. A four days' notice ought to be enough, describing the objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may describe many other things he may not be able to meet.

Mr. BLAKE. He ought to be able always to meet an attack on his character.

Mr. McCARTHY. By the eleventh sub-section a refusal on the grounds of character is final in its consequences, not only for that year, but for subsequent years. The disqualification for three years seems too long. I move that this sub-section be amended by substituting two for three years.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). One year ought to be enough.

Mr. BLAKE. He could not get his license for a year even without the provision.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 32,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not approve of this section because it introduces the principle of petitioning. I have little faith in the virtue of petitions signed as they usually are. I do not think the license should be subjected to the risk of the result of a petition of simply the majority of the electors of a sub-division. I would move to omit section thirty-two.

Mr. MITCHELL. I sustain the suggestion of my hon. friend. We know how petitions are got up. Almost anybody will sign one that has nothing particularly improper about it. Two weeks may be taken to get this done, and a respectable house is closed up under the authority of the sub-section.

Mr. BERGIN. There ought to be some other way of depriving a man of his license than under this system of petitioning. We all know that a petition asking almost to send a man to penitentiary, and probably even that, could be got up and signed by the majority of electors in almost any sub-division, if presented by a respectable man or a man looked upon as respectable; and we know that men taking strong views upon the temperance question would not hesitate at any time to close up houses even upon mere rumor. Besides there is a very great uncertainty as to

whether a man, wrongfully deprived by means of a petition of securing a license, could obtain one for many years to come. I am not prepared to suggest a change, but I think a proper way would be to strike out the clause altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Victoria objected to this sub-section on the sole ground that petitions were very easily got up. He did not say he objected to the principle of allowing the people in a community to be what they certainly are, the best judges in the matter of granting licenses. If he objects to the petition system will the hon. gentleman suggest any better way to which the people may express their opinion? Or does he go against the proposition, which I think is a very evident one, that no person knows the wants of a community so well as he who lives in it. I think there are a great many considerations on the other side of this question as to why this clause should be maintained in principle, whether it be literally retained or not. The chief of these is that the people of a community are the best judges of their own wants. They are the ones who have to support the institution, and to meet the difficulties that are thrown in the way of a community by the licensed shop, and, I think they are the ones who should have something to say in the matter. Already in the city of Montreal, and I think, in the city of Quebec, the people have this power conferred upon them, and in any municipal district may block an application for license by a majority petition. This petition is very well guarded. It has to be attested to on oath and is liable to revision in open court, and that takes away a good deal of the objection to what may be called the general petition system. In the city of Montreal last year they closed some very objectionable places by the exercise of this power; and I think it is hard that a right the people already possess in every municipality in the Province of Quebec, should be taken from them. If hon. gentlemen object to the petition system, let them take the ballot system; but I do plead for the people of every community having the right to say whether one of these institutions should be placed in their midst.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). It is a well-known fact that a petition can be obtained from almost any person; and when we consider the fact that any person can go about, even ladies, and get petitions signed in this way we must be very careful how we give parties the right of petition with reference to this question. But there is another reason. I submit that it is the intention of the Government, as I understand them, that this Bill is not to be, so far as Ontario is concerned, more restrictive than the Crooks Act. Now, the Crooks Act has no such clause as this in it. I know from experience that even politics will be introduced into this petition system; and that because a man does not happen to be of the same politics as the majority of the people who live in that particular section, he will be voted out and not allowed to have a license, although he may be in every way qualified; and although, as in many cases that I am aware of, he has maintained a licensed house for many years, yet, because a sentiment of that kind might arise in the neighborhood, a man's vested rights might be interfered with and his property cut from under his feet. Now, I ask the Government not to press a clause of that kind which goes so far beyond what the Crooks Act has heretofore made law in Ontario. I submit that clause ought to be struck out altogether; it is quite sufficient to have it in the hands of Commissioners who are supposed to be dispassionate persons and who act according to their judgment in each case that comes before them.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think the hon. gentleman is not the man who should quote the Crooks Act in this House. The Crooks Act was passed by the Ontario Legislature; we are dealing with the question *de novo*, and if he wants only the restrictions of the Crooks Act, let him sup-

Mr. BERGIN.

port the Legislature of the Province in regard to this matter, and then he will have the Crooks Act restrictions, nothing more and nothing less. I think this is one of the best and most valuable clauses in the Bill. The hon. gentleman says that perhaps ladies may go round soliciting signatures to the petition asking for a reduction of the number of licenses or for prohibition in any case. I do not see why the ladies should not have the right of petition. I think the supporters of the hon. gentleman propose to give the ladies the franchise. Now, if ladies are going to be qualified to vote on this and other questions, qualified to vote on the question of sending my hon. friend to Parliament, why should they not be qualified to circulate petitions? Moreover, not only is this a small proposition in itself, but it is commended in almost all the Provinces except Ontario. As the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) has said, it is already admitted in Montreal and Quebec. Now, the Provincial Legislature of New Brunswick has enacted that no license of any kind shall be granted where a majority of the ratepayers petition against it. In Nova Scotia, a license is granted by the sessions in each county on recommendation of the grand jury, concurred in by two-thirds of the number present, and on petition of two-thirds of the ratepayers of the polling district. In Prince Edward Island, a majority of the ratepayers say whether a license shall be granted or not. In British Columbia, a license is granted on petition of two-thirds of the residents to the magistrates to whom application is made; and in Manitoba, outside the city of Winnipeg, sixteen out of every twenty electors, who are resident ratepayers, must support the petition before it is granted. So the proposition in the Bill before us is practically conceded by six out of the seven Provinces. We have then the judgment of six Provincial Legislatures that this is a wise provision. The wholesale traffic is regulated in these six Provinces under somewhat similar provisions, in some cases more stringent. I am glad the Committee have introduced this clause, and I propose to support it just as it stands.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Hamilton objects that under this clause a license might be refused for political reasons. I cannot see, if the general opinion of a municipality is in favor of granting licenses, how it is possible that a majority should try to cut out one of their political opponents when at the same time they must therefore prevent any of their political friends having a license. I think this clause of the Bill will effectually prevent any political considerations entering into the question. The hon. gentlemen said it was the general understanding that this Act should not be more restrictive than the Crooks Act. I have heard no such pledge from the Government of the day; I have not understood this Act was to be modelled upon the Crooks Act nor that the Crooks Act was to restrict this Act in any way. I do not see why the other Provinces should be deprived of the continued benefit of this clause because Ontario has not hitherto had the advantage of it. The people of the Province of Quebec have this clause, not only the people of Montreal and Quebec but also those of rural municipalities, and it will be a source of great injustice to the Province of which I am a representative, if this clause should be struck out, for thereby it will be deprived of one of the many advantages of this new Act.

Mr. ORTON. We have already the Scott Act, which can be used in any part of the country, and we have local option in regard to counties. If you extend that power, the results will be still more disastrous than they have been proved to be in regard to the Scott Act. Any municipality may, by this Act, do away with tavern licenses; the result will be to place the trade in the hands of a very inferior class of men, who will sell impure ardent spirits, instead of beer and native wine, which are now becoming more largely used in the country. There is another objection, that in a

small town or village this option clause may be carried, and yet the people who are accommodated by the houses will have no vote on the matter. I think this clause will have the effect of creating disorder and increasing intemperance, instead of diminishing it, for so long as intoxicating liquors are allowed to be sold, and are introduced into, and are manufactured in the country, there will be men who will sell them in spite of all efforts on the part of License Commissioners. We also know that petitions can be got up for almost anything, and a great many persons are induced to sign them, not because they object to licenses being granted, but in order to please individuals who happen to present the petitions. Many are induced, for business purposes, to sign such petitions merely to please extreme advocates of temperance, without considering the effect of such a course. I hope this clause will be struck out of the Bill.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not understand the provision as being general in its character. The grounds set forth in the petition must be specific. I, therefore, think the provision is a good one, and should be retained in the Bill. The object is to get rid of objectionable houses, and I do not know any better judges than those who reside in the immediate neighborhood in which the licenses are sought to be granted. I was sorry to hear some hon. members state that petitions might be got up for almost any purpose. I think it does not speak well for the electors among whom those hon. gentlemen reside. In my opinion this is one of the most important provisions in the Bill, and I trust the Government will see their way clear to have it retained. If it were a general provision I would, perhaps, in justice to those holding licenses, hesitate before I approved it. When that question comes up I trust the House will be able to deal with it in such a way as will be just to all parties concerned; but in this particular instance, seeing that the charges against the applicant must be specified, I think the clause should be retained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In dealing with this generally, especially in dealing with a clause like this, we must see that we do not proceed too fast, or go too far. We must take the middle course and not look at this question, or at any of the provisions of the Bill, either from the standpoint of a member of a temperance society, pledged against the entire use of intoxicating liquors; or, on the other hand, we must not look at it from a tavern keeper's point of view. We must consider if we can get a reasonable Bill, because too strict a Bill will defeat itself—we have seen that time and again—and a Bill too relaxed in its provisions will offend the moral sense of the community. I must say I have a strong objection to a person losing his license or his application by a petition behind his back, if it can be avoided. I would infinitely prefer, if there is any objection to a man getting a license, and especially to a man getting a renewal of a license, that the objection should be taken openly or by a vote. There is, however, a good deal in what the hon. gentleman who spoke last stated, that this is not a general provision, but one of specific objections, and people are much more likely to be induced to sign a petition in favor of a license being granted, where it should not be granted, than they are against the granting of a license. At the same time, I do not think that a person should be deprived of his license—for it would have that effect—upon a petition presented by a mere majority, which might be a majority of one. I would propose a compromise, that instead of a majority, a petition signed by two-thirds of the electors should be required against an application for a license. That would be a compromise which would meet the views of the moderate men of the House.

Mr. BERGIN. I would suggest that there should be added to the clause something to show that the allegations

in the petition were well founded before the license was taken away.

Mr. BLAKE. The petition has to set forth some grounds, and the Committee would act under a misapprehension if it thought the petition as limited as the hon. member for Lanark stated. Among other grounds are the following: That a licensed house is not required in the neighborhood, and that the quiet of the people will be disturbed if a license is granted. These are questions of opinion. If a majority are of opinion that a licensed house is not required, I think the majority should have the power to decide it, and not have a licensed house forced on them. All the other provisions are more specific. The hon. leader of the Government has very strange notions on this point. The other evening when it was proposed to alter the Bill by adding a provision which would require licensees to obtain one-third of the number of electors, he said it would be wholly unjust and would inflict a great hardship on present licensees. One evening the hon. gentleman who thought it would be exceedingly difficult to obtain one-third, and the next evening he thought it would be an easy thing to obtain a majority, although as the hon. gentleman has repeatedly observed, a minority petition is to be obtained for a purpose for which people's good nature is likely to lead them to concur. He might get a request quite favorable to a man; but to get the majority of the petition as he said, to refuse a favor to a man is most difficult, and, under the circumstances, I have hoped that the Bill which the hon. Minister himself introduced on his own responsibility, may not be marred by his own act.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. When this question was before the Committee, I opposed this clause—I am certainly opposed to petitions. I have had some little experience in these matters, and I have found them, on more than one occasion, to work injuriously. We very often find the same names on two opposite petitions. I heard of one such case since I came to this House. An hon. member received a petition for a certain purpose, and a second petition with an opposite design, and the name of one person was on each petition. I heard of this only a few hours ago. I think that the principle is wrong. It is true as has been stated by some hon. members, that you can often get petitions signed for anything—almost to have a man hanged. Whilst I am not at all favorable to these petitions, I am at the same time quite willing that the people should have a voice as to who should have a license, and who not; and I think that the proper and more straightforward and manly course would be to give them the privilege of depositing their votes in the ballot box. This is the only straightforward way to my mind in which to ascertain the true feelings of the people. It is a very easy matter to get people to sign their names to petitions. I have seen it done simply to get rid of the applicant, without the petition being read or due enquiry made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I must say that the amendment proposed is entirely in accordance with my views in the interest of temperance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is no new idea with me, for I appeal to my hon. friend opposite, whether, when I was occupying the position of Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and a convention was held in Montreal to consider what steps should be taken by way of legislation in the Dominion Parliament for the suppression of temperance, I did not write a letter, which that hon. gentleman quoted on one or two occasions, expressing the hope which was my conviction in this matter, that if any law were passed by which a vote of the people should be taken, the measure should not be carried by a bare majority. I

was willing that the vote should be three-fifths of the whole. That was a letter written when I was in a position to express my views without reference to political and party considerations of any kind, and that is my conviction to this day; and, therefore, I urged my friends when moving in the Scott Act, only to move in localities in which the public sentiment would sufficiently sustain it. I did so in the interest of temperance. I can appeal to gentlemen present, who have known that when the Scott Act was carried by a majority and not enforced, that it was not in the interest of prohibition and temperance in many cases, and, therefore, the opinion that I then entertained thoroughly, and still entertain with reference to this proposition: That if you wish it to be beneficial to the cause of temperance, and to show that by shutting liquor out of a locality the effect is good, you will do it where the moral sentiment of the people is sufficient to enforce the law. That will convince the people, and they will say that it is a correct principle, and it will extend from one end of the Dominion to the other; but if you carry it and put it into operation where the public sentiment is not with you, a reaction will follow, and the people will say: "It is a failure," and abandon the whole principle. This position I have maintained now for thirty years and upwards since I introduced into the Legislature of New Brunswick a Bill in favor of prohibition, which was endorsed by almost all the men, women and children in the Province, and we thought from the petitions received—a cartload almost was brought in—we had the public sentiment sufficiently strong in the Province to carry it; but many who signed the petitions the moment it came into force backed down and never lent the least assistance, moral or in any other way, to the measure. And, as "a burnt child dreads the fire," I have always felt since that that it is most desirable in the attempt to get prohibition—which I believe will be carried some day in the Dominion of Canada throughout—to educate the people up to it, and to show that its results are favorable and beneficial to the morals and social condition of the people. If the moral sentiment of the community is not sufficient to sustain it then we will have a dozen grogeries. Take the county of Charlotte in my own Province. I think that in some sections of that county, to-day, there is as much liquor sold as before the Scott Act went into force, and it is sold openly. In St. Andrews there has never been any attempt to enforce it. The moral sentiment of the community is against it; and, therefore, I am quite sure that it is not better for the cause of temperance—though we all felt that it was a triumph to carry the measure—that it was carried. As a matter of sentiment, I would like to see it carried everywhere; but we have to look at the matter with a degree of common sense, and to see whether we can carry the principle to success. That is my reason for favoring this amendment. If I had been a member of the House when the Scott Act was considered, and a division had been taken, I should have voted, that not simply a majority but three-fifths of the whole votes cast should have been required in its favor. More than that, a great deal is to be said in favor of open voting on this question, because when a man goes up and records his vote in favor of the principle, it is a pledge that he will see it enforced; but if he signs a petition, often that will not follow. I would rather have open voting, as it commits a man to it; and feeling ever since this has been discussed in favor of such a majority from every locality as will ensure enforcement if the principle is adopted, I would therefore, myself, rather as between the two propositions for the success of the measure, go for the amendment than for the section in the Bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. Did the hon. gentleman introduce the Prohibitory Bill in New Brunswick thirty years ago? I thought it was Mr. Schooler.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Schooler introduced the first Bill; but not the Bill which carried—that I introduced as a member of the Government at the time.

Mr. BLAKE. I have always believed a great deal in the adoption of the view, which the hon. gentleman has just stated; and if we were dealing here with a large one, there might be some plausibility in his observations, because if so—if we were dealing with whole electoral districts, or a county, as in the Scott Act, it is quite possible that a bare majority in that county will mean a minority in particular localities; and if you find it carried by a small majority throughout the county, it will almost certainly be that in certain localities there will be a majority against the Act where it will be difficult to enforce it. But that is not the proposition before us, which is that of a small locality, a polling sub-division, where there are only 200 voters according to the law; and in that small locality you have not that difficulty. If you find a majority in a small locality against the introduction of a tavern, I say that the popular sentiment may be fairly taken to be sufficiently pronounced there to ensure the observance of the law in it. This is quite a different case. I have known myself in a county with which I was intimately connected for many years, where the Temperance Act was carried by a very considerable majority; but in particular parts of the county, in considerable sections of it, there were large majorities against the Act—which circumstance rendered it inoperative, and it was repealed almost without resistance; so I was satisfied by experience as I was by theory, that when dealing with a very large area of country, in which a diversity of feeling exists in different parts of it, a bare majority does not ensure you such a moral force as to enable the Act to take effect. But we are dealing with a different state of things, with a locality containing no more voters than there are members in this House when it is full; and as the majority of this House decides what shall be the laws of this country all over the country, I believe the majority of the electors of a polling sub-division can decide fairly for the polling sub-division, whether there shall be a tavern in it or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman's argument should lead to just the opposite conclusion. In one locality, or village, or town—

Mr. BLAKE. I am not talking of the town, but of the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. But the Bill applies to both town and country.

Mr. BLAKE. There are hundreds of polling divisions in the country to one in the towns.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then there is no difficulty in amending the law to suit the country. The hon. gentleman has requested with great earnestness that the clause should stand; but before any person can get a license he has to get one-third of the signatures of the electors in the polling division, and then the License Commissioners have to deal with the fitness of himself as an applicant for license, the suitability of his house, its situation, &c. The clause says that a majority can petition against the application on one or on other of these grounds. First, that the applicant is of bad character, and if it were confined to that ground I should be willing to have the clause stand as it is. The second ground of objection is, that the premises are out of repair. Now, eight, or ten, or twenty people may say that the house is out of repair, other twenty may say that he is not a man of proper character to keep a hotel, while others may say that a tavern is not required in the neighborhood. The result may be that the applicant cannot even have his case considered, and the matter is practically decided without a hearing. The hon. member for Perth spoke of the town of Stratford where

there are no less than three or four hotels about the market place. Now if the majority of the sub-divisions should decide against the granting of licenses, it does not prevent them from being issued in the town, but it does prevent the hotel licenses being issued to hotels in that particular locality. Now, if we want to give the municipalities power to say in a suitable manner that they do not want taverns within the environs of the place, let us say so. But what object is there in 200 voters being able to say that they shall not be licensed in a particular place, though they may be licensed in other parts of the municipality? The effect will be mischievous, and will not advance in the slightest degree the cause which I think we all have at heart—the cause of temperance. If it were only the character of the applicants which should be the ground of objection I would not object, but I do not think it would be right that his premises or the surroundings of the proposed hotel should be decided in this way.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman thinks so badly of his own Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for South Durham has charged us with inconsistency, because we now object to a decision by a majority, while on Saturday evening, as he said, we objected to one-third as being too large a number for signing a petition in order to obtain the renewal of an existing license. That charge is based on a misstatement.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that, on last Saturday evening, objection was made that one-third was too large a number.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Substantially that was the hon. gentleman's statement—that it was difficult to get one-third of the electors to sign such a petition.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON. That was the statement the hon. gentleman made as I understood him. We did not object to one-third, or to any particular number, but we objected to existing licensees being required to get licenses signed by any number at all. When we come to discuss the merits of this clause, I have some difficulty in understanding what it means. If I understood the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) aright, he understands the clause to mean that a majority of the electors may decide that no license shall be granted in that particular sub-division. I think the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) spoke in the same sense, and though I think the wording of the clause is rather vague, I do not so understand it. If the grounds referred to in the clause are those set forth in section seventeen as I should judge from the remarks of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), then it is clear that the thirty-second clause simply is intended to provide that a majority of the electors may petition against any particular person and not against any license at all being granted; and if that is the meaning I think the words should be inserted "grounds set forth in the seventeenth section." The effect of the clause is simply that it removes from the Commissioners the right to judge as to the merits of a particular application. If this clause be carried as it stands, the effect of it will be that in the event of a majority of electors signing a petition to the effect described in the clause, then the Commissioners shall have no right whatever to consider whether the charges are well founded or not, but they are compelled arbitrarily to refuse the license. Now, I am content to leave the discretion in the hands of the Commissioners, and I do not think that such gentlemen as will be appointed under this Act will be unfit to be entrusted with that discretion. I cannot believe that if it appears that the applicant is of bad fame and character, or of drunken habits, or has previously forfeited a license, or that the applicant has

been convicted of selling liquor without a license within a period of three years; or that the premises in question are out of repair, or have not the accommodation hereby required, or reasonable accommodation if the premises be not subject to the said requirements; or that the licensing thereof is not required in the neighborhood, or that the premises are in the immediate vicinity of a place of public worship, hospital, or school, or that the quiet of the place in which such premises are situate will be disturbed if a license is granted—I say I cannot believe that if a petition is presented to that effect to the Commissioners, signed even by ten persons, they are not more competent to decide that matter than the tribunal which it is proposed to be provided by the thirty-second clause. Moreover, I object to this system of petitioning, as being unsatisfactory and unreliable as the basis upon which action should be taken. I think if anything of this kind is to be done we should accept either the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare), or the suggestion of the hon. Finance Minister, that it should be conducted either by open vote or by ballot; and in any event it should be decided by more than a bare majority. There is another objection which I have to the Bill, and that is, that I believe its effect will be to introduce the greatest possible uncertainty amongst the tavern-keepers as to whether licenses shall be granted or renewed, and the effect of that will be to keep out of the business those men who would be most likely to carry it on in a respectable and proper manner, as such men will not be likely to go into the business without some security of permanence being guaranteed by the Act. If they knew that they are to be at the mercy of the bare majority of the electors in any polling sub-division to have their license taken away, you will not get a respectable class of men to embark in the business. And I think it should be the object of all of us, that if taverns are to be allowed, they should be kept by the most respectable men in the community who can be induced to keep them. For that reason, also, I object to the clause. While I think the amendment suggested by the hon. First Minister would, to some extent, remove the objections to the clause, I think it would only do so partially. For my part, I would prefer to see this clause struck out altogether, believing that the restrictions of the seventeenth clause, and the discretion that will be exercised by the Commissioners, will be ample security to the public that no taverns will be licensed in improper neighborhoods or of an improper character. For these reasons, I should like to have the sense of the Committee taken as to whether the clause should remain or not. If it is decided that it should remain, I think it should be modified in the sense suggested.

Mr. GIGAULT. I would like to make another proposition, by way of compromise. In some countries more stringent measures are adopted with reference to new licenses than with reference to old ones; and I would suggest that against an old license, a petition signed by two-thirds should be required, but that against premises, which have never before been licensed, a petition signed by a majority should be sufficient. We often hear a good deal about vested rights, and when once certain premises have been licensed, it is very hard to get the license withdrawn. I see that in New Zealand new licenses are granted, subject to the vote of the ratepayers; in Victoria, a new license cannot be granted without the consent of a majority of the ratepayers; in South Australia, it is necessary to have a petition signed by two-thirds. I think we should adopt some rule which would not be so stringent upon premises which are to be relicensed, as upon premises which have never been licensed.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to point out one or two things which have been omitted from this discussion. We have already provided, at any rate in the case of a new license, that a petition must be signed by one-third of the electors

in favor of it. The hon. First Minister now proposes that there must be a petition signed by two-thirds to prevail against it. It is, therefore, necessary that the voice of every elector, resident or non-resident, in a division must be pronounced. The hon. Minister of Finance spoke of the necessity of something more than a bare majority; but we all know that a bare majority of the votes cast is a very different thing from the majority of all the electors on the roll, which is provided for here. In how many elections is an absolute majority polled? We know that the majorities given are only relative majorities; we know that an absolute majority of all the electors is a very decisive majority—a greater majority than you usually find in a Parliamentary contest.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This only applies to polling sub-divisions.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of the general effect of a majority such as we understand it, as compared with a majority of all who can poll; and I say that if it is the case in an electoral division that you do not poll an absolute majority of all the voters on the roll, one side or the other, to demand that you must obtain two-thirds of the voters on the roll, in order to prevent the issue of a license, is to demand practically the abrogation of the clause.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that the effect of one-third of the electors being required to sign a petition for a license and two-thirds being required to prevent it, would be to require the whole electoral vote to express itself, in order to affect the Act. But, as I understand it, the petition of one-third is required for the first granting of the license; the vote of the two-thirds, or whatever fraction may be determined upon, is a continuous power, and may be exercised at any time afterwards, when, I understand, the petition of one-third is not required. It is only required in the first instance; and after that the Commissioners still have to make their enquiry. That being the case, it seems to me that it stands to reason that a majority of two-thirds should be required to prevent a license being renewed; and instead of this provision being an anomaly, it is the legitimate conclusion of the other provision. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that I think the principle of the petition is an unfortunate one, although I know it may be necessary in some cases. One case occurred in the city of Montreal, in which a person sought for a license for a saloon in the residential part of the city, in the vicinity of most of the churches. The whole community in that neighborhood were against the granting of the license; but notwithstanding that, the Commissioners granted the license, and the place was looked upon as a decided nuisance in the neighborhood. The sense of the people was urged by an overwhelming majority, which was considerably more than two-thirds—aye, than three-fourths, or even five-sixths of the entire residents in that sub-division. It seems to me, therefore, that if a place is of such a character, that it fairly becomes a nuisance to a locality, there can be no difficulty whatever in obtaining the signatures of two-thirds. If we make it a mere majority, it will place a man who has a license at the mercy of any majority that may be obtained at any time for any reason. It has been stated that the argument has been used as to the effect of politics in connection with the matter. One of these objections—in fact the only objection, so far as I am concerned—to the Crooks Act in Ontario, is that it has been used in some localities for political objects, and has been administered in a political sense. It would be very unfortunate if, in passing a law which will, I think, free the licensing system altogether from that kind of political influence, we were to leave in a clause of this kind which required no preliminary proceedings, no notice to be given, no holding of a poll of any kind, nothing in

Mr. BLAKE.

fact which is equivalent to a reasonable and serious expression of opinion on the part of the majority, but which simply gives to any one person the power of going round a sub-division, and by arguments used behind the back of the man against whom the petition is urged, inducing the majority to sign it. Just imagine a contested election going on—take the very case we had last year—when we had the General Elections for this Parliament in June, and those for the Local Houses of Ontario, in the February following, when political feeling ran very high. In a polling sub-division where there was a majority of one side or the other in politics—it makes no difference which, in a matter of this kind—if a tavern keeper held political opinions opposed to those of the majority, he would be placed under this section, entirely at the mercy of that majority. The local canvasser could tell him: "If you do not vote with us, we will get a majority to petition against you." There is no process provided for any serious action of the people, no responsibility except the signing of a petition declaring a particular place as not required. It need not declare that no taverns are wanted in that particular sub-division, but simply that this particular house is not required, that this particular individual should not get a license. It would be most unfortunate if, in passing a measure, which, we hope, will have the effect of removing the licensing system from the political arena, we were to leave in a clause placing this question in a worse position than that in which it stands under the Crooks Act. A two-thirds majority is more difficult to obtain. That might, at least, be said to be a clear expression of the opinions of the people and would, at any rate, lessen very much, if not remove altogether, the objection I have just urged to the adoption of the system itself. Personally, I have no hesitation in saying I would prefer to see this local option made by the process of voting instead of by petition. I think the amendment of which the hon. member for Rouville has given notice would be infinitely better than the process of petitioning; but residing as I do, in Montreal, and knowing the particular difficulties that the west end of that city has labored under in connection with this matter, I am quite in favor of some plan, whatever that plan may be, whereby a decided majority—say two-thirds—of a particular locality could prevent the imposition down there of a tavern of any kind when the majority are opposed to having one in their midst. For that reason, I am in favor of some process of local option being adopted by which a two-thirds majority would be required, if the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville be not accepted.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am in favor of prohibition upon a large scale; but I believe the result of all prohibitory legislation, when confined to small localities, has invariably been followed by bad results. The effect of this section would be that in a sub-division, where the temperance sentiment was very strong, the best hotel in the place—a hotel erected at very large expense for the accommodation of the public—would be closed; while in other adjoining sub-divisions, in which the temperance sentiment did not prevail to the same extent, smaller hotels which, perhaps, ought to be closed, would be allowed to continue their business and not receive the benefit of this section. For that reason I am opposed to the clause, although believing, as I said before, in prohibition as applied to countries.

Mr. AUGER. I do not understand the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are opposed to this system of petitioning against the sale of liquor. They are willing to give the man who wants to sell liquor the right to petition and to make his petition valid on his obtaining only a third of the voters to sign it, while they are opposed to allowing a majority of the temperance men among the electors of a division to make their petition good, on obtaining the sup-

port to it of a majority of the voters. I have heard the hon. Premier say both parties should be put on the same footing. I think so too. I do not believe in obliging the temperance men to get two-thirds of the voters while the liquor seller need only have one-third. Compare the position of the two. On the one side, you have a man who makes money by selling liquor, and has an interest in obtaining signatures to his petition; on the other hand, you have temperance men who do not make a cent by their action, but give up their time and neglect their business for the sake of morality. Is the temperance man then to be put in a worse position than the liquor seller, because the latter makes money, while the former works solely for the good of his locality? The getting up of a temperance petition cannot be done in the dark. Sometimes it is the priest, sometimes the minister, or other men who are interested in the morality of the locality, who are instrumental in having it signed. The liquor seller goes around with his bottle and influences those who are susceptible of such influence, to sign his petition. I think it would be telling the temperance people: "You must have a hotel whether the majority is willing or not." I do not believe that licensing a hotel is in favor of temperance; I have been a temperance man all my life, and I have learned that the best way to make men temperate is to keep the bottle away from them.

**Mr. FAIRBANK.** By the amendment it is obvious that petitioners are divided into two classes: If the petitioners are for the license, one-third will do; if against it, two-thirds are required. The amendment proposes to say that one man who votes for a license is as good as two men who vote against it. We are constituting a new court, and the rule of that court is to be that it will take one-third of the Judges to enter a verdict for the plaintiff, but it will take two-thirds to enter a verdict for the defendant.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to on a division.

**Mr. CAMERON** moved that the thirty-second clause, as amended, be struck out.

Motion negatived on a division.

On section 40,

**Mr. McCARTHY.** I desire to move the following as a sub-section to section 40:—

Provided always, that in any Province in which, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes, a duty has been imposed under the authority of the British North America Act, 1867, on any license, before the license issues the person entitled thereto shall establish to the satisfaction of the chief inspector, that he has paid or tendered such duty.

**Mr. BLAKE.** That clause would appear to reaffirm the incapacity of the Provincial Legislature to pass a law as to the raising of a revenue. As I understand it, the Local Legislatures are acknowledged to have a right, of themselves, to legislate as to the issue of licenses for the raising of a revenue. The hon. gentleman seems to indicate they have no right to issue licenses for the raising of a revenue.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** They can issue licenses if they please in order to secure the payment of a fee. But this provides that before an applicant can get a license he has to show that he has paid or tendered his money to the local authorities; otherwise they would have to take other means in order to collect the revenue.

**Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.** There is a third admission and assertion of the right of a Provincial Legislature to impose a license duty in the matter of revenue for provincial, local and municipal purposes. In order to aid them in collecting their revenue, it provides that the Dominion authorities cannot issue a license under this Act without producing a certificate that the party has paid to

his own provincial authorities the license fee that has been imposed by the provincial authority.

**Mr. BLAKE.** Of course, under the most restrictive interpretation of the Act, it would be impossible, if the Local Legislature did issue a license on condition of paying a certain sum, that the party could legally sell, no matter how many licenses this Parliament might authorize. Therefore, I do not think this is much protection.

On section 42, sub-section 1,

**Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton).** I do not understand why the proportion should be different in this Act from what it is in the Crooks Act. The section under discussion says:

In cities, towns and incorporated villages respectively, according to the following scale, that is to say, one for each full two hundred and fifty of the first one thousand of the population, and one for each full five hundred over one thousand of the population.

Under the Crooks Act it is provided that the number shall be 400. In the city of Toronto alone—I have not got the returns for Hamilton, but no doubt they will be in proportion—if this Act goes into force no less than forty persons who are now carrying on business respectably will be deprived of their licenses. I submit that this Act should not be for the purpose of depriving persons of their licenses, if, in the opinion of the Commissioners, they are qualified in other respects. I, therefore, move that 400 be inserted instead of 500 in this section.

**Mr. BLAKE.** It will be a great blessing to the city of Toronto to have the reduction made.

**Mr. BERGIN.** If this section will work mischief in Toronto it will also work mischief in all the other towns of the country. It will prove a very great injustice to men who have invested their capital in the business, and are keeping creditable houses. In the town from which I come it will work great mischief, for it will deprive of their licenses some men who for many years have kept highly respectable houses, without giving them an opportunity to relieve themselves from their property. Why should they not be placed on the same footing in this respect as they at present occupy, and one license be allowed for every 400 inhabitants? It is not intended, I presume, that this Act should be used as a means of persecuting people engaged in this traffic, but it is intended to be a protection to the public generally. I do not think it is going to forward the cause of temperance; I am a temperance man and a teetotaler, but I do not see why I should force my opinions down the throats of people in a manner to injure them. It is not in the interest of temperance that we should make this law so oppressive; we should endeavor to be just and not injure people in regard to their property. I will ask for the Committee to be divided on this question as between 400 and 500.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section 3,

**Mr. BLAKE.** Will the hon. gentleman explain the exceptional provision regarding the city of Victoria, B. C.?

**Mr. McCARTHY.** One of the members from that Province on the Committee desired this exception to be made, and perhaps he can explain it better than I can. The figures 7,000 are a clerical error; they should be 8,000.

**Mr. GORDON.** I was going to ask that this be struck out. I cannot see why this exception should be made. The same principle applies to every other city and town in the Province; but it is so refreshing to find such a clause in the Bill, that I feel obliged to move that it be struck out.

**Mr. SHAKESPEARE.** As a representative of that city, I know better its requirements than any outside member. It may appear strange to find any difference made

with regard to Victoria and not in favor of any other part of the Dominion; but I may say that the temperance question has never been prominently brought before the people of that city, as before many other parts of the Dominion, and hence this accounts for the fact that we ask this exception to be made. We have now in Victoria some sixty-one licensed places for the sale of intoxicating liquors. I am sorry to say so, but it is the case for a population of 7,000; and the law would work a most radical change in that part of the Province. The number would be reduced about one-half, and I think that this would be a greater reform than will take place under the Act in any other city in the Dominion. I am a total abstainer myself and have been so for a number of years. Not only so, but with regard to the temperance cause, I do not propose to take a back seat with regard to any member of the House in this respect. At the same time I think that there is reason in every question, there are two sides to everything, and I believe that in matters of this kind we should move cautiously and be sure that the ground on which we stand is good. I know that there have been many false steps taken by temperance men with regard to the temperance cause, where they have tried to push ahead of the moral sentiment of the people. This has, in many instances, worked injuriously; and I believe that this clause will work a great deal more good to the interests of temperance, than if we placed that city on the same footing with all other places. When this matter was before the Committee, I only spoke for my own constituency; and I think that we know better than any other members, the requirements of our own Province. I sincerely trust that the clause will remain as it is.

Mr. BAKER. I quite agree with my hon. colleague in this matter. Nanaimo and New Westminster were not considered in this relation, because the members for those constituencies had told us that this Act would not seriously affect them in reducing the number of licensed places.

Mr. GORDON. But it does.

Mr. BAKER. I understood you to say it did not.

Mr. GORDON. You could not have so understood me.

Mr. BAKER. At all events, I was under that impression; and these hon. gentlemen can now move amendments to the clause if they like; certainly we know better what we want in our constituency than anybody else. If this Act went into force as it is, it would reduce the number of licenses from sixty-one to sixteen, which would be a very material change, and it would not be appreciated by the people in that constituency. It must be borne in mind that this is not an inland or country constituency; but essentially, a seaport, the initial point for the Province where all the large mail steamers come. All descriptions of vessels, of every class, tonnage, and nationality drop anchor in the Royal Roads of our harbor, and since it has been in the wisdom of the License Board of Victoria to grant an exceptional number of licenses, which are now fixed at sixty-one, I think such a wholesale reduction as would take place if this clause were not introduced, should not be made, and I therefore hope the hon. members of this House will be good enough to allow the clause to pass.

Mr. GORDON. I am sorry that I was misunderstood as to the effect this Bill would have on my own town. The effect will be to reduce the number from eleven to five; and notwithstanding that these six may suffer, whoever they may be, still in the interest of the cause which this House has taken seriously to heart, I could not have the effrontery to ask that a special clause be inserted in order to relieve the town of Nanaimo from the general effect of the Bill. Whatever effect it may have amongst my constituents I believe I am acting rightly in supporting the general propositions of the Bill, and allowing it to apply

Mr. SHAKESPEARE.

to my own Province and town as it applies to all the other Provinces and towns. I have frequently noticed that the House has opposed the principle of making special exceptions at the solicitations of hon. members, and I hope this principle will be adhered to with regard not only to British Columbia but every other part of the Dominion, unless in my Province the matter is left to the Local Government.

Mr. HOMER. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare) spoke to me when the Bill was printed, and I told him I was in favor of it. In British Columbia we have a large Indian population—about the same number that you have in the North-West, and while the sale of liquor to Indians in the North-West is strictly prohibited we shall be giving almost free trade in liquor to our Indians. One of the best things that this House can do will be to restrict or prohibit the sale of liquor to the Indians. I believe that the striking out of this clause will confer a benefit upon the whole Province and especially upon our Indian population. It is said that Victoria is a seaport town, so is Montreal, and Halifax, and Quebec, and St. John, and I do not see any exception made in favor of them. As a representative from British Columbia and feeling some interest in the credit and representation of that Province I hope the House will not allow such a stain to remain upon it.

Motion, to allow the clause to stand, negatived.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the following be substituted for sub section two: "In incorporated villages, being county towns, five licenses may be granted notwithstanding that according to the population that number may not be issued."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 44,

Mr. GIGAULT moved that the words "township or parish" be inserted after the word "village."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the county councils ought to have the same right to limit the number of licenses in the different parishes in that county, as the council of any city, town or village. In New Brunswick our counties are municipalities, but our parishes are not.

Mr. RICHEY. The position taken by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) is perfectly correct. So far as I am aware, outside of the cities in New Brunswick, there are no municipalities, except the county municipalities. There are no township or village municipalities.

Mr. DAVIES. We have no municipal organization or anything approaching it, so that the clause as it now stands will not apply to Prince Edward Island. The only thing we have is the School District.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then this clause cannot operate there.

Mr. DAVIES. But you take away from our people the right enjoyed elsewhere of limiting the licenses, and a right they enjoyed before.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not taken away, because if you look at section 46, that gives to the municipality or parish this right, and that may be extended to the School District in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman supposes that the majority of all the electors resident in the parish is equivalent to the majority of those present at the meeting in a school district. The hon. gentleman has only run one election or he would know better.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman who last spoke will never be more clear or definite in his facts than he is now he will be but one-half in the truth and one-half in error. I ran two elections.



Mr. BLAKE. I should have said only one valid election. I thought you would have liked the other to have been forgotten.

Mr. DAVIES. What do you propose to substitute for our present system?

Mr. McCARTHY. I leave it to the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman to devise that.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I beg to move the following amendment: "The Council of every municipal organization not embracing more than one municipality may, by by-law," instead of the "Council of any city, town or village."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. By the present law no saloon licenses are allowed in incorporated villages. I would, therefore, move in amendment: "That in incorporated villages, townships, and parish municipalities, no saloon licenses shall be granted."

Mr. FOSTER. That does not quite meet our case in New Brunswick. Our parishes are not municipalities.

Mr. ORTON. I think that is provided for in section 26, which provides that there shall be no saloon licenses except in cities and towns.

Mr. BLAKE. That to which the hon. gentleman refers merely allows in cities and towns to be granted a certain number of saloon licenses without the accommodation which the law prescribes. As the clause stands, I hope it will not pass. A saloon is required to have the accommodation of an eating-house, but the sub-section of this provides that you grant license to a saloon without the accommodation of an eating-house, that is to say, you grant it to a grog-shop.

Mr. McCARTHY. We will accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) and make it sub-section 6, clause 42.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would like to know whether any town will be affected by this? In 1869 we prohibited the sale of liquor in shops by vote of the people, though that law is not now on the Statute-book. I apprehend that it would require a vote of the people to repeal the law.

On section 45,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to leave out all from the word "except," to make a special exception for the Province of Quebec.

On section 46,

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Gigault) has a much better local option clause, if the opinion of the Committee is that there ought to be a local option clause at all.

Mr. BLAKE. When did the hon. gentleman become convinced of the superiority of the local option clause of which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) has given notice?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been opposed to a local option clause all through, but I had to submit to the voice of the Committee, and a majority of the Committee were in favor of such a clause.

Mr. GIGAULT. I beg to move that section 46 be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—

46. No license shall be granted by the Board for the sale of liquors within the limits of a town, incorporated village, parish, township or other municipality (save and except counties and cities), when it shall have been made to appear to the Board in manner hereinafter provided, that the majority of the duly qualified Parliamentary electors therein, who have voted at a poll, taken as hereinafter specified, have declared themselves to be in favor of a prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors in their locality, and against the issue of licenses therefor.

2. When a requisition shall be presented to any License Commissioner from one-fifth of the Parliamentary electors of any town, incorporated village, parish, township, or other municipality (save and except counties and cities), requiring a vote to be taken as to whether or not such license shall issue or be granted therein, it shall be the duty of such License Commissioner or Chairman, upon the receipt of such requisition, to scrutinize the names of electors of such requisition, and being satisfied that the said electors, whose names are attached to said requisition, are duly qualified and registered, and after the person or persons, who have witnessed the signatures to the said requisition, shall have sworn before a Justice of the Peace or a Notary Public, that he the said witness or they the said witnesses, were present and saw the said electors sign the said requisition, and that the signers constitute one-fifth of the Parliamentary electors of such municipality, to command the holding of a public meeting of the said electors, to ascertain whether or not such licenses shall be granted, and the taking of a poll to that effect. The License Commissioner to whom the requisition has been presented shall, by an order inserted in the Register, (1st) appoint the license inspector or other person to preside at such meeting and act as returning officer, and (2nd) fix the place and day at and in which the poll shall be taken. "The returning officer, in accordance with the order, shall give public notice of such meeting in some newspaper within the Municipality or District, or if there be no newspaper within the District, then in some newspaper as near thereto as may be, the publication to be continued in at least one number of such paper each week for three successive weeks, and also by posting up such notices, or copies of the same, at the polling places within such Municipality fixed in the order, and also at two or more of the most public places in the Municipality. This meeting shall be held in the month of January next ensuing, on such day as shall be most convenient, and not less than four weeks, and not more than seven weeks, from the date of the first publication of such notice, said poll to be taken between the hours of nine A.M. and four P.M. of the day so appointed. Should any riot or disturbance take place, so as to disturb polling, such poll shall be continued on the next succeeding lawful day.

3. On the day appointed for taking the poll the license inspector, or person appointed as returning officer, shall preside over the meeting, and such officer shall have all the powers for the preservation of the peace which are by law vested in a returning officer at any election of a member of the House of Commons of Canada, and shall have the powers of appointing and swearing constables.

4. The returning officer and the election clerks whom he shall employ, shall subscribe and swear to the oath for the due and proper performance of the duties of their respective offices according to the forms *mutatis mutandis* prescribed in the Schedule to the Dominion Elections Act, 1874, before the nearest resident Justice of the Peace or a Commissioner for taking Affidavits, and shall be subject to the same penalties for the neglect or improper discharge of their respective duties as are imposed on similar officers in case of any election of a Member of the House of Commons.

5. The Clerk of the Municipality shall furnish the returning officer with a correct list of the qualified electors within the municipality for which the poll is to be taken; and such returning officer shall, in case of doubt, have the power to administer to voters the oath as to qualification required in cases of the election of a Member of the House of Commons.

6. Each elector, desiring to vote, shall come forward in turn to the person presiding, and shall give his vote upon the question put to him by the presiding officer: "Shall licenses be granted for the sale of intoxicating liquors in this town, village, parish, township, or municipality, as the case may be; "yes" or "no," the word "yes" meaning that he votes for the granting of licenses, and the word "no" that he votes against the granting of the same, and every vote given shall be recorded in a poll-book by the person or persons appointed to act as election clerk or election clerks, and all votes shall be taken under the same restrictions, regulations and penalties with regard to the eligibility of the voter, and as to bribery, as exist under the Dominion Election Acts.

7. If, at four o'clock in the afternoon of the first day of the poll, the votes of all the electors present have not been polled, the meeting shall be adjourned to the hour of nine in the forenoon of the following day, for the purpose of proceeding with the polling of such votes.

The election must be closed at four o'clock in the afternoon of the second day.

If at any time after the votes have commenced to be polled, either on the first or on the second day of the said election, one hour elapses without any votes having been polled, the presiding officer must close the election.

8. At the close of the poll the returning officer shall count the "yes" and "noes," and ascertain and certify on the face of the poll-book the number of votes given for or against the granting of licenses, respectively. The certificate must also be signed by the poll clerk. The certificate, with the poll-book, shall be deposited in the office of the Board within two days after the close of the poll.

9. Objections to any act or proceeding under this section must be made in writing and filed in the office of the Board of License Commissioners, within eight days after the certificate is deposited in the said office. These objections shall be considered and adjudicated upon by the Board at their next regular meeting. The decision of the Board shall be final, and in the event of the objections being maintained, they shall have the power to cause another poll to be taken on the question whether or not licenses shall be granted.

10. Nothing in this section shall be construed as permitting any of the proceeding had, or paper writings filed, or notices required therein,

to be vitiated or set aside by reason of any mere want or defect of form, or any irregularity in the drawing up or execution of the same.

11. The decision of the majority of the electors against the granting of licenses as declared at the poll, shall come into force on the then ensuing license year, beginning on the first day of May, and such prohibition shall continue in full force for such year and any future year until repealed.

Mr. BLAKE. Does any member defend the Committee's clause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman who moves this amendment was one of the Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member insisted on this clause in the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. But he was not able to secure a majority.

Mr. RICHEY. Before the amendment is considered I should like to enquire whether the hon. gentleman would not specify all the municipalities which he wishes to include within it, because there is a possibility of the same difficulty cropping up under this section as we endeavored to dispose of under the other section. I would ask that any other municipality, or village, or parish, or township might be named.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That is a question of detail. I think it objectionable on principle to adopt the clause *in toto*. As far as I understand it, it seems to be an application of the Scott Act, to minor municipalities, towns and villages. If that be so, I think that on principle, it is objectionable—at any rate for introduction into this Bill. If it be thought desirable at a future time to amend the Scott Act in the direction my hon. friend proposes, that can be done in the proper way by amending that Act. This is introducing into this License Bill a provision of the Scott Act, extended to villages and townships. It was considered, when we were passing the Scott Act, that to apply it to counties as a whole, was going as far as the best interests of temperance rendered advisable. The effect of passing a clause of this kind and having it made law in particular villages or townships, and of not having it enforced, would undoubtedly do more injury and harm to the cause of temperance, than if it had never been passed at all. For these reasons, I will vote against its adoption.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think that the best thing to do is to accept the clause of the Committee, clause 46. I notice that my hon. friend, the Chairman, has lost all confidence in the report of the Committee which he submitted to the House, and fails now to come to time; the proposition of my hon. friend is exceedingly complicated and open somewhat to the objection raised by my hon. friend from Victoria. We have the Scott Act applying to large areas, its machinery is somewhat extensive and the cost of it somewhat expensive, and let us leave the turmoil and confusion of the Scott Act to the larger areas, and as to the smaller areas, let us adopt this simpler and equally effective machinery, which I think will be productive of very good results. The Committee acted very wisely in submitting a report containing this clause, and although unable to support everything which they have proposed heretofore, I support this provision.

Mr. JAMIESON. Although I will go as far as the hon. member for Middlesex for prohibition and vote for it at any time, I am not prepared to insist on this provision, clause 46. I think that we ought to approach this question in a spirit of fairness to all interests concerned. When we come to legislate on prohibition, it will be another matter; but we are now legislating in the direction of the regulation of the liquor traffic. Objections have been urged against the principle of petition, and perhaps a good deal is to be said against it. All I think we are entitled to now, however, is to have restored to us the provisions which were taken away by the Scott Act. It will be remembered that the old Dunkin Act of 1864, permitted electors in

Mr. GIGAUT.

minor municipalities to vote in favor of prohibition; but under the Scott Act of 1878, this right was taken away and prohibition was confined entirely to county municipalities. I think that the temperance people of the country are entitled to have restored to them, either in this Bill or by amendment to the Scott Act, what the latter took away; and it would be better that we should either adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville, or receive some guarantee from the Government that they are prepared to accord it either at this or at next Session, by amending the Scott Act. This seems to me to be a fair proposition; and I think it will meet with the approbation of the House, both of temperance men and of those who represent the licensed victuallers. The hon. member for Victoria made some reference to the evils which flowed from the enforcement of prohibition in minor municipalities; but in my constituency some years ago two townships adopted the Temperance Act, and since then have successfully resisted all efforts to repeal that Act, so that it is still there the law. I saw the gentleman in charge of the Bill smile a moment ago at the remark I made with regard to the by-law in force in my own town. I would just refer to it here, because I will ask for an amendment to prevent the issue of shop licenses under this Act. It will be remembered that the Ontario Municipal Act of 1866, irrespective of the provisions of the Dunkin Act, permitted Municipal Councils to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in shops, if they so thought proper. Under it, the municipality in which I live took action, and in 1869 the sale of liquor in shops was prohibited, and this has never been repealed. When we come to subsequent sections we will be able, I think, so to amend this Bill as to prevent the issuing of licenses in this municipality, which is perhaps the only one in the Province where such a state of things exists.

Mr. GIGAUT. I have no objection to vote for clause forty-six, as reported by the Committee; but I heard some supporters of the Government and others say that they had some objections against the petition system, and that is why I gave notice of the amendment I have moved. It has been said that the right hon. Premier promised—I do not know whether this is true or not—that none of the restrictions enacted by the Provincial Legislatures would be removed. We know that in Quebec that our local councils have always had the right to prohibit the sale of liquors. Since Quebec has existed, this right has always been given to municipalities. Even cities have a special clause in their charters, declaring that their councils had the right to prohibit the sale of liquors. This principle has been admitted into our Statutes and has there remained. The Scott Act was adopted in 1878, but the Quebec Legislature has never thought of amending the local law I have mentioned. We have the Scott Act in force, I think, in very few of our counties, but practically we have it—under the local law—in many municipalities. I think that one of the great defects in the Ontario law was that the people did not sufficiently control the granting and renewal of licenses. That is not my affair. The Ontario members can keep their law to suit themselves; but I think that the people of the Province should have more control in this matter. This it was what they complained of in England, and we saw that on the 22nd of April last a motion was carried in the British House of Commons, recognizing the principle that the persons mostly interested were the inhabitants themselves, and that consequently they should have some control over the granting or the renewal of licenses. The following is a motion which was moved in the House of Commons by Sir Wilfrid Lawson:—

"That the best interests of the nation urgently require some efficient measure of legislation by which, in accordance with the resolution already passed and reaffirmed by this House, a legal power of restrain-

ing the issue for renewal of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors may be placed in the hands of persons most deeply interested and affected, namely, the inhabitants themselves."

The system which we have had in the Province of Quebec has worked well, so that there have been no complaints against it; and since we have been dealing with this matter in this House I have received a great many letters from different portions of the Province of Quebec, and they all say that if in the legislation which we are now proposing there is no disposition to give to a majority in the municipalities or to the local councils the right of prohibition, it will be the most unhappy law which was ever enacted for the Province of Quebec. Public sentiment in the Province of Quebec is strongly in favor of the Bill just as it has been reported by the Committee. At a meeting of grocers held in the city of Montreal, when one of the grocers of Toronto tried to urge those who were present to get the French members to vote against this Bill, the Secretary of this meeting, who is a grocer himself, said he was sure that the great majority of the Province of Quebec were in favor of the Bill as reported, and that the members who would vote against this Bill would have great difficulty in being elected again. This local option may not have worked well elsewhere, but in our Province it has worked exceedingly well. During the discussion on the Local Option Bill in the English House of Commons, Mr. Hill a member of that House, spoke of the Province of Quebec. He said:

"A few words with reference to the condition of things in countries where prohibition existed might guide the House in coming to a conclusion as to what the effect of the resolution of the hon. Baronet would be if it became law in this country. The first place he would mention was in North America, where, after going up the St. Lawrence and crossing the Charles River, they would in proceeding shortly pass through the parish or town of Beauport, where the old inhabitants of French extraction were completely under the influence of the clergy. The priests have brought their influence to bear so strongly that not only was no intoxicant of any kind sold there but none was kept by any person. All were agreed to banish it; and throughout the length and breadth of either the Eastern or Western hemisphere not a better conducted, more happy, or more moral set of persons could be found than they were."

This is true, and I am happy to say, that in a great many parishes and counties in the Province of Quebec the greatest sobriety prevails, and the population of those parishes are very happy. But I may say, that if you have not local option, if our parishes and municipal councils have not the right of prohibiting the sale of liquors, then the inhabitants of those parishes may bid adieu to that happiness which they have enjoyed heretofore; and if drunkenness prevails in those parishes they will have just reason to make strong complaint against the legislators who have enacted such legislation as to force liquor shops and public-houses upon the municipalities, against the wishes of the majority of the electors. The House must remember, that in the Province of Quebec we have only about 1,300 tavern licenses, while in the Province of Ontario they have more than 3,100 licenses, which is a proof that in a great many parishes we have no licenses as the result of local option. We know that the best license law which was ever enacted, according to authors who have dealt with this subject, is the one enacted in Sweden. We know that in Sweden drunkenness was prevailing to the highest degree, and the people appealed to their legislators, and asked them to adopt such legislation as would lessen the evils of intemperance. One of the Kings of Sweden said that he would give the finest jewels of his crown to any legislator who would find some means of lessening the evils of intemperance. The Legislature began to study that question, and the result was that in 1855 the License Act of that country was adopted. What has been the result?

"As already stated, the Act allowed of local prohibition; and under it the traffic in spirits was not licensed at all in certain parishes, and greatly restricted in others."

The British Consul, in a letter to Mr. Gladstone, says:

"So vigorously have the people outside of towns, used their permission to limit and prohibit, that among 3,500,000 there are only 450 places for the sale of spirits."

Further on he says:

"The social condition of Sweden, as in Scotland, England and Ireland, and indeed everywhere else, proves that just in proportion as you limit the number of houses for the sale of intoxicating liquors you improve the morality and social well-being of the district; and in like manner as you multiply the facilities for drinking, you increase drunkenness with its never failing attendants of crime, beggary, and irreligion."

He states further:

"One result of the passing of this Act was the reduction of the number of distilleries from 44,000 in 1850, to 4,500; and with the aid of auxiliary legislation to 457 in 1869, and a reduction of the annual product from 26,000,000 to 6,900,000 gallons."

In Ontario, the Crooks Act was adopted, and according to the report of the License Commissioners, I see that under that Act the number of licenses in 1874, under the old law, was 6,185, and which been reduced under the operation of that Act by 2,247. I find also that the consumption of spirits was also reduced, there having been consumed in 1874, 4,566,609 Imperial gallons, and in 1876, after the number of licenses had been reduced by more than 2,000, there was a consumption of only 3,441,125 Imperial gallons—a reduction of more than 1,125,384. Some persons may say that there was a crisis in 1876, but we had good times during 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, and yet during any one of these years there was a reduction in the consumption of spirits, compared with the year 1874, by more than 1,000,000 Imperial gallons. So that we see that legislation may have a good effect, and consequently we should have the greatest interest in adopting a law which would tend to reduce the number of licenses, and consequently, to reduce the consumption of liquors. When we go electioneering, we always tell the electors that they are very intelligent and well acquainted with the administration of the affairs of the country. With what face shall we meet the electors if we say here that we cannot trust them even in the matter of granting a hotel or saloon license? Now, I say that the question is one of the most important which has been discussed in this House. It is far more important than the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other question which we have dealt with; and I am sure, if we adopt a License Act at this Session, without inserting a local option clause, it will be one of the most unpopular measures which could be enacted, at all events in the Province of Quebec. I think we should deal with the matter in a very serious manner. We say that we wish to promote temperance; we say that we wish to pass legislation which will render the homes of our countrymen more happy and comfortable. If we wish to do so, we must be taught by the experience of other countries; and when, in everything else, we recognize the right of consulting the people, we should try in this Dominion the same legislation that has produced so much good elsewhere.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad, Sir, that this poor little legislative waif and stray, this little bantling, which has been disowned by all its putative fathers, is to receive the support of my hon. friend, while those who ought to be its natural guardians are prepared to cast it out upon the world. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) has told us why he proposes his alternative. It was not that he was dissatisfied with the clause; but he thought he would get more support for this long parable than he would for three or four sections in the Bill. I think he is mistaken. I think the hon. gentlemen who found fault with his clause were gentlemen who did not want local option at all; and the objection is often made in the same way to the form in order to get at the substance. We have already agreed to the principle of the hon. gentleman's amendment. We

have agreed that a petition signed by one-third of the electors should be entitled to apply for a license; we have agreed that a petition signed by two-thirds of the electors should be favorable to the granting of a license, and having agreed to that mode of deciding, it seems to me reasonable that we should agree to the same mode of deciding that there should be no licenses at all in a district. If we oppose this proposition we should go back, and decide against admitting the clauses allowing certain portions to be decided by the people. The form is a rigid form—a form, as I pointed out before, not merely requiring a majority of all those who go to the polls, but an actual majority of all the electors in a division. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) objected, because, he said, it had been proved by experience that prohibition in minor districts is a bad thing. I do not think it has been proved by experience. On the contrary, my belief is that, if anything is more established than another, with reference to the plague of drink, it is that, the fewer the facilities, the less the plague, and that, if you can limit the number of drinking places, you will have less drinking. It is quite true that, if your law be such that it is a dead letter, and your ostensible limitation means an increased number of drinking shops, then you do not limit the drinking facilities. But you have already adopted the proposal that two-thirds of the electors in any polling division may petition, and with absolutely fatal effect, against the granting of any licenses in that division; and so, by adopting that cumbrous procedure, the people may prohibit in that division. Now, why not permit those in a larger area—those of a municipal organization, which the present proposition deals with—if they please, to declare, by an absolute majority, that there shall be no licenses within their municipality. It is quite true, that will not be so perfect a protection against the plague of drink, as if the people were enabled to effect the absolute prohibition within a larger area. It is quite true, it would be much more advantageous if instead of one township having no liquor sold within its limits, you had a large area of township in which there was no liquor sold. It was that that the advocates of the Temperance Act sought to accomplish, and it is that that they will accomplish in those cases in which there is a diffused popular sentiment within the area—a sentiment prevalent in the different parts of the district in favor of their view. We are now dealing with the case of a municipality in which an absolute majority of all the electors signify their desire that there shall be no licenses within that municipality; and I say it is a good and wise provision which secures a very decided preponderance in favor of prohibition within the municipality, and it will produce good results. It is quite true that the drunkards in the municipality will go outside and get drink; but they will not get so much as they would if it were sold in the municipality; and those who live in it, and are liable to be tempted—the young men—will be less liable to wrong when they have to go outside of the bounds of the organization to get their liquor. Therefore, I regard it as a most valuable thing to secure prohibition in a small area if you cannot get it in the larger area. To say in the face of what we know exists in the Province of Quebec, where we have heard from time to time from hon. members of there being two or three or four townships or municipalities within their counties in which no licenses were sold, because the people did not choose there should be any issued, and that good results have flowed from that—to say in the face of that you are going to do away with the right of the majority of the people in a municipality to prohibit the sale of liquor, is to tell us the most precious part of the Bill you proffer to us is to be blotted out by your own act.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have listened with pleasure to this temperance address of my hon. friend, but we are not  
Mr. BLAKE.

here as a temperance meeting. We are here for the purpose of giving practical legislation for the people. If there is one thing we ought to be careful of, it is not to legislate in advance of public opinion, not to put a law on our Statute-books which will be disregarded. Whatever may be the state of public opinion in Quebec, I hold this law is to be a law for the whole Dominion, and we have endeavored in the Committee to so arrange this measure that it would be acceptable to the people at large. I was opposed to the forty-sixth section from the first, and am perfectly consistent in opposing it still, but it is a different thing to say I should be opposed to the proposition of my hon. friend in amendment. What is the proposition in the Bill, and how does it compare with the law? My hon. friends opposite who are so eloquent in favor of temperance, took from the people, when in power some five years ago, the right to have the sale of liquor suppressed in local municipalities. They professed to speak in the name of temperance when they contended that the law would be ineffective in smaller municipalities than counties and cities, and substituted for the Dunkin Act the Scott Act which only allows prohibition in large places, because they believed that to be the only practical measure that could be given effect to. My hon. friend had then not one word to say against this, but was dumb when the Dunkin Act was repealed and the Scott Act substituted for it. To-night he asks that, by simple petition, without an opportunity being given of hearing both sides, it shall be decided in a place whether liquor shall or shall not be sold. We know now, that where the Scott Act is in force, a large petition has to be presented; we know that after that petition has been presented and the question debated, frequently the majority of the voters, on hearing what has to be said on both sides, do not support the law, and the people who signed the petition are found, as my hon. friend told us they were in his own case, turning their backs on their presentation and not giving that moral support to the law without which no law can be effective. If we are now to restore the power to have prohibition in local municipalities, let us know what we are doing and do it with moderation becoming to the House. I do not believe any of us would be satisfied with a prohibitory law simply enacted by the vote of a majority which might at the very next opportunity declare themselves, in the same way, opposed to the law. We ought without hesitation to reject the clauses in the Bill I have presented, and consider then the other question suggested by the hon. member for Rouville, and see whether that can be a proper measure or not. Is this question which has been raised by the hon. member for Durham germain to the matter before the House? We are not here dealing with a prohibitory law. The Committee was not struck for the purpose of passing a minor Scott Act, but for the purpose of regulating the trade in intoxicants—not for the purpose of saying that in particular localities there should or should not be prohibition. That does not appear to me to be at all germain to the Act. I would much prefer to see this question brought up in connection with the Scott Act. I want to see the Scott Act made as effective as possible. I desire that in those places in which Parliament thinks the people ought to have the power of determining whether there should or should not be prohibition—prohibition, if decided on, should be made effective beyond measure; but if in one village there is practical prohibition, while in the neighboring localities there are licensed houses—if a small area is to be deprived of licensed houses, while they are allowed to exist on the border, what practical prohibition have you got? That was the reason which induced Parliament to say prohibition could not be effective, unless enforced in places as large as a city or county. If prohibition should be restored, it ought to be restored by amendment to the Scott Act. What does the amendment of the hon.

member for Rouville propose? It proposes that upon a petition by a limited number, presented to one of the Commissioners, and on his being satisfied—as the Governor in Council would be under the Scott Act—that the requisition has been signed by electors duly qualified and registered, he will call a meeting of the electors to vote for or against the prohibition, and upon the result of that vote, the law will be determined in that particular municipality. I see no objection to carrying out that proposal. If hon. gentlemen opposite were serious, if they were not simply attempting to embarrass those who are endeavoring to make a good license law—

**Mr. BLAKE.** In maintaining the decision of the Committee.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** My hon. friend is actuated by the express purpose of embarrassing those who have endeavored to give, and have given, the best liquor law ever given to any House. His friends have been in power in Ontario for years with a large majority, and whatever view may be taken of this Bill, it is a great step in advance of anything adopted in that Province. My hon. friend was in power for four years, and the result was the Scott Act, which has proved wholly inefficient. He is now endeavoring to embarrass those people who take a different view from him, but who are as true friends to the cause of temperance as he or any of his friends. What we have to decide is, whether we shall accept the amendment. If the Committee believe it is wise we should pass an insufficient prohibitory law of this kind, I have no objection to allow these areas to be made smaller than by the provisions of the Scott Act. The question is whether it is wise, at this late hour, to attempt to pass a law which, no doubt, will require amendment and be dealt with thoroughly at the next Session.

**Mr. DESJARDINS.** I do not wonder that in a Bill of this kind, we must meet with difference of opinion. For my part, I am afraid that if the amendment be adopted, it would create so much difficulty and expense in the municipalities that it would be effectively doing away with the clause altogether. As far as our experience in the Province of Quebec goes, local option has worked much better than the Scott Act. We find that local option has worked better than the Scott Act, because where local option was adopted, public opinion was strong enough to sustain the law to its fullest extent, while it has often happened that where the Scott Act was adopted, the law has been a failure, because it was in advance of public opinion, so that the good effect we expected from a vote in a large area was practically nullified. In view of these circumstances, I think the 46th clause ought to be accepted, more especially as we have accepted the same principle in the 32nd clause. If it is found that such a provision would not be beneficial to temperance, I would suggest that instead of a majority, the petition should be signed by two-thirds of the electors. Since we have adopted the principle for a single license, I think we should adopt it for the whole; it reflects the same opinion and it ought to have the same weight in one as in the other. I would, therefore, move as an amendment to the amendment: "That no license shall be granted for the sale of liquors within the limits of a municipality or parish, if there is deposited in the office of the Chief Inspector a petition signed by two-thirds of the electors."

**Mr. FOSTER.** This is a very important question, and I do not think it is any reason, because it is late in the night and late in the Session, that we should pass this over without first discussing it as fully as the case demands. The question of local option with reference to licenses for the sale of liquors, is now a recognized one in almost all Anglo Saxon countries. If we look at Great Britain, as has been said by my hon. friend opposite, we will find that local option principles have made great progress within the last few years. In 1864, Sir Wilfrid Lawson first brought up the idea of local pro-

hibition. The fight has been carried on, and the first victory was won in 1880, when the British Parliament passed a local option resolution, by a majority of 26; in 1882, the resolution was carried by a majority of 46, while in 1883 it passed by a majority of 87. In 1883, there was no counter motion in direct opposition to it, and the mover of the resolution, as well as many who spoke upon it, laid down the doctrine, from which they would not depart, that the people in certain areas—and these not very large areas—ought to be the supreme and ultimate arbiters as to whether they should have any liquor shops in their midst, how many they should have, and the character of them. I think that is something which may guide us as well in our deliberations. In New South Wales, in Sydney, and I think in Victoria, they have a local option clause in their local Acts. I know of very few Liquor Acts in the United States which have not this local option clause, giving to the small municipalities the right of prohibition within their areas. But I put the strongest argument for the recognition of the principle of local option upon what we already possess in the Dominion of Canada. We have heard a good deal about vested rights, we have heard a good deal about putting violent hands upon vested rights. Now, my hon. friend who has charge of this Bill, stated here in Committee, that he differed from other members of the Committee with reference to this clause, and, as I differed from him, I may also state my views in this Committee. I was strongly in favor, in Committee, of the local option principle being applied. When the so-called Scott Act was passed in 1878, it was made applicable simply to counties, but at the same time it did not take from Quebec, nor from Nova Scotia, nor from any other Province in the Dominion, any power which they possessed by virtue of their existing laws, and it was a good argument and could not be impugned—that these other laws that then existed, and about the validity of which there was no question, should remain for the smaller municipalities, and one would be given which was fitted for the larger municipalities, for the county, and for the city. That makes quite a difference in this matter. Now, if we look at vested rights, what do we find? Down in Nova Scotia at this moment, no man can obtain a license unless he gets two-thirds of the ratepayers to sign his application, and unless this is endorsed by two-thirds of the Grand Jury, and then it goes before the Sessions, which may ultimately refuse to grant the request. By the License Law of New Brunswick, if the majority in any municipality petition against licenses, no license can be granted. If you go to Quebec, you find that in the cities of Montreal and Quebec the majority petitioning against any single license may block it. In municipalities, a majority sending in a petition may block a license, while the municipal councils have also the right to prohibit within their areas. If we go over to Manitoba we find still greater restrictions; a man has to get sixteen out of twenty of the nearest resident householders to sign his certificate before he can get his license, and if five put in a petition against it, the license cannot issue. In British Columbia you find, outside of Victoria, that two-thirds of the persons over twenty years of age have to sign a certificate before the license can be granted. Now, what I wish to impress upon this Committee is this: that these are vested rights, and they are just as dear and precious rights as are the financial or nominal vested rights of any person who keeps a hotel and sells liquor across the bar. We must look at these facts, and I think it would be a very harmful thing, a very monstrous thing—if you will permit me that expression—that we should legislate these rights away from these six Provinces and not give them a fair equivalent in return. Now, I am not wedded to the manner in which this return shall be expressed. What I want is to have the principle acknowledged and embodied, I do not care very much whether it is by petition or by open vote. Some pre-

fer one and some the other, but I am most anxious, not only for the cause of temperance, but for the goodwill afterwards of the public to this Bill, that it shall not disturb those long-continued vested rights which are held very dear by the people who have them. I tell you that it is something after a country has through fifty years of struggle and difficulty risen to the height of this social legislation, of being able to prevent a license being granted unless two-thirds of the electors sign a certificate for it in any small area. In the county represented by my hon. friend from Yarmouth, I think there has not been a license granted for forty years. I think in those districts and in the smaller places which have the right under Provincial legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, it would be too bad if we were to take those rights from them and give them nothing in return. "Oh, well," but says one, "you have the Scott Act and can apply that." But there is this difficulty: the Scott Act only applies to counties or cities, and not to small municipalities. "We must have a majority," says one, "in order to carry out the law." This very provision then is to ensure a majority in favor of prohibition, otherwise it cannot be carried, and a majority has to be got in the district where the law has to be carried out, which is very different from having a majority over a county and in portions of which county where there is no majority in favor of the Act. All these difficulties arise with respect to local option and the Scott Act, and I beg hon. members to bear them in mind and be perfectly fair in considering the question. It is asked by some: Why are these laws not enforced? Why? Because no machinery is provided to enforce them. It is more than any Legislature can expect that any people will, even after years of long-continued conflict, themselves carry the law into execution. Take the Canada Temperance Act. If it is adopted in a county, there is no machinery by which it is to be put in force. I know hon. members will be fair enough to say that, before you judge the merits of an Act, and of the principles embodied in an Act, adequate machinery must be employed to enforce the law, and if it does not work well, then, and not till then, can you find fault with the Act, because before that you have not given it a fair trial. I wish to call attention to some of the parties who have asked for this. Not only is there this strong demand with respect to vested rights, but there is coming up a strong demand in favor of the principles contained in this measure. One thing is significant: I have never seen a measure brought before Parliament or legislation discussed in the country, treated by the press of different parties with so much unanimity of sentiment as this measure now before the House. There have been differences of opinion as to Provincial and Federal jurisdiction; but after those differences the ideas expressed have been almost unanimous—an acclaim of sentiment that this is a good Bill; and one of the features most favorably commented on, more favorably perhaps than any other, is that which strikes the popular heart, which appeals to the popular mind, and which we can never erase from it, and never should—that in the ultimate analysis the people of the district who have to support the taverns and bear the brunt of all the evils that may come from them, are the proper persons to say whether they will have them or will not have them. I want to say something in regard to the licensing power. I believe this Licensing Board is almost an ideal Licensing Board, and I do not think hon. gentlemen will find fault with the Board as appointed, as compared with any other licensing authority there is in this Dominion. But I want to say this as well: it is not perfect and is not balanced until you place over and against that somewhat irresponsible authority the will of the people as well; and when you place the veto power of the people in connection with that somewhat autocratic Board which gives the licenses, you will have a proper balance, and then you will have an ideal license-granting power. And I do hold and argue for this

Mr. FOSTER.

in order to make a balance in this respect. We have it stated on one side of the question that it may be hard for a man who has been engaged in business for a number of years to be by the will of the people prevented from any longer carrying it on. But will any hon. gentleman deny this proposition: that there never is a bar opened in any community and continued for one year, but some home had to feel the danger, anxiety and evil results that come inevitably from the opening of that bar. That is another side of the question. Financial injuries on the one side must be balanced and weighed against social injuries on the other side. We must look at the matter fairly, and if there comes a period when the majority of the people in a community feel that their morals will be better, the order and happiness of society will be increased, in the name of all that is democratic in the Government, all that is good in social life and in morals, do not let us put them outside of the power of being able to gain that for which they ask. Why is it that this traffic fears to face the people? Is it for fear of condemnation? If that be so, I say no legislation of ours will ever avail in the long run to keep alive a traffic which fears the public voice, and which does not care to have the public will expressly declared without any intervention or subterfuge in regard to it. We must recollect that there is an advancing tide in the opinions of this country, and of England and other countries as well. The Legislature which legislates on the liquor traffic to-day dare not retrograde on the legislation of yesterday, but by every impulse of public opinion, growing and increasing daily, it is inevitably forced to a higher tide-mark than it reached yesterday in its legislation. So it is not sufficient to say that this Bill goes just as far as the most stringent legislation we have. In order to meet that rising public opinion it must go a little further, and this Bill does go further, and I, as a member of this party and of this House, hail the day when this Bill will have passed through Parliament with its principal provisions undamaged. It shows to me not only that temperance sentiment is increasing in this country, but it shows also that the public mind of the Parliament of the country holds itself, as it always ought, somewhat sensitive to public opinion, and determined to go as far as that public opinion would carry. That it should go further, I think, no legislator and no wise man would assert; but that it should come up to that point, I think, every legislator and wise man would assert. I say, let us heed the representations of men who have much to do in connection with this matter. We, moving about in our technical and professional pursuits, having little, comparatively, to do with the work of society and the world, do not know all the evils going on in every grade of society as do those who are doing the work—for what? Not for their own interest, but in order to make public morals better, and to carry out the principles of the religion which they profess. I hold in my hand a petition which, I think, is of very great importance. It is a petition from a number of the clergy of the Province of Quebec, the Catholic clergy, the Church of England clergy, and the Protestants as well. It is signed by the Archbishop of Quebec, the Bishops of Three Rivers, Rimouski, Montreal, Sherbrooke, Ottawa, St. Hyacinthe, Chicoutimi, Cethère, and clergymen of other denominations; and that petition contains among others a provision embracing this request, that in any legislation here no retrograde step should be made as regards privileges enjoyed under Provincial legislation, and that in the Bill there should be a clause that every certificate necessary to obtain a license should be signed by one-half of the ratepayers, or that at least the signatures of at least one-half the ratepayers against the application should prevent the license being granted. I ask attention to that petition which has been laid before the House from another large body in this country, the Dominion Alliance, a body which has an organization in

every Province in this country, men who are not engaged for any selfish purpose, men whose expenses have to come out of their own pockets, and whose time is given to this cause, and who work in this cause. This petition embodies the request, the best request of the temperance sentiment of the country, praying that this provision be inserted and the local option for these localities be given as a right which the people hold dear, and a right which if exercised will do much towards the betterment of the country in respectability in every municipality, and so I think that this request should have some weight as well. I will not tire the House by speaking longer on this question. I will only say this in conclusion, I do want this principle of local option; I want it to be embodied, and embodied in a workable way in this Act; and I believe that if we do it, as I believe we shall do it, that it will meet with the approval of the country, and that it will be a decision and conclusion which the people of this country will carry out. I know something of the opinion in the Province of Ontario as well, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is my firm belief that if to-morrow you could poll the Province of Ontario and give a decision with reference to this matter, you would poll a majority in favor of giving to the people of these localities a veto power upon the liquor traffic in their localities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure that the whole Committee must have listened with great pleasure to the speech we have just heard from my hon. friend behind me; and it must be satisfactory to the Committee who have framed the Bill, that in his opinion—and he was one of the powers of it—it deserves his laudations. However, we are now discussing the forty-sixth clause of the Bill and the amendment; and the question now before the Committee, is, whether the principle of petition is to be adopted, or the principle of open voting as suggested by the hon. gentleman in the amendment. As I have already stated during the discussion of this Bill, I am opposed to the petition system; and I hope that my hon. friend from Hochelaga will reconsider his expressed opinion in that regard. The hon. member from West Durham said: "Oh, but this Committee has already committed itself—twice—to the principle of petition; first on the application for a license, and then on the question of depriving a person of his license, or in refusing a license for a specified purpose;" and therefore he said they have committed themselves in these two cases and should carry out the principle of petition here. Why, there is no similarity between these two cases and this one. This is a license system for the purpose of regulating trade in intoxicants. The whole aim and end of the Bill, with the exception of this single clause, is for the purpose of the regulation of the sale of intoxicants and not for the prohibition of it. Why, in the first case, it is merely to give a *prima facie* color to the claims of the party to get a license, and that petition does not decide the matter. This merely gives the applicant a *prima facie* right to go before the Board of Commissioners and ask for his license—there is the governing power. The first petition only opens the door by which the applicant to keep a tavern can come before the governing, the licensing power; and therefore there can be no comparison, no similarity between that case and this, because this petition is the governing power. If this clause passes as framed, then there is no appeal. The petition is prepared; it is final; it decides whether a party is to get his license—

Mr. BLAKE. The petition decides whether there shall be any license or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or rather, as the hon. gentleman has said, this petition prevents the possibility of a party getting a license. The petitioners in signing the petition are placed by this clause in the position of authority, and with the power which is ultimately in the other case of

granting a license vested in the Board of Commissioners. I shall not ask the question with respect to the action in the carrying out of this clause by petition. I am strongly opposed to it. I believe that it will not meet with the approbation of the country. I believe that the country will not agree to it. I believe that the country will prefer the system which now exists under the Scott Act, and which is to be carried out under the amendment of my hon. friend. But my hon. friend from Hochelaga says it will be very difficult to carry it out, and expensive. Why, not so very expensive as are the annual elections in every county and municipality. There is a little trouble and a little expense, but that goes on from year to year, and every year in every county, and in every township, where there are municipal institutions, and the people do not grumble at the expense, or at the difficulty experienced in that way. They decide, they meet every year, and they form their whole municipal organization; and why will they not meet for the purpose of settling a question like this? I shall, in the first place, vote for the amendment as against the present resolutions; and I really hope that the majority of the Committee will vote for the amendment. It is a very serious thing to interfere with vested rights. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who spoke so eloquently last, that there are two sorts of vested rights. The people have vested rights in good Government in the same way that the people who have invested their fortunes in a particular trade, have in it vested rights, and under the protection of the law. When parties have invested their money and gone into a trade, and their wealth, their position, their future, and perhaps the future of their families, depend upon their being protected in that trade, I think that while individual rights must yield to the public good, yet you should take care that in the over-anxiety to press what you think is the public good, you do not ruin the individual or prejudice the individual, if there is any mode by which he can be fairly protected. Now, the great objection to this system of petition under this clause, is the utter uncertainty which must exist in the mind of every publican, every inn-keeper, every hotel-keeper, as to whether he may not at any moment be deprived of his means of existence, and whether his property and his house, in which all his means have been invested—the whole of that may not be swept away and he be ruined; and it is not for the public advantage that this uncertainty should exist. What is the public advantage with respect to hotels?—that they should be large, commodious, and respectable. How can you expect, is it reasonable to expect, as we all know that capital is very timid and easily frightened, that we will have Windsor Hotels, Rossin Houses, or Queen's Hotels put up, and have large sums invested in them, when at any moment they may, by petition signed behind the back of the proprietor, be obliged to close their doors and their houses, thereby rendering them actually valueless. The consequence will be, so long as the uncertainty exists as to whether this clause may be put in force at any time, people will not invest their money in these buildings, and you have all over the country an inferior class of hotels and inferior accommodation. If parties keep these houses upon such an uncertain tenure as the casual feeling of the municipality they will not invest in large, expensive buildings, but rather in an inferior kind of buildings, so that the loss may not be so great if at any time local option should decide against hotels altogether. This feeling that they will be ruined if they erect large and respectable hotels will spread through the country, and a feeling of dread will be produced that the whole business will be destroyed, and this in turn will produce the consequences which I have mentioned. On the other hand, if there is to be a solemn vote taken, if the people come forward and vote on their responsibility, if the will of the people is thus publicly declared in the eyes of the world, then, if these parties suffer it cannot

be helped. Then comes in the doctrine that the individual must yield to the public good, and you have, at all events, given the individual whose interests are affected the opportunity of seeing the people and meeting them before the election, and at the election, and presenting and urging his case. As between the two questions I shall support most strongly the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted by the House.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I regret exceedingly the course taken by the hon. leader of the Government on this question. I understood, from the public press, and statements made on various occasions, that the proposition of the Government was not to relax any of the restrictions placed on the liquor traffic. I think he has stated that himself, in this House, in the debates which have taken place upon this matter, and, at all events, it has been stated for him in the public press. Now we find that these restrictions are to be seriously relaxed. We have had it stated, over and over again, that in the Province of Ontario, for example, where the majority can veto a license, and where they have vetoed them year and year after year, there shall be no relaxation, but unless this clause is adopted, that privilege will be relaxed. The same remark applies to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island—in fact, to every Province in the Dominion—so that the proposition of the hon. gentleman is a very great relaxation of the restrictions which are at present imposed on the liquor traffic. The hon. gentleman says that people will be ruined if this petition system is adopted. What did the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) say? It has prevailed in the Province of Quebec for many years, and has the hon. gentleman shown that people have been ruined by that system? Not at all. The hon. gentleman says the people will be ruined by the system of petition, but if the electors are allowed to go forward and cast their solemn vote, they cannot be ruined—in other words, they can be ruined by petition, but not by vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Where is the relaxation?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The relaxation is that instead of the simple and inexpensive process of option which prevails in that Province, the hon. gentleman proposes a more difficult and expensive one. He says we will have no respectable hotels if this prevails—we will have no Windsor House, no Rossin House. The Windsor House of Montreal, I believe, was built where this right of petition prevails, so that we have the example of one of the largest and most respectable of the hotels of the Dominion erected in the very teeth of the system which the hon. gentleman condemns. He says that the petition system is uncertain—that petitions may be presented without the other side being heard. We have in this country a very good understanding on both sides of that question. The people understand thoroughly well the effect of the liquor traffic in communities and the effect of prohibiting it. This is not a question upon which there is any necessity of arguing, for every person in Canada who has arrived at the age of maturity knows that the effect of increasing the facilities for drinking is to increase the amount of drinking, and the effect of limiting these facilities is to reduce the amount of drinking. The hon. gentleman says that vested rights must be respected. Does the hon. gentleman protect vested rights in every instance? In clause 42 the hon. gentleman proposes practically to reduce the number of licenses that can be issued, as compared with the number that can be issued in Ontario under the Crooks Act. As the hon. member for King's has pointed out, the various Provinces of the Dominion have a vested right in the legislation which has been conceded time after time, and the hon. gentleman now proposes to set aside the vested rights which sober and temperate communities have in that legislation in favor of the vested rights which a few hotel-keepers have in a few hotel buildings. I

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

think the common sense of the people will be in favor of the vested right which the community has in that legislation which prevents the increase of intemperance and the evil consequences which arise from it. The hon. gentleman says that this is a Bill to license and not to prohibit, but assuming that it is, we have prohibitory as well as license enactments in this Bill. The very principle of limiting the number of taverns or hotels, is a principle of prohibition. You limit it in certain respects by requiring that there can be only so many hotels to so many inhabitants. We propose to go a little further and to say that if a majority of rate-payers declare that there shall be no hotels, then there shall be no hotels. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated that this is one of the best License Bills ever submitted; but if he eliminates this clause, will he be able to say that? I say that it will not be as good a Bill as the Bills they have in Nova Scotia, Manitoba or Prince Edward Island. It is destroying one of the most valuable concessions which were made to the temperance community when the Bill was drafted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at all.

Mr. ROSS. I say it is. It is reducing the effectiveness of this Bill so far as these various Provinces are concerned, and it is extending to Ontario the privilege which we have not now. We are charged with embarrassing the hon. member in his Bill, but we are only assisting him. He submitted a Bill and we want to help him carry it out—we are loyal to the measure. To use a common expression, the hon. gentleman is going back on his own Bill; he is embarrassing himself by taking a retrograde step, and we come to his support in the hour of his weakness by voting for the Bill in its integrity. I trust that the House having listened to this discussion so patiently at this late period of the Session and this late hour of the night will now be prepared to vote for the Bill as it was reported from the Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to correct a mistake which I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and my hon. friend behind me, have in regard to what are called vested rights in this law. It is quite true that the provision they speak of exists in the Province of Quebec. If that was the law before Confederation, nothing we are proposing to do in this Bill will alter that law. We are not taking away any rights; we are dealing with this question, because, according to the decision of the Privy Council, the laws passed in the Provinces since Confederation are unconstitutional; but if these laws were in force before Confederation, as I understood the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) to say, we do not intend to take away anything from the effect of that law, and a saving clause may be introduced to that effect. In New Brunswick there is a similar law; but my hon. friend behind me, unintentionally, no doubt, misled some of us by stating that it was the same in all the other Provinces. Neither in Ontario, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, nor Manitoba, nor in any of the Provinces except the two I have mentioned, is there a local option clause such as is mentioned here.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, there is.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is power in these Provinces to petition against the granting of a license to a particular man.

Mr. BLAKE. In Nova Scotia no license can be obtained, unless two-thirds petition for it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Exactly; but that is not local option, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. BLAKE. I know that it is local option of the most effective character.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may quibble about the words, but that is a different thing from the law of local option, and my hon. friend knows it very well.



Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In Prince Edward Island, if two-thirds of the people petition against it, no license can be renewed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and we have made that very provision in this Act. But what we are now dealing with is, in point of fact, an extension of the Scott Act. We are dealing with the question whether it is wise and prudent to extend the Scott Act to a smaller area than a town or city; and hon. gentlemen say, why should not the Scott Act be carried out? The hon. member for West Durham spoke about the majority governing this and governing that. I ask, could a law be passed by the majority of this House signing a petition in favor of it? No, we would want to hear it discussed, and decide openly in this House by our votes. So, the question involved here is whether the people shall decide by petition, or by recording their opinions by their votes at the polls. There are local option laws of many kinds, but everyone of them contains a provision for voting. If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Rouville has taken his amendment from one of the Australian laws; and I would like to know where, in any British colony or British country, any law is made by petition. That is the question before us—whether we are to adopt a petition as final, or whether a vote must be taken. But I do not stand here without authority, and I have an authority which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will accept. In the *Globe* of to-day the system is condemned in unmeasured terms, and it is pointed out that the proper way is to submit the question to a vote of the people:

"The clause respecting the exercise of the power of local option on the larger scale provides that where a majority of the Parliamentary electors of a municipality petition against licenses, no licenses shall be granted, and that if they petition for a limitation in the number the Commissioners shall not exceed the limit. Each petition is to have effect until superseded by another indicating a change in the popular will. It is open to serious question how far this system will be at all workable outside of the smaller municipalities, as there is a provision that each petition shall be accompanied by the affidavit of two electors stating that each of the signatures or marks at the foot of the petition is that of the elector indicated by it, he being a Parliamentary elector. Whether this is the intention of the framers of the Bill or not, a strict construction of this clause would make it necessary that the same two electors should swear to the genuineness of every signature on the petition, which would render this method of procedure a practical impossibility in a much smaller city than Toronto. If it is simply the intention that each signature shall be duly authenticated by two electors without its being necessary that the same witnesses should identify all the signatures, the wording of the clause should be changed. It will be a sufficiently arduous undertaking to secure a majority of the electors by the clumsy and cumbersome fashion of getting signatures to a petition—without throwing an insuperable obstacle in the way by requiring the same two witnesses to swear to every man's signature and identity."

And a little further down:

"The Local Government has the municipal machinery in its hands. As an addition to the Crooks Act, local option in the form of a veto, either upon all licenses, new licenses or licenses above a fixed number, would be easily worked. The electors could cast their ballots on this issue at the regular municipal elections, at a very slight additional trouble and expense, as under the Massachusetts law."

And again:

"That such an awkward and cumbersome system should have been adopted to carry into effect the local option principle, is another evidence of the difficulty of dealing with the matter at all."

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman did not read that rightly:

"That such an awkward and cumbersome system should have been adopted to carry into effect the local option principle, is another evidence of the criminal blundering of the Dominion Government in attempting to rob the Provinces of their appropriate and constitutional functions."

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend insisted on that "criminal blundering." I think I have said enough to show that these hon. gentlemen ought to read the *Globe* newspaper.

Mr. ROSS. I want to read another sentence:

"If properly worked in connection with the municipal electoral mechanism, the extension of local option to the limited area of the polling sub-division would be a beneficial reform."

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose it is of much consequence what the opinion of the newspaper article is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. Or of all the newspapers together. We have to decide upon our own judgment, and not upon what these Mentors of the press tell us. But I may say to the hon. gentleman, that if he reads that article as justifying his present action, it certainly is a severe condemnation of the Committee that brought forward the Bill. But I do not so understand it. I understand the last sentence read to mean that the principle of voting provided by that Government which has charge of the municipal machinery could be inexpensively and conveniently applied to local option. We have an annual municipal election at which the electors of our municipalities are called on to vote for the election of their municipal officers, their reeves and councillors, for the year, and those governments—for they have all that portion of the functions of a government—could arrange for the application of the principle of local option by a vote without any additional expense or inconvenience; and I understand the writer to point out—I believe with propriety and justice—that this is a very good reason, in point of convenience, at any rate, for the proposition, that the question of the regulation of licenses should remain with those who have the control of the municipal institutions of the country. I believe that it would be a better plan that a vote should be polled than that it should be decided by petition, if you can procure the polling of a vote without inconvenience to the people and expense.

Mr. McCARTHY. Tell us why we cannot arrange that a vote should take place at the municipal elections.

Mr. BLAKE. I say first of all that the hon. gentleman has not proposed that. He has declared this thing ought not to be dealt with by the Act at all, that it ought to be stricken out and nothing established for it; that it is alien to the Act altogether, that we ought to throw it on one side, and trust to some happy day when the Scott Act, which we have tried without success to have amended in those practical details, should be amended to cover this thing up; and he whose attitude towards the adoption of the principle of local option in this Bill is one of hostility, and his hon. friend beside him, are now endeavoring, under cover of a preference for the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville, to accomplish this object—to spew out of this Bill that which they say is foreign to it, the principle of prohibition altogether. They both tell us it is for the regulation of licenses, not for prohibition, but that they very much prefer the proposition of the hon. member for Rouville, and believe this provision in the Bill is an abominable proposition. It is a most awkward thing, it is such a dreadful clause that those who support it are embarrassing the promoters of the Bill. It is such an atrocious specimen of stupidity and bungling, such an instance of legislative incapacity, that no friends of the cause could sincerely stand up and advocate that it should be retained in the Bill. This clause which, after six weeks' incubation, was formed, and which the hon. First Minister brought into Parliament, is a clause that no sincere man can support. What was the character of the man who brought it forward? And we who maintain the clause, are to be told that we are embarrassing the proposers of the measure. When did they change their minds and come to the conclusion it is an evil clause? My hon. friend from West Elgin says they were converted by the deputations. I believe the difficulties with reference to the proposed amendment are expense and confusion. There is one point, no doubt, in which it is better than the provision in this Bill—that only a majority of those who vote at the poll—if there be a poll—that is required to prevent the license being issued. Therefore, as one desirous to see the opinion of the majority prevail, if I held that the clauses of the hon. member for Rouville

were such that in their practical operation they would be carried out by the people, that [particular would do much to recommend them in my eyes; but I am satisfied they are too complicated, and require so much legal expense, that this amendment of the hon. member for Rouville would not be acted upon. I am the more satisfied of that, because I find the foes of local option altogether in favor of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has just asked when my hon. friend was converted. We were converted at about the same time as the hon. gentleman was to give his support to the Bill. He is suffering under the keen pangs of remorse. The hon. gentleman is held up in the press to the criticism of his own side, and the Conservative side—he is even shown by his friend, Mr. Bengough, in that great paper, *Grip*, as weeping—over what? Because this Bill was introduced without his assistance, and really it is a good Bill. He did not wish this introduced, nor Parliament to interfere in any way in this matter.

Mr. BLAKE. Nor do I now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not wish to have any legislation. He has found out that he made a great mistake. Never did a man make so great a political blunder, never did a man show himself so wanting in political sagacity as when, to back up the pretensions of Mr. Mowat, for the mere purpose of backing up his own party in his own Province, he chose to oppose a great measure of reform. He cannot deny it. He is playing the cheap game of patriotism. He does not want a Bill that will redound credit to this House and the Committee, and this measure will redound credit to Parliament. His first speech against the measure showed his true sentiment, and that was to stand by his own party, and his own Province. That was the principle that actuated him, and he now calls us the foes of the temperance cause. Why, I wonder that, notwithstanding all the training and his long experience in Parliament has given him, he would not blush at getting up and throwing that taunt across the floor. A man, who, when he was asked to sit on the Committee declined to go, because he thought that by playing that little game this measure would be thrown over, and he might taunt the Government, as he has tried to do about the Franchise and the Factory Bill, that this was a mere pretence and the Government never intended to carry it out. He kept away and kept his friends away from sitting on that Committee, and now taunts us with not being sincere. The country will know whether we are sincere or not. When the country gets this measure, with or without local option, they will say the Government fulfilled its pledge by bringing down a measure, by taking the best means of getting a good measure, in choosing men of experience in every Province to sit on the Committee, and that we did not desire to get the miserable satisfaction of having it called a mere party measure. On the contrary we invited the hon. leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend from Middlesex, who has been an apostle in the cause, to attend the Committee. We invited the leading members of the Opposition to join in making this a good measure. They stayed away, they would not come, they hoped we would fail, they hoped no measure of this kind would pass; and when they find they are disappointed and that the whole country has declared against them, the hon. gentleman has tried to draw back, to make violent speeches for temperance to make up and atone to the Dominion Alliance, to the Temperance cause in the whole Dominion, for his lack of wisdom, his lack of prevision, his lack of patriotism and his sacrificing the interests of the country and of morality to the miserable spirit of party jealousy.

Mr. BLAKE. Trying to atone to the Dominion Alliance, am I? Has not the gentleman read the resolution of the

Mr. BLAKE.

Dominion Alliance deprecating action of this Parliament on this question?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. It was before any action was taken.

Mr. BLAKE. Deprecating any action, I said, this Session of Parliament, after the Speech from the Throne had been delivered, after the announcement had been made that it was intended action should be taken. Does the hon. gentleman not know, that sitting here under the shadow of this building, that Alliance pronounced itself against interference with Provincial rights? Make atonement to the Dominion Alliance! Whether I act for or against it, in this or in any other question, I have no call to offer an atonement to the Dominion Alliance, or any other body. I have acted throughout on my conviction; and for the hon. gentleman to tell me that I am trying to atone to anybody, or to make up to anybody, when I am simply endeavoring to persuade him to hold fast by all that is good in this Bill! Am I opposed to amending the Act? Am I proposing a change? Am I proposing something different? I say, stick to what is good in the Act. If the country has received his measure in any respect with pleasure or satisfaction, why is it? Has not the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) told him that it has been received upon its merits, as a measure of great merit, and that the clause which has most induced that view is the clause which he proposes to obliterate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the hon. member for King's to speak in that sense, and a good many other gentlemen on this side of the House understood him to speak in that sense.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman is probably right, and the House is right. I did say that amongst all the clauses in the Bill, there was none that called forth a more unanimous acclaim of public approval than the one providing for local option. The hon. gentleman is right so far as that is concerned, but he is not right when he says that the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government has expressed himself as being determined to vote against that principle in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not at the moment asking the hon. gentleman to vindicate my views of what the First Minister said. I was confining myself to the hon. gentleman's own utterances, and if he will attend to himself, I have no doubt the hon. First Minister will be able to do the same. Now, Sir, we have heard here a discussion of whether I was guilty of an act of unparalleled political stupidity and want of prevision in the course I took at the commencement of this Session. I am inclined to think that, under these circumstances, events will justify me rather than the hon. gentleman. I am inclined to think that what the country will look at is not what the hon. gentleman has proposed, but to what he will do; not what he has brought down, but what he carries, and that the House will look at his action in this light. It must be remembered, in reference to what is called the Scott Act, that it has been found almost impossible to procure the needed amendments to carry that Act into practical execution, and that those who are interested in the Temperance cause were told: "It is dangerous to appeal to Parliament to amend the Scott Act, because you will find that something will happen to destroy it altogether." Something of that nature was tried, and when the amendments came down, there were tacked on to them clauses which would destroy the Scott Act practically. And at this very Session a suggestion was made for amendments to the Scott Act. And the question was whether an attempt should be made to amend it, unless the Government would consent to take the matter in hand, and I believe an appeal

was made to the hon. gentleman, and I believe that the hon. gentleman, after taking time to consider it, declined to interfere; and I presume those who were chiefly interested in the Scott Act thought it was imprudent for him to bring it again before Parliament. And so you find that even the peculiarity of the Act that is proposed to-day in this Parliament, the question that you relegated it exclusively to the jurisdiction of this Parliament is placed in the position in which that Act might be impaired at some future day, and so would be beyond remedy by those who would have abandoned it to Provincial jurisdiction. Now, it has been made clear in the discussion to-night that there is a different state of progress on the question of temperance in the different Provinces. Different modes of action on this matter have been adopted in the several Provinces. Have we not heard suggestions made as to the impolicy of obliterating in one Province what has worked well in it, and have we not heard deprecations of doing away with these local provisions in our effort to attain uniformity. An hon. member says that there is no principle of local option in Nova Scotia. I say there is a principle of local option in Nova Scotia of the most satisfactory character. The hon. gentleman says it is not one general local option, because it is applied to any particular license. But, Sir, with a law such as that which provides that no license can be granted to any individual unless he produces a petition signed by two-thirds of the ratepayers of the district, you have the most satisfactory provision for local option that can be conceived—one far more satisfactory than this, because those who are against the granting of the license have not to move at all in the matter, and the man who wants the license has to go to the trouble of securing the two-thirds. In Prince Edward Island, I understand, there is the vote of a majority; in Manitoba, 16 out of 20 are required to sign the certificate; and in New Brunswick it has been conceded by all they have a thorough provision for local option. In Quebec, reference has been made to the provision for local option in cities. But because, in these respects, many of the Provinces are in advance of Ontario, the Province from which I come, are we to run them all down to the point at which it is supposed the law will be satisfactory in our Province? Not at all. I believe we are ready and willing to advance. I believe we are prepared to go onward, and not deprive the other Provinces of that which they have got. I was rejoiced when I saw this clause in the Bill. We are told that I could not acquiesce in the clause with sincerity. Those who brought it in, brought it in, no doubt, in all sincerity, though now they oppose it, decry and condemn it. But I, in my innocence, supposed that it was a good clause, and, for holding that opinion still, I am condemned as insincere, as acting only to embarrass the Government. I was amazed at the action of the First Minister. He told us, when he moved his resolution, the other day, for the introduction of this Bill, that the House would not be asked to concur in the report of the Committee, that the Government would act upon their own responsibility, that they would bring in such a Bill as they thought fit, and when I asked him for some information, he would not tell me anything about the Bill, he introduced his Bill, and the Bill contains the clause. This Bill contains the clause, and yet the hon. gentleman says it is wrong for me to support the clause. I admit that there is a *prima facie* case against me when I support anything coming from the hon. gentleman, but I hope to be relieved from that position, because I now find he is opposed to it himself.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The propositions before the Committee are, first: the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville, in favor of a bare majority of the voters given at an open vote deciding the question; and the proposition of the hon. member for West Middlesex, that the petition should be signed by an absolute majority of the qualified electors. I am not in favor of either of these proposals. I

do not approve of the principle of local option as applied to minor municipalities; but if I may judge from the remarks made by various speakers, it is probable that a majority of the House now is favorable to a local option clause, and if that be the case, I think it should not be determined by open voting but in accordance with the usual system of voting adopted in Dominion Elections and in nearly all Provincial Elections, by ballot. I think on a question of this kind, especially, it is proper and necessary that the voting should be by ballot. In matters of this kind we cannot trust to open voting, but under the ballot, judging from our Parliamentary experience, men vote according to their honest belief; whereas under open voting they vote according to the influences surrounding them at the time. I, therefore, beg to move, as a further amendment, "that the voting be by ballot, and that instead of a bare majority being required, two-thirds of the duly qualified electors be necessary." If a vote were taken in this way we should not be passing a law against the general sense of the community, which public sentiment would not favor, and therefore could not be administered. The experience under the Dunkin Act warrants me in saying that when a majority was able to carry the law the Act became inoperative, and the cause of temperance, instead of advancing, retrograded, because there was no license and no restraint on the improper sale of liquor, and it was sold indiscriminately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. member not to press his amendment just now. The question before the Committee is open voting, or voting by petition. Let the first be determined, and motions in regard to details can afterwards be considered.

Amendment (Mr. Gigault) agreed to.

On section 55,

Mr. METHOT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, where, in districts where no licenses are granted, the fund is to come from with which to pay the salaries of the Inspectors and the expenses? In the county of Nicolet there has been no licenses issued for thirteen or fourteen years, and in that county there were no funds to pay these officers, simply because every time one came in we always succeeded in throwing him out. That county is a license district, but I do not see how they will have funds to pay the expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. You will have to issue licenses.

Mr. METHOT. That is what I am opposed to, and I am sure that if the principle of local option is left out the Bill will be received with great disfavor in my county.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman now says that the License Commissioners shall be paid out of the license fund. I say that the Commissioners will thereby be placed in a most invidious temptation, and that they will be under great temptation, which, whether they yield to it or not, they will be suspected of yielding. These gentlemen should not be put in the painful position of its being said or suspected that they give licenses to Jones or Smith or somebody else for the purpose of increasing the fund, or otherwise they would not have been paid their salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. When the Dunkin Act came in force in our county, it was said that there would be no machinery to carry it into effect, but it was found that there were still prosecutions to be made, and that the funds arising from these prosecutions was sufficient to pay the Inspectors salaries. With regard to this question of local option, I may say that while the Dunkin Act was carried in our county by a majority of something like 900, we found, after our experience with it, that there was not a man who voted for it the second time to every fifty who voted for it the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with the hon. member for West Durham, that it would be unfortunate to

have the Commissioners in any way dependent for their salaries upon the results of the license fund. I believe that whether the license fund be large or small, these men should be paid, as the public is willing to pay those who perform public service. This Bill was reported from the Committee, and though it is true that I took the responsibility of adopting it; still, as I stated, my adoption of it was subject to the full consideration of it by both sides of the House. It will not come in force until the 1st of January next, and by the next Session the Government will be prepared with a measure for the reasonable remuneration of the Commissioners. Whether that measure will make the license fund a Dominion fund, against which will be charged the expenses or not, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BLAKE. In that case would it not be better not to include the provision proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We wish to provide for this fund now.

Mr. McCARTHY. What I understand is this, that the payment of the Commissioners and the Inspectors is not dependent on the amount they collect. Their remuneration will be a fixed sum, and what they collect will go towards it; but if there is any deficiency, it will be made up. But the mischief the hon. gentleman speaks of is to be avoided.

On section 65,

Mr. McCARTHY. This is a new provision: that during meal hour on Sunday liquors may be sold to be used at table, but not otherwise. The clause states from 12 to 2 o'clock p.m. and from 5.30 to 6.30 o'clock p.m. I should suggest that it be left to the municipality to fix the hours, or else from 1.30 to 3 p.m. and from 5.30 to 7 p.m.

Mr. FOSTER. On this question I do not think there is one on either side who believes the implications and allegations which have been so freely made about my position with regard to the matter. The statement was made by Mr. Hodge that in Ontario saloon-keepers were obliged by law to furnish their guests with liquors at any hour of the day between 7 p.m. Saturday and 6 a.m. Monday. I saw his statement shortly before I went into the Committee, before which I presented the opinions of the Alliance. My own observations in Ontario led me to the conclusion that on Sundays, in the principal hotels, there is a constant supply of liquor at least to guests. When I went into the Committee, the Chairman spoke about this matter of restriction. There was certainly no idea by any hon. member of the Committee, certainly not by myself, that there was to be any provision for the indiscriminate sale of liquors on Sunday. The only sale of liquor talked about was to *bona fide* guests and lodgers. In that Committee, I stated my preference decidedly to having no liquors sold, even for that purpose on Sunday, as I thought it would not be a great hardship for the guests to supply themselves on Saturday night. Then came the option as to whether there should be sale on all hours of Sunday to *bona fide* guests and lodgers, or for a restricted number of hours; and as between those two, I chose to have it restricted to three hours, rather than have it spread over the day, and this I spoke about as a step in the right direction. That is exactly my position on the question. With reference to newspapers who say this and that about me in connection with this matter, I have nothing to say in this House, but I thought it necessary to make this simple explanation of my position.

Mr. CURRAN. I think this clause makes rather a sweeping change in the law of the Province of Quebec. There for some time the hour for closing on Saturday night was eleven o'clock, but it was subsequently extended to twelve o'clock, and all the year the hour fixed for closing hotels, and bars generally, is twelve o'clock at night. Now, this clause compels all bars to close at seven o'clock in Quebec

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

as well as elsewhere. I do not doubt that a great deal of good will be effected closing the bars earlier on Saturday night, but I think it should be left to the City Councils to determine the hour at which drinking-places shall be closed on Saturday night.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman who suggested some changes in this proviso, spoke of drink being sold to *bona fide* guests to be used at table. The clause is more extensive, it is to be drunk or used in their private rooms or at the table. Now, I believe this law is extensively evaded as it stands. I must confess I have some doubts as to the consequences of the provision which the hon. gentleman proposes. I believe the result will be that in many places you will have some *bona fide* guests or lodgers, who is a *bona fide* guest or lodger for the purpose of having his private room turned into a bar room.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the hon. gentleman and we will strike out private room.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think if this clause were made so that the sale of liquors on Sundays in hotels were confined to meal hours and to meals alone, the clause would be better than it is. But the second proviso I hope will be struck out altogether—that is, the one that relates to the sale of liquor at any time on Sunday at railway stations. We had a debate here one night concerning the sale of liquors at some railway station where the trains stopped over the whole of Sunday, and the passengers had nothing to do but to loaf around the railway station and drink all the time. Apart from that it is most desirable that the sale of liquor at railway stations should be prohibited altogether. It is a cause of annoyance to respectable passengers and the cause of serious risk and danger to the service of the railway.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a fact that some years ago the Grand Trunk Railway Company paid £5,000 to lessees of the stations on their line who had the right to sell intoxicating liquors in them, in order to curtail that practice in the stations on the line. There is no doubt that where liquor is sold in railway stations and when conductors and engineers and brakemen come in on cold nights, they are subjected to a very strong temptation to drink; and I really think that if the travelling public on the whole would exercise a little self-denial and consent to the abolition of bars at railway stations, they would much conduce to their own safety and to the benefit of the railway employes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must remember this clause only applies to Sundays. I would have considerable objection to the suggestion of the hon. member for Cardwell if it applied to the whole week, because people going into a station for dinner or supper might like to have a glass of beer. But we ought to have as little Sunday traffic as possible. In regard to the time for sale on Sunday in the hotels, I really think the proposition of my hon. friend is a good one. I do not think it is advisable that people in a house who, in order to have what they want to drink on Sunday, should be obliged to fill their rooms with it on Saturday night. Whatever the law is, we know, as a matter of fact, when persons are traveling, liquors are used during the whole day, and I believe that respectable hotel-keepers desire to stop that, and to meet only the reasonable wants of their guests; and if this clause is confined to the two periods mentioned by my hon. friend, with the further limitation that it shall only be at table meals, I think the case will be met. It is suggested that liquor should be allowed to be sold from 1 until 3 o'clock, and from 5.30 to 7 o'clock, which would cover the meal hours at the various city and country hotels, and during all the intervening period the bar should be absolutely closed.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The clause should be struck out. Let liquor be totally prohibited on Sunday, as it now is in New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. Not all through it.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). That is the general law of the Province; there may be special cases, however. The difficulty in fixing the time during which liquors may be sold shows the utter futility of attempting to meet the wants of the people by this clause. What is one man's dinner hour is not another man's dinner hour. If a man was somewhat late to dinner he would be deprived of his grog, and thus the clause does not meet the necessities of the consumers of intoxicating liquors. I think absolute prohibition would conduce very much to the proper observance of the Sabbath, and would tend to lead people's minds in a proper direction. I move that the clause relating to Sunday selling be eliminated.

Mr. COURSOL. If this clause be adopted a large number of citizens, especially in Montreal, will be deprived of common rights which the people of other cities may enjoy. It is well known that a large number of families board permanently at the Windsor House, St. Lawrence Hall, and other Montreal hotels. At the first named, lunch is from 12:30 to 2 o'clock; dinner is not before 7 or 7:30 and is often not taken until 8:30; and thus, under the provisions of this clause the parties would be prevented from having their wine or what they wish. The clause should be extended to the meal hours of those hotels.

Mr. FOSTER. With regard to the hours of sale I hope there will be no change made, and that hope is joined in by many others. In the petition from the Archbishop and Bishop, the thirteenth point they make is this:

"That it may be expressly forbidden for all saloons, taverns, and restaurants to remain open, and for all licensed places to sell intoxicating liquor by retail, on Saturday after seven o'clock at night, or until five o'clock on Monday morning."

That is asked for by Quebec, and by a competent authority. It already prevails in Ontario, and no change is desired. With regard to Sunday sale, I would prefer to see total prohibition on the Sabbath. It would relieve the stomachs of many people who drink too much, and they would enjoy the liquor better on Monday. It would be, no doubt, some hardship on those accustomed to having drinks at their meals; but, on the other hand, if you once open the door, a great many will take advantage of that clause, and will importune the bar-keepers, and tempt them so much that they will actually sell to them during all hours of the day. But if you say there shall be no sale of liquor on Sunday, and you impose a heavy fine, and provide for the withdrawal of the license, the law will be observed. So I say I am in favor of closing up the saloons all day on Sunday. However, if the sense of the Committee is otherwise, I would restrict the sale to a certain number of hours.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I believe this clause will change a great deal the customs of the people of the Province of Quebec. In Ontario taverns are closed at seven on Saturdays, but in Quebec for many years the taverns have not been closed until twelve o'clock. I believe we should fix our law between these extremes, say nine or ten o'clock. Leave that as a matter for the police of municipal councils to deal with, even for Sunday. I do not think that this is altogether a matter of regulating the liquor traffic. It is more a matter of police, and the municipal authorities are very likely the best judges in this respect. If we do not leave it in the power of the authorities, we ought not to adopt the rule which prevails in Ontario, to which our people are unaccustomed. We have found our regulation in this respect in our Province no great grievance. I think that twelve o'clock is too late. A man has no business in a tavern after ten o'clock. The hour of seven o'clock was adopted in Ontario to prevent the laboring classes taking too much liquor on Saturday evenings, and this was supposed to be pay-day. But this custom has

changed; laborers and mechanics are now paid very often on Friday and Monday, and there is no reason why there should be so great an exception for Saturday. The laboring classes leave the factories about six o'clock, when they reach home it is almost seven, and it would then be impossible for them to get a drink on Saturday evening. Business men close at one o'clock, and have the whole afternoon during which to indulge in a little drink. I do not see why the common classes should not have a like advantage in this respect, until nine or ten o'clock. I would suggest ten o'clock; but if not accepted, the hour should not be fixed later than nine. I have not much to say about Sundays. We have been accustomed in Quebec to have the taverns closed on Sunday; but this Saturday night close would be a great change.

Mr. FISHER. I think that the objections of the last speaker have been very fully met by the petition to which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) alluded. It was signed and sent here by representatives of the Province of Quebec, and certainly it ought to bear weight. It is true that heretofore Quebec people have been able to obtain liquor up to twelve o'clock on Saturday night—but Saturday as pay-day has been to a great extent done away with—but that is not the only reason why those who wish to spend their evenings in taverns ought to be defended from this temptation on Saturdays more than on other evenings. Sunday following Saturday, and people being then at leisure, many are tempted to indulge in more liquor on Saturday night than any other night during the week. I think this is a very wise defensive proposition, the taverns should be closed earlier on Saturdays than any other nights. The sale of liquors in Quebec on Sunday is forbidden, and it is very unfair that we should be now asked to pass a law permitting Sunday selling. The question of hours gives great difficulty, and I am quite sure that these hours would lead to almost continuous selling on Sunday. If, on the other hand, Sunday selling were absolutely forbidden, the person in charge of that bar would have an absolute holiday and be able to enjoy his rest, and not be tempted to break the law, as would be the case under this Act. It is true that liquor is only proposed to be sold to *bona fide* guests who reside or board in the house, but we can easily understand that in many cases people would make arrangements to spend this day practically drinking in these places in clubs, and the result would be, instead of on Monday there being comparatively little drinking, there would be more on it, probably, than on any other day of the week. For all these reasons, the difficulty of closing at suitable hours, &c., it will be very undesirable to pass the clause as it stands. I trust that, at any rate, the suggestion of the hon. member for Durham, which seems acceptable to the hon. member for Simcoe, that liquor be not allowed to be drunk in private rooms, will be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. To clear up a point, I will read the Quebec Sunday closing provision:

"The present Act shall not apply, in any case, to keepers of hotels and houses for the lodging and entertainment of travellers, &c., who are hereby authorized to sell and supply the same at every hour or every day of the year, Sundays included, to their *bona fide* boarders or to travellers sojourning at such hotels; but, on Sundays, not elsewhere than in the rooms of such boarders or travellers, or the dining-rooms of such hotels."

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That is a sensible and reasonable law; and, if embodied in this Bill, it will be just and right. I do not believe in the doctrine that, if I happen to arrive at an hotel on Sunday, I shall not be allowed to drink in the hotel during that day. I do not believe in that kind of social tyranny. If we are to have total prohibition, say so; but, otherwise, if I want a bottle of wine on Sunday, why should I not then have it as well as on any other day. This is all cant, which we have heard on some occasions—I will not say to-night—and hypocrisy, from peo-

ple who set up to be uncommonly good and virtuous, because they do not drink a drop of spirits or wine, when perhaps there is none other of the known virtues in their disposition. I do not know of any better law than the Quebec law. I think it perfectly right that bars in public-houses and in hotels should be closed on Sunday. No such drinking should be permitted, and I quite agree with my hon. friend from Cardwell, that the last clause in the Bill should be struck out. Bars and drinking places in railway stations, as well as elsewhere, should be closed on Sunday. No legislative exception should be made in favor of stations; but so far as allowing a person who chooses and wishes to have a glass of wine or spirits in his own room, or at the table in his hotel on Sunday, he ought to have it, if he chooses. I think the law in Quebec is proper and reasonable, and if any hon. gentleman will move it in lieu of the present clause, I will cheerfully support it.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I move that the whole proviso with respect to the sale of liquors on Sunday be struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we cannot allow that. We have fully discussed the measure, and I think, by a sort of mutual consent, we have succeeded in getting a very reasonable clause. We have considerably increased the restrictions of the law in both Quebec and Ontario, and I do not think the hon. gentleman should now propose this amendment.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I admit that the clause has been very much improved, but still I do not believe in the sale of liquors at all on Sunday, and I think it would be better to strike the clause out altogether than to allow it.

Mr. McNEILL. I should like to say, that if you limit the hour to seven o'clock, you run great risks of inducing attempts to violate the law. You cannot expect, in these large hotels, that a man who comes in and sits down to dinner at seven o'clock, will be prevented having his bottle of wine, while the man who finishes his dinner at seven will be allowed to have his wine.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). I understand that under the Provincial law of Ontario all taverns are to be closed at seven o'clock. I have been told that in almost every case that law is violated, and that the people drink from seven until later hours. If so, why not make a law that would be respected by the people—a law that would make the hour nine or ten o'clock, or whatever hour could be observed?

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard) they are entirely incorrect. There is no part of the Dominion of Canada in which the law is more strictly observed than in the Province of Ontario. I visited the city of Montreal, and I have been able to assist in violating the law there on many occasions, but so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned it is almost impossible to do anything of the kind there. In fact, the liquor dealers there positively refuse to give anything after seven o'clock on Saturday night until Monday morning at six o'clock.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). My experience at the Queen's Hotel in Toronto and other hotels in Ontario last summer was not what has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Hon. gentlemen can state what is their experience in the city of Ottawa, which is in the Province of Ontario. I do not know that there is any strict observance of the Saturday night law here.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). I would propose nine o'clock instead of seven o'clock for closing on Saturday night.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

On sub-section 2,

Mr. SMALL. I would suggest that the hours for closing taverns on polling day be from nine o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the evening. I never could see any reason why taverns should be closed except during polling hours.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If hon. gentlemen wish to pass a law that will never be evaded they had better pass a law that there may be drinking on polling day until twelve o'clock at night. I have been in good many elections in Ontario, and I have never seen one yet at which there has been any pretence of obeying the law after polling is closed. On an occasion of that kind it is impossible to prohibit drinking; people will have liquor under excitement such as exists during election day and after the poll has closed, the reason of the prohibition is at an end. There is just as much excitement at an election meeting the night before the election as there is on the night of the election, and yet the taverns are allowed to be kept open on that night. I, therefore, support the proposal of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) to make the law as it will be obeyed.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason the Committee inserted this provision was that an impression has existed that the moment the poll is closed, the bars may be opened, and that is probably the reason of the violations of the law of which my hon. friend speaks. So it is proposed that they shall be closed from six o'clock on the morning of polling day until six o'clock on the following morning.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I am not in favor of amending the clause. I think it better that there should be no drinking on election day, from twelve o'clock in the morning until twelve o'clock at night. I do not see much objection for shortening the hours for Municipal Elections, but I think that there should be no open bars on the day of a Parliamentary Election. We all know that the successful party is very much excited and exhilarated, and there is an inducement to indulge in intoxicating liquors, which may lead, before the night is over, to disturbance. Therefore, I am in favor of the law being left as it is in Ontario under the Election law, that no liquor shall be sold during election day, which means from twelve o'clock in the morning until twelve o'clock at night.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to point out a defect in the provision with regard to the requisition that may be made to medical practitioners for certificates. I have known that to be abused by medical men granting certificates very freely. I think it should be provided these certificates should be in the shape of blank forms and charged for at the rate of 25 cts. apiece.

On section 66,

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). This is a most extraordinary provision. It will prevent people who take a drive into the country from having a dance at a hotel.

Section dropped.

On section 75,

Mr. JAMIESON. I have very serious objections to sub-section 2, permitting the sale of liquor in shops where other goods are sold until the year 1890. In the case of hotels, where the proprietors have spent some money for the purpose of accommodating the travelling public, there might be some reason for so long a delay, but in the case of shops, I think we ought to fix a period much earlier, at least during the lifetime of the present Parliament, and I would suggest that instead of 1890 it be made 1886. I do not see any necessity for shop licenses at all. In my constituency, with a population of 20,000, we have one shop license, and I think we could get along very well without that. We ought not to encourage the sale of liquor in shops. If there

is any profit to be derived from the sale of liquor, it should go into the pockets of those who are accommodating the travelling public, and not for the benefit of those who carry on a business simply to make money out of it. I think that section is very objectionable, and that the sense of the Committee will be taken upon it, and the time greatly reduced.

Mr. BENSON. I have numerous letters from all parts of my constituency asking that shop licenses be done away with. I am sure this sub-section 2 will give them great dissatisfaction. I can easily conceive that in large cities, where they have made great preparations in the way of vaults, and have laid in large stocks of wines and spirits, it may be necessary to give them some time to get rid of their stock without loss. But I am satisfied that in small towns and villages they might as well give up at once as at any future time.

Mr. PAINT. I approve of this clause, and, as there are considerable financial interests involved, I think it only proper that parties should have until 1890 to make their preparations. It is a very difficult matter to deal with, and there ought to be ample time afforded.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason of the Committee in adopting this, was, that in their opinion it was unfair to the men who were in the trade, a deputation of whom appeared before the Committee, representing they had leased in some places establishments which would not be required if they had to separate their business, and asking, at all events, that some time should be given them in order to make their arrangements and that leases might terminate. What have we done? We have gone much further than any law in any Province but one, and we have enacted that it is improper for the sale of liquor to be carried on with the sale of any other goods, and we give people a delay within which they can arrange their business so as to go out of it without loss.

Mr. KIRK. There is no necessity of giving them so much time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Some have been in the business twenty years, some have leases for seven or eight years, and some have built houses for the purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to this clause being adopted, but I think the next sub-section should be made more stringent where it provides a penalty for persons having a shop license who gives or treats. Then it should be provided that if any person sells or allows to be sold in quantities of less than one quart, he should, on conviction, forfeit his license. The great objection to shop license is that they allow liquors to be sold by the glass.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that there is no need, with the utmost liberality of treatment towards those persons, that this clause should pass in its present shape. In the first place as to large investments is to be taken with a great deal of allowance, because, now under the present law, these persons that did so did it at the risk of being refused their license in any one year. In the second place, the suggestion that there has been large sums invested in stocks is not applicable to the bulk of the holders of shop licenses; it is applicable, I presume, only to holders of shop licenses in cities and towns. Those who hold shop licenses in the country could very easily run off their stocks within a much shorter period than within now and 1890. In their case, therefore, a line of distinction could be naturally drawn between licenses in cities and towns and those in other parts of the country. Once again, in cities and towns there are probably numerous holders of shop licenses, and there will, therefore, be a certain amount of competition even if the licenses continue to exist up to 1890; but in the country shop licenses are issued to fewer persons in each locality, and it is extremely likely that some will go out of the business, and others may die long before the expiration of the period, and you have left few or no holders. You will practically be giving a

great advantage to holders of shop licenses in the country up to 1890 over all fresh comers into the trade. At all events we might shorten the time allowed as regards the country. There is a very strong feeling in the country against shop licenses; and under these circumstances there is no reason to extend the limit to 1890.

Mr. KIRK. In Nova Scotia where holders of shop licenses are not allowed to sell other goods, will be permitted under this law for seven years to engage in the two businesses.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In Ontario municipalities may by-law, separate the liquor from the grocery business at any moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a matter of doubt.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In Woodstock such a by-law has been in force for some years, and in my own town a similar by-law has worked very well, and no complaint has been made. I am quite willing to allow a little time to those in the business to adjust themselves to changed circumstances. The time might be extended to 1886.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are many persons doing business in groceries and liquors in Ontario and Quebec, at all events. If we were commencing *ab initio*, it might be better to separate the two businesses, but I have my doubts on it. My opinion is, that in towns persons having shop licenses to sell liquors are almost compelled to keep their stores respectable; whereas when dealers are selling spirits only, there is not sufficient check on them, and less chance of the houses being kept respectable—in towns at least; I do not speak of the country. However that may be, firms have established businesses, and have erected large buildings for the purposes of the double business. They have been encouraged to enter into the business, and there is no reason why, because in some cases it might be considered advisable to sever the businesses, a sense of injustice should be extended to those engaged in the grocery or liquor trade throughout western Canada. In order to prevent such a sense of injustice being felt, it is proposed to extend the time to seven years, and I do not think it is too long a period. No doubt the moment this Bill passes into law, grocers will look ahead and see how to make arrangements to alter their business.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman looks at the question from a different stand-point from many hon. members, for he holds that no particular injury accrues from the two businesses being united. As regards the country at least, a shorter time might be inserted than is provided in the Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). A by-law prohibiting the sale of liquors with groceries has been in successful operation in Woodstock. Instead of difficulty being caused in enforcing the law, the law has worked much better. The establishments are much more respectable and the duties of the Inspector are made easier. I would suggest that a clause be inserted by which the provision under discussion might be extended to large cities, but not to towns and smaller places.

Mr. McCARTHY. I feel there is a good deal in what the hon. member for West Durham has said, but it is difficult to understand why a man in the village should not be protected as well as a dealer in the city.

Mr. BLAKE. It must be remembered that the country merchant can close up his business much more rapidly than the city merchant.

Mr. BOWELL. Why should you have one measure of justice for one, and another for another. It may be true that a man carrying on a combined liquor and general business in a country village, may have greater difficulty in succeeding if the business be separated, than in a town; but the argument of the leader of the Opposition is this:

If a man invests a large amount of money in a city, he is to be allowed to go on for a longer time in business, than the man who has invested a smaller sum. It may be that one business is the larger, and the other the smaller; but because a man is poorer is he to be crushed earlier than the richer? This is a measure of compromise in very many respects; and the Committee desired to have a law uniform in its character. There are many provisions in the Nova Scotia law, that many members of the Committee, myself among the number, would have readily incorporated in the Bill, but they were opposed, and as every member of the Committee felt it incumbent to make the law workable for the whole Dominion, they conceded their individual opinions. It was better to concede and give a little. I have grave doubts as to the propriety of including this clause at all, in the law. There are many others holding different and very strong views. I do not see any justice in saying that a man who invests his all in a country grocery shop, in which he sells both articles, shall have only three years in which to wind up his business, while the man in the city shall have seven; let us have both alike. All the representations which I have had from the country, outside of cities, are the opposite to those received by the leader of the Opposition. I am told that it will shut up and ruin a large number of those engaged in this trade, if this is made applicable to the country, but by all means let it be enforced in the city, because a man can separate the businesses and succeed in the city, while greater difficulty in this respect is experienced in the country. I am under the impression that in cities and towns, at the end of the period, you will find people gradually adapting themselves to the circumstances, as provided for in this Bill, and there will be less difficulty and trouble, and less discontent and violation of the law, if all are placed on the same footing.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be sorry to be guilty of any unintentional injustice to the poor as compared with the rich. I heard a good deal of long leases, of extensive buildings erected for the purpose of carrying on the combined business, of vested interests of that description, which required time for turning round, and of great establishments, and in deference to those who have enquired into the matter and received representations concerning it, I was not indisposed to accept the view that a considerable number of years was needed in this relation, for the large transactions, large investments, long leases, &c.; but this is not the way in which things are done in the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg pardon. In rural places there are stores in which \$7,000, \$9,000, \$10,000, &c., are invested with leases of five to ten years.

Mr. BLAKE. I know; but grocery stores are not there much larger on account of the liquor trade which is done. It is not the liquor trade which makes the difference; and these smaller transactions, these smaller establishments, and these smaller investments are easier wound up than the great ones. The latter might require seven years; but now the hon. gentleman proposes a longer period for the smaller than for the larger establishments, because if the greater ones are separated the businesses will still be profitable, while with the smaller ones the difficulties are greater. That is the reason for making the term longer than seven years, for they must then share. I understood that the time was extended in order that they might get out of the business without loss.

Mr. FARROW. I entirely agree with the members for West Durham and Oxford. I know there is a desire in my section of the country that the liquor establishments shall be separate from the grocery stores. I am glad to say that this is the case in the town of Wingham and in the village of Blyth. When liquor was there sold with other goods, customers were treated as an induce-

Mr. BOWELL.

ment to buy, and there was more drinking often done in these places than in hotels; and, therefore, I think it very proper that these businesses should be separated as soon as possible. As to the cities the year 1890 is quite right; but in incorporated towns and villages, three or four years would suit the majority of people in Canada.

Mr. ROSS. I would move in amendment that in cities the term be fixed at the 1st of May, 1890, and in towns and villages, at the 1st of May, 1886.

Mr. BOWELL. You take a city or town of 9,000 or 10,000 and another town made by Act of Parliament with 10,000; and you give to the city with the same population as the town an advantage.

Mr. ROSS. I will place cities and towns together.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us make a compromise. Instead of 1886 make the year 1887.

Mr. McCARTHY. It can be managed by adding to the clause "or elsewhere prior to the 1st of May, 1887."

On section 89,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think that this clause, which provides a penalty for drinking liquor in a house to which a shop license applies, should also apply to drinking in contravention of the law, in a licensed tavern. The offence of the purchaser who obtains liquor at a hotel contrary to law, is just as great as the offence of the seller. I want the law to be made applicable to the informer. The misfortunes of these prosecutions is that vagabonds are engaged as informers, who try to induce tavern keepers to sell liquor frequently under false pretences. A case appeared in the press of an informer who sent a boy to get liquor, on the pretence that he wanted it for his mother, who was taken ill at a railway station; and it turned out this boy was in the employ of an informer, who went, on receiving the liquor, and informed against the tavern-keeper.

Mr. BLAKE. It is true a very untrustworthy class of men are those who give evidence in these cases, but I cannot see how you can alter that system.

On section 92,

Mr. HALL. Some discretion should be given to the Inspector. The complaint may be untrue, or upon trivial cause, and I would suggest that these words be added:

The said Inspector, if satisfied the statement made to him is correct and the requirement a reasonable one, shall thereupon serve a written notice on the person or persons holding license, forbidding such sale to the person in said notice designated.

Mr. BLAKE. From what was this clause taken?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was taken from the law of the Province of Quebec, the only change being that third parties are allowed to give notice.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no objection implied in the words, "may require."

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not deemed well to make it imperative upon him. The reason for the change was, that the woman, or wife, might, perhaps, have delicacy in going herself to the tavern-keeper and forbidding the sale of liquor, and might prefer to go to a third person. The notice, also, would come with more force from the Chief Inspector. I think we cannot accept the suggestion.

On section 96,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend that, by leaving out "License Commissioners" and adding "Chief Inspector or Inspectors." We can hardly subject a Judge who is one of the Commissioners, to a penalty of the kind, nor suppose him guilty of an offence.

On section 5, sub-section a,

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend the clause by inserting in the eighth line, after the word Quebec, "the



Judge of the judicial district, a Judge of the Session of the Peace, a Prothonotary, the Registrar of the county or registration division, as the Governor in Council may appoint."

Mr. HALL. I think the district magistrates should be included, because, though they are not numerous, they would be very valuable officers for this purpose.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman on that point.

Clause amended by inserting "Stipendiary Magistrate of the district."

On section 26,

Mr. CURRAN. Formerly in Montreal, the law prohibited any but restaurant licenses. Now saloon licenses are allowed. The experience there was that if the saloons were dispensed with, it would give rise to unlimited selling without license. It was the temperance people who first sought to isolate altogether in the city, the liquor traffic by stating people would go into a restaurant to get a drink who would not go into a saloon. After the experience of a great many years, the establishment of saloons was agreed to on the grounds of public policy.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). This is to dispense with the accommodations of saloons established under some other clause. I move that section 2 be struck out as the opening of mere groggeries in our docks and seaport towns will be a source of mischief.

Mr. DALY. I do not see the force of the hon. member's objection. The Board is supposed to exercise a judicious discretion, and we can leave this to their discretion.

Bill reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and (at 4:40 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 22nd May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LOBBE.

The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1884, and, in accordance with the provisions of The British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the Houses of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 19th May, 1883.

Ordered, that the said Message, with accompanying Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LANDRY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to correct a statement made in the last issue of the *Montreal Gazette*, with regard to the deepening of Lake St. Peter. This paper said:

"The only opposition to the resolution was made by Mr. Robertson of Hamilton, and Landry, the one representing the jealousy of Montreal

entertained in Western Ontario, the other the jealousy of Quebec city; the ground of objection by these gentlemen being that the expenditure on the channel is solely in the interest of Montreal."

Mr. SPEAKER. I never took such a position. I did not discuss the matter from a sectional point of view, and I deny in the most emphatic manner the statement of the *Montreal Gazette*.

Mr. BLAKE. We are now at the end of one Session, and I hope we shall commence another Session with a practice of careful abstinence from any references to what the newspapers say of our Parliamentary action. It is very difficult to keep them all right. They will make mistakes, and we had better understand that, and not attempt to correct them here.

### FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS.

Mr. DOWELL, in introducing Bill (No. 143) to extend to British Columbia the Act relating to fishing by foreign vessels, said: My reason for introducing this Bill is that the notice of the Government has been called to the fact that foreign fishermen have been encroaching upon the British Columbia in-shore fisheries; and as the British Columbia fishermen are not entitled to any advantages arising from the Treaty of Washington, not being allowed to take their fish free into the United States, and as this Act has never been applicable to that Province, it is advisable that the Act should be extended to British Columbia, in order that the Government may be enabled, as far as possible, to protect the in-shore fisheries of that Province.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

### ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 138) to provide for advances to be made by the Government of Canada, to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BLAKE. I made some suggestions as to the defects of the Bill, which I am sorry to see were not adopted. I only wish to record my own view, and beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend it by providing that the advance to be made by the Government, shall be a first charge in the undertaking; that the tolls to be charged shall be equal to all companies and persons using the bridge; that all persons and companies shall have equal rights of user, without any preference or advantage to any one over any other; that the tariff and tolls and the regulations for the user of the bridge shall be subject to the approval of, and to revision by the Governor in Council,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Bill contains an equality clause, by which all companies connected with it are to be treated alike; therefore, that part is met by the provisions of the Bill.

Amendment negatived on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

### SUPERANNUATION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the third reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the superannuation of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). At this late hour I will not inflict on the House the speech I would like to have made

at an earlier day. I did wish to review the arguments for and against the system of superannuation, for I think the time has come when we should change the mode of superannuating and, place the whole Civil Service system on a new basis. However, at this late hour of the Session, I will not trouble the House with any remarks, but submit the following amendment:—

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same, so as to provide (with due regard to the rights of those who have been already admitted to the Superannuation List) for the abolition of the present system, and the substitution of a plan whereby a percentage of the salary of each Civil Servant shall be retained, and placed to his credit, and shall be payable to him with interest on his quitting the service, or to his family in case of his death in the service.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) negated on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Armstrong	Fleming,	McMullen,
Bain,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Pickard,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Scriver,
Casey,	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Davies,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Thompson,
Dupont,	McMillan (Huron),	Trow, and
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Vail.—47.
Fisher,	McIntyre,	

NAYS:		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Dugas,	McCarthy,
Allison,	Dundas,	McDougald,
Amyot,	Farrow,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Mitchell,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Fortin,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Foster,	Orton,
Benoit,	Fréchette,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Girouard (Jacq. Cart.),	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Girouard (Kent),	Pope,
Billy,	Gordon,	Reid,
Blanchet,	Grandbois,	Richey,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Brecken,	Haggart,	Royal,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hall,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hawkins,	Shakespeare
Carling,	Homer,	Small,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Coursol,	Krauz,	Tilley,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Landry,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell)
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Williams,
De Beaujeu,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (G. Breton),	Wood (Westm'land),
Desjardins,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Woodworth, and
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright.—100.
Dodd,		

On motion for third reading,

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not intend to detain the House but a few minutes. It will be remembered that when this Bill was introduced, I made some remarks and presented to the House a statement, the accuracy of which was challenged by the hon. the Finance Minister. I stated there were fifteen on the Civil Service list that had served for six and two-thirds years, and the hon. gentleman replied that there was no person on the list who had not served ten years. I promised when the Bill came to the third reading that I would supply the House with the names. The hon. First Minister also, on that occasion, challenged the correctness Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

of my statement. I will now read to the House a list of the fifteen names I referred to:

	Years in the Service.	Years added to Length of Service.	Amounts.
E. N. Piché.....	6	10	\$400.00
Rev. J. Cameron.....	3	10	252.24
P. E. Côté.....	9	10	424.08
G. J. Coursolle.....	8	10	851.20
E. Daigneault.....	7	3	187.91
Robert Donkin.....	5	10	437.04
John Flinn.....	5	7	456.00
Charles Ketchum.....	6	7	499.20
J. W. King.....	6	10	608.04
C. M. Nutting.....	5	10	145.56
W. A. Ryan.....	3	10	75.72
F. Z. Tassé.....	8	7	997.44
V. Tétu.....	8	10	345.60
John Costley.....	10	10	592.20
L. Crosscup.....	10	2	78.36

Bill read the third time and passed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 132) respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of Licenses therefor.

Mr. OUIMET. I desire to submit to the House an amendment, to preserve a right which was enjoyed by municipal councils in the Province of Quebec, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the limits of their jurisdiction. It will act as a further restriction on the sale of intoxicating liquors, and will be an improvement to the Bill; it will aid the cause of temperance, and at the same time will be a recognition of the rights which municipalities enjoyed before the passing of the British North America Act. The Municipal Council, according to the laws in force in 1867, that is, before Confederation, had the right to prohibit within their jurisdiction the sale of intoxicating liquors and to pass by-laws to that effect. As was stated by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last night, those powers and privileges which were enjoyed before 1867 by the different municipalities could not be affected by any law passed by this House; that is to say, that no municipal privilege or franchise could be restricted by any legislation passed since 1867, as under the Confederation Act those municipal institutions were placed under the protection of the Local Legislatures. This is the constitutional view and the temperance view of the question, and the adoption of my amendment will give another lever to temperance apostles to assist them in prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors when deemed advisable. I beg to move the following amendment thereto:—

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend the same, by adding thereto the following clause:—Section 44 (a). No provision in this Act contained shall affect the powers conferred on the municipal councils in the Province of Quebec, of each county, city, town, village, parish and township, by the laws in force in the said Province on the 1st July, 1867, to restrict or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the limits of their respective territorial jurisdiction, and these powers and the by-laws now in force, passed under the authority of the said laws, are hereby confirmed (*confirmés*).

Mr. DESJARDINS. I am in favor of the principle of this amendment. I would like to see it inserted, if it is not already covered by the amendment made to section 140:

Nothing in the foregoing provisions of this Act shall be construed to affect or impair any of the provisions of The Canada Temperance Act, 1878; and no hotel, saloon, or shop license shall be issued or take effect within any county, city, town, incorporated village or township in Canada within which the second part of the said Act has been brought into force as by the said Act provided, or within which any by-law for prohibiting the sale of liquor under the Temperance Act of 1864, or any other Act, is in force.

Mr. OUIMET. The Act of 1864 is no longer in force.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It seems to me that the amendment is all right with the exception of the word "restrict." If

confined to "prohibit" it retains what my hon. friend and his Quebec *confrères* desire. This would leave to municipal councils, under the law of 1864, the power which they have exercised, of prohibiting.

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot make out the precise meaning of section forty-four. What is it?

Mr. McCARTHY. A certain maximum is provided, but the Council may reduce the number to anything they please.

Mr. OUIMET. That is where the word "restrict" comes in.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not necessary, as this is already provided for in section forty-four.

Mr. OUIMET. I wish to retain all the powers which we had before.

Mr. McCARTHY. Every power is expressly given in this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. What the hon. gentleman wants, is, that it be not given by this Parliament, which may also take it away; but that they have an inherent right to have this power retained within local jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. OUIMET. I want to retain all the powers which we had before 1867; and I find that not only the power of entirely prohibiting, but the power to limit jurisdiction was given to us by the Consolidated Statutes of Canada.

Mr. McCARTHY. Carried.

Mr. LESAGE (Translation). Mr. Speaker: Before voting on this amendment, I beg leave to give the reasons why I seconded the amendment moved by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). We from the Quebec district are in a somewhat exceptional position. Some of our municipalities have the advantage of possessing no licensed taverns. Now, we consider that, if in certain districts it is deemed advantageous to limit the number of licenses, in certain others, especially where there exist no licensed taverns; supposing the amendment of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), which has been substituted for clause forty-six, be not applied, we shall be left to the mercy of a few ill-minded individuals. These, after having got a certain number of signatures, will simply go to the Commissioners' office, whose duty it will be to grant the license, unless a counter-petition, signed by two-thirds of the voters, be filed, showing that the parties applying for a license are not qualified to hold one. This question is a very important one, and I call to it the attention of the hon. members of the Quebec district, where the present state of things has been for years in existence. Municipal councils, acting often under the influence of the priests, and even of Protestant ministers, think it their duty to enact every year prohibitory by-laws against the granting of licenses in their districts. Now, this present law takes away from the municipal councils the right of refusing the granting of licenses within the limits of their municipalities; and this provision of the law, if it were adopted, would, I believe, be unfavorably received in the district of Quebec, for I may well add that a very small number of votes, in any electoral sub-division, will take the trouble to register their vote in favor of a prohibitory law; and unless a large number do, once a hotel keeper will have recorded in his favor one-fourth of the voters, all he will have to do will be to say: "I did fulfil the conditions of the law," and he will get his license. You may reply that the majority of the voters will have the right to prevent this by filing a counter-petition to the effect of preventing such party from getting his license. But to do this the majority will have to give some reasons against him personally, stating that he possesses a bad character, or that he is deficient in that which the law requires. The case becomes a personal one, and

the question of prohibition goes to the background. I myself, Mr. Speaker, live in a rural district. I practice as a doctor in eleven large parishes where not one licensed tavern exists. In my district the sale of liquor is now carried on according to our Provincial Act, ratified by the Bill now before this House. If this clause be not inserted in favor of our municipal councils I believe this law will not prove, for my district, one of prohibition and temperance, but one of intemperance. For my part, I raise my voice asking that the rights of the municipal councils be maintained. You will never succeed, in our parishes, in inducing the farmers to vote in favor of prohibitory laws. Each one will say: "Let them settle those matters among themselves; I have no time to be bothered with them;" and the ends of the law will be eluded by the fact that it will be impossible to get up a petition to prevent the granting of licenses. I am aware, in my district, that a great number of Protestant ministers, and all the Catholic priests, have united in demanding that the existing laws in favor of the municipalities be maintained. And why? Because they can, from the pulpit or otherwise, notify the council that, at a certain date, a prohibitory law must be enacted in order to prevent the granting of licenses. While if you make it obligatory for each council to vote in favor of a law of prohibition, you will never be able to get the number of votes necessary to establish that law. Consequently, I am very glad I have been called upon to second the motion of my hon. friend the member for Laval. As to the question of constitutionality, I am not competent to decide; but as to the moral question, and as to the rights of our municipalities, I insist that the existing laws be maintained, and I will therefore press with all my power the adoption of this motion.

Amendment (Mr. Ouimet) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Fairbank,	McDougald,
Allison,	Farrow,	McIntyre,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McMullen,
Bain,	Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Fisher,	Massé,
Barnard,	Fleming,	Méthot,
Beaty,	Forbes,	Mitchell,
Béchar,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Foster,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Fréchette,	Orton,
Benson,	Geoffrion,	Ouimet,
Bergerson,	Gigault,	Paint,
Bergin,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Patterson (Essex),
Blake,	Girouard (Kent),	Pickard,
Blanchet,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bowell,	Gunn,	Reid,
Brecken,	Hackett,	Richey,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Haggart,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hall,	Riopel,
Cameron (Victoria),	Harley,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hawkins,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Victoria),	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Carling,	Homer,	Royal,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Scott,
Casey,	Innes,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Catudal,	Kilvert,	Small,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Smyth,
Cochrane,	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant),
Costigan,	Kranz,	Somerville (Bruce),
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Springer,
Coursol,	Landerkin,	Sproule,
Curran,	Laudry,	Sutherland (Orford),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Tassé,
Daly,	Lesage,	Taylor,
Daoust,	Lister,	Thompson,
Davies,	Livingstone,	Tilley,
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Tyrwhitt,
De Beaujeu,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vail,
De St. Georges,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Vanasse,
Desaulniers,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Desjardins,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Cardwell),

Dickinson,  
Dodd,  
Dugas,  
Dundas,  
Dupont,

McMillan (Huron),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),  
McCarthy,  
McCraney,

Wood (Brockville),  
Wood (Westmoreland),  
Woodworth, and  
Wright.—148.

NAYS:  
Messieur

Guilbault.—1.

Bill recommitted and reported.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I beg leave to move that the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out clause sixty-five, which permits the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman should describe more accurately what the resolution means before it is put. I do not think that the motion describes the object of it fairly. This is a proviso which regulates that the sale of liquor shall take place on Sunday only at meal times. I am in favor of this principle, and I do not wish to be recorded as voting apparently in favor of the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday. It would be better if the hon. gentleman would describe the provision of the Bill more accurately in his motion.

Mr. ROSS. I have not the slightest objection to insert in my amendment the words of the proviso, and move that those words be struck out. Some amendments were made in this proviso last night in Committee. The Bill had been reprinted, or I would have inserted the proviso. I am quite willing to amend my amendment to that effect. Of course, any person who wishes to understand the full force of the amendment, can do so by referring to the Bill, which contains the objectionable provision that I desire to strike out.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion cannot now be changed without permission of the House. Shall it be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the nays have it.

Mr. BLANCHET. I think that the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw his amendment, and put it in another way.

Mr. BLAKE. The House has declined to allow the hon. gentleman the courtesy of withdrawing it.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,
Armstrong,	Foster,
Bain,	Fréchette,
Béchar,	Geoffrion,
Bernier,	Gigault,
Blake,	Gillmor,
Blanchet,	Girouard (Kent),
Blondeau,	Guilbault,
Bourassa,	Gunn,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Harley,
Cameron (Ivernness),	Holton,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,
Catudal,	Jamieson,
Daoust,	Kirk,
De Beaujeu,	Landerkin,
De St. Georges,	Lesage,
Dundas,	Lister,
Dupont,	Livingstone,
Fairbank,	Macdonald (King's),
Fisher,	McMillan (Huron),
Fleming,	McCraney,
Forbes,	McIntyre,

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,
Amyot,	Dodd,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,

Mr. LESAGE.

McCarthy,
McDougald,
McNeil,

Beaty,  
Bell,  
Benoit,  
Benson,  
Bergeron,  
Bergin,  
Billy,  
Bowell,  
Brecken,  
Cameron (Victoria),  
Campbell (Victoria),  
Carling,  
Caron,  
Cimon,  
Coatigan,  
Coughlin,  
Coursol,  
Curran,  
Cuthbert,  
Daly,  
Davies,  
Dawson,  
Desaulniers,  
Desjardins,

Farrow,  
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),  
Ferguson (Welland),  
Girouard (Jac.-Cartier),  
Gordon,  
Grandbois,  
Hackett,  
Haggart,  
Hall,  
Hawkins,  
Homer,  
Hurteau,  
Keefer,  
Kilvert,  
Kinney,  
Kranz,  
Labrosse,  
Landry,  
Langevin,  
Macdonald (Sir John),  
McDonald (Cap Breton),  
Macmillan (Middlesex),  
McMillan (Vaudreuil),

Massue,  
Mitchell,  
O'Brien,  
Orton,  
Quimet,  
Patterson (Essex),  
Pope,  
Reid,  
Richey,  
Riopol,  
Robertson (Hamilton),  
Scott,  
Shakespeare,  
Small,  
Sproule,  
Tassé,  
Taylor,  
Tilley,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Wallace (York),  
White (Cardwell),  
Wood (Westm'land) and  
Wright.—79.

Mr. BLAKE. A few moments ago, by an almost unanimous vote, we reserved to one of the Provinces the municipal powers to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors which that Province enjoyed at the time of Confederation. I move in amendment thereto:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same, by adding to Clause 46 (a) the words following:— And nothing in this Act contained shall affect the powers conferred on the municipal authorities of any other Province by the laws in force in such Province at the time of its Confederation with Canada, to restrict or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the municipality; and these powers are hereby confirmed and continued.

I have paid my hon. friend the compliment of adopting his language.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman state what law was in force in Ontario at the time of Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot name them all, but amongst them was the following:—

"The council of every township, town and incorporated village, may pass by-laws for prohibiting the sale by retail of spirituous, fermented, or other manufactured liquors in any inn or other house of public entertainment; and for prohibiting totally the sale thereof in shops and places other than houses of public entertainment, &c."

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend has read only a portion of the section.

Mr. BLAKE. I said "and so forth," but I will read the remainder:

"Provided the by-law before the final passing thereof has been duly approved by the electors of the municipalities in the manner provided by this Act."

Mr. McCARTHY. We should consider the portion of the clause which we have extracted from my hon. friend—and which I hope he did not intentionally desire to conceal—and how it will agree with the local option clause which we have put in the Bill. If it disagrees, to put it in will be only to confuse the whole Bill. While I think we should consider what its effect would be upon the Bill, for my own part I have no objection to accept it, so far as it does not render the present clauses of the Bill with regard to local option wholly nugatory. We have already defined the manner in which this local option, if desired, can be carried out. If there is any conflict between the two, doubts and difficulties will arise in connection with the Bill, and I think we should accept either one principle or the other, seeing that there is no substantial difference between them, as in each case the question has to be submitted to the vote of the people, and they have to obtain under this section an actual and positive majority. I shall say no more until I hear the further discussion of the question, as I merely rose for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the importance of the amendment which was sprung

upon us without, I think, a very full, fair, or candid explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of the hon. gentleman must be obvious to every supporter of this Bill—to everyone who desires to see a good License Act made operative throughout the Dominion. The amendment is introduced for the purpose of destroying this measure; but I believe the majority of this House are not so blind to the interests of the country as to play this little game for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. It seems to me that this amendment is simply a logical consequence of the one which has been adopted. The same difficulties which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said might arise with regard to Ontario are just as liable to take place in the other case. I wish to point out, however, that this is a matter which is not confined simply to Ontario and Quebec, because there are other Provinces in this Dominion, and if the Bill passes in its present shape it will produce chaos in the License Laws of some of these Provinces. For instance, in the Province of Prince Edward Island there is no provision in the Bill to regulate the licenses there—no provision by which the voice of the people can be obtained in any way. The amendment of the hon. member for West Durham amounts to this: That inasmuch as Parliament has failed to make any provision for that Province or other Provinces the laws which were in force when we joined the Confederation, and which gave universal satisfaction, both to those engaged in the traffic and to the temperance people, shall remain in force.

Mr. BRECKEN. I have simply to say this: That I am afraid my hon. colleague is trying to make a little cheap popularity. The Scott Act is in force in Prince Edward Island from one end to the other, and this law cannot possibly have any effect upon the temperance people or upon the grog-drinking people of Prince Edward Island until this Parliament meets again.

An hon. MEMBER. Suppose the Scott Act is repealed.

Mr. BRECKEN. The Act must be in force for three years. There is not the slightest chance of its being repealed. There is no action of the kind contemplated in the Province.

Mr. DAVIES. I beg your pardon. In Prince county there is a petition to repeal it now.

Mr. BRECKEN. There is not the slightest chance of its being repealed; and even if this Act can possibly have any bearing on Prince Edward Island, the Dominion Parliament will have the opportunity of making any provisions for Prince Edward Island that are not included in this Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the answer the hon. member for West Durham gave to my question, and his omission of the most important part of the answer he ought to have given, was hardly creditable to him, and was certainly not satisfactory to this House. The gentleman's amendment may appear on its face to be a logical sequence to that which we have already adopted by a practically unanimous vote; but the difference is as manifest as it can be. In the Province of Quebec, there are laws in operation at this moment, passed before Confederation, under which the municipalities are regulating the liquor traffic to-day, which, by this law, if it had passed without the amendment of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), would have been repealed; and as a consequence of that repeal, powers which these municipalities at this moment possess, and are exercising, would have been taken from them. The full significance and effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Laval was simply to continue these powers to the municipalities in the Province of Quebec. Now, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do with regard to Ontario? To revive

laws which have been repealed by the Acts of the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE. To revive laws which are not in operation. The Crooks Act, of which hon. gentlemen boast so much, is an Act of the Province of Ontario to-day. They tell us, when this House undertakes to deal with the license question, that we are going to do away with the wholesome restrictions of the Crooks Act; and yet the hon. gentleman asks us to revive laws which the Legislative Assembly of Ontario have practically wiped out of existence, and which the municipalities are not at this moment exercising powers under. That is the distinction between the two cases. In the one case, the effect of this law would have been to repeal Acts now in operation, to deprive the municipal councils of Quebec of powers they now exercise; in the other case, there is an attempt to revive laws which are not more restrictive, but less restrictive than this Act, and which, if revived, would simply have the effect of giving greater freedom for the sale of intoxicating liquors. But I think we may fairly infer that the hon. gentleman was not candid, at any rate in this House, when he deliberately made—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I ask you, Sir, whether it is in accordance with the Rules of the House that I should be charged with want of candor?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is exactly right that an hon. member should charge another with want of candor.

Mr. WHITE. I said the hon. gentleman was not candid. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. Want of candor is an imputation against a member of wanting to mislead the House, against which I ruled the other day.

Mr. WHITE. Then, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is this, accepting your decision entirely, that the hon. gentleman was not fair to this House when he deliberately, as a lawyer, read portions of that Statute, and left portions of it out—if that was fair to this House, then I do not know what fairness is, coming from the hon. gentleman occupying the position which he occupies on the floor of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that I may be allowed to say, Sir, that if I had the slightest impression that I should mislead this House by not reading the whole of a clause—of which I distinctly said that I was not reading the whole—I distinctly said, "and so forth"—

Mr. WHITE. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman denies it; but once again he is out of order. I repeat that I did say "and so forth." I was perfectly aware that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that dozens of hon. members in this House, knew what the Municipal Act of Ontario of 1866 was, and what I was wanting to show was that there was a clause in it for restricting the sale. It would have been a ridiculous and absurd thing for me to suppose that I could mislead a large number of hon. members of this House, even if I had been disposed to do it by such a paltry attempt as reading a portion of a clause instead of the whole of it. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have such a low notion of the acquaintance of the members of this House with the Statute Law of the country as to say that I could mislead them. The hon. member for Cardwell asked what clause I was reading, and I read enough to show that it was a prohibitory clause. I did not want to waste time reading the whole of it, but I was perfectly willing to read the rest if he had asked for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not intend to make a speech on this matter, nor to discuss what the legal effect of the amendment may be, and the only reason I rise now is to

place myself right in relation to my own Province. It might be inferred that, in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and opposing the amendment of the hon. member from West Durham, I should be voting to support the local rights of the Province of Quebec; while voting the other way, not only with reference to my own Province, but all the other Provinces of the Dominion, it is well that I should put that matter right. I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham; and I shall do it on this principle: I cannot say that I have any faith in the results of the working of this Bill; but the Government of the country, having taken upon themselves the responsibility, not of drafting this Bill, but of fathering it and placing it before this House, and this House having spent a great deal of time in endeavoring to make it as workable as possible, I have arrived at the conclusion, whether correctly or not, from some objections which have been raised during the passage of the Bill through Committee, that there is a very strong desire in this House to make the Bill as unworkable as possible. I am not one who has much faith in the working of the Bill; but I intend to do nothing, by my vote or voice, to impair the efficiency and workable character of this Bill. The Government having assumed the responsibility of placing it before the House, and of making it, as I trust they will, the law of the land, I think it would be very unfair to introduce such a clause as that moved by the hon. member for West Durham, the effect of which would be, if I rightly understand the law, to give co-ordinate powers to the Provinces and the Dominion, which might lead to the defeat of the harmonious working of this Bill, and to immense litigation throughout the different Provinces. Taking that view of the case, I felt it necessary, as a New Brunswick representative voting against a resolution which gives powers to the Local Legislatures on this question, to make these explanations, which I hope will be satisfactory to this House and to my constituency.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to delay the House, but I think the remarks of the hon. member for Cardwell ought to be alluded to. I think he will require rather more time than was at his disposal this afternoon to leave the impression on the House, even on his own side, that there was any attempt on the part of the hon. member for West Durham to mislead the House. Was any insinuation cast out by the hon. member for Cardwell last night, when the hon. member for Simcoe, reading an extract from a newspaper, closed with a sentence which was not in the paper at all, and for which he was brought to task by the hon. member for Middlesex? There was no censure then, no imputation, no insinuations thrown out by hon. gentlemen opposite; and yet the hon. gentleman thinks it not beneath him to attempt to cast doubt on the good faith of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in the House. On this side of the House we have unbounded confidence in the hon. gentleman, and I believe that, in the country, the people have unbounded confidence in his honesty and integrity; and I beg leave to say, I believe there is not one hon. member in this House—and I would hardly except the hon. member for Cardwell—who has not the same confidence.

Mr. OUIMET. I really find myself in a very awkward position. Indeed, I am very grateful for the compliment that was paid my motion, and the principles involved in it, by the hon. member for West Durham. I hold this Parliament has no power to restrict, or take away from any Province any privilege or jurisdiction it may enjoy under the British North America Act. But if we have no power to take away anything from a Province, have we the power to give it anything? If this Act were in force, I would be the first to vote against any motion preventing to carry it into effect; but if it has been repealed by the Crooks Act,

Mr. MITCHELL.

have we the power to revive it, to say that a law Ontario has repealed should be re-enacted?

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask my hon. friend whether, upon the theory of this Bill, the Local Legislature can have the power to repeal—whether their repeal would be valid?

Mr. OUIMET. No; the point is this: As I understand it, in my humble opinion, anything that belongs to the municipal institutions belongs to the Local Legislature to legislate upon; and, of course, in this way the Legislature of Ontario had the right to deprive the municipalities of a power given them. If my vote could give the municipalities that right I would give it to them; but the Legislature of Ontario, led by the friends of the hon. member for West Durham, have taken upon themselves to take that away from the people of Ontario—that is the power to give or to control the giving of licenses in that Province. What their reason was, I do not know, but I suppose they had good reason for so doing. Now we are asked to give back to the people of Ontario that power which was taken from them by their own Legislature. Why? Because, they say, it was taken from them wrongly. But we in this House cannot say that. The Legislature of Ontario have passed upon it, and we have no power to go over any legislation they have thought proper to make. I say we have no more power to revise any law which is no longer in force—that would be an infringement on their rights—than we have to legislate to take anything from them.

Mr. LISTER. I will detain the House only a few minutes in order to set my hon. friend who has just spoken right. This Act is based on the assumption that the Local Legislature has no right whatever to restrict or control the sale of liquor within the Province, and there can be no doubt that the Act to which the hon. member for West Durham referred was in force in Ontario at the time of Confederation. This Bill now before the House is based on the assumption that a Local Legislature has no right to interfere with the Acts in force in 1867 relating to the sale of liquor. Such being the case, this Act existing in 1867, to which my hon. friend referred, could not be repealed, and the Act repealing it was nugatory and void, if the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct. The repealing of it, on their contention, was an act of usurpation on the part of the Ontario Legislature. The hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec have been assisted by hon. members on this side in maintaining which we contend to be Provincial rights, which existed previous to Confederation, and we have a right to expect from them to set aside all party considerations, and stand with us on this question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." It was that unfortunate speech the hon. gentleman made at Yorkville, under such remarkable circumstances, last June, that caused this legislation to be introduced. We would never have been asked to legislate on this subject if he had not made that unfortunate speech; and he comes into this House with this Bill, not in the cause of temperance at all, but simply to do battle with Mr. Mowat. The way this Bill has been brought up shows it has been bungled; and while we are willing to protect the rights of Ontario, you are taking away from every Province in this Dominion rights which they heretofore enjoyed. You are invading those rights, and I believe when you come before the people they will bring you severely to account for this.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I deny that the hon. gentleman is justified in attributing to the hon. First Minister that he was actuated by such motives; and I contend he would be fully justified, in any case, in taking away from Mr. Mowat and his corrupt Administration the charge of the liquor traffic in Ontario. It is well known in Ontario, and throughout the Dominion, that

the Administration of Mr. Mowat have used the licensing machinery to coerce the tavern-keepers. The hon. gentleman is aware that in his own county, and in every county where they could, they have utilized their corrupt power, which they took purely for party purposes. That, in itself, is a justifiable reason why this House should take away from men, who are merely the tools of a corrupt so-called Reform Administration, this power, and place it in the hands of independent men who will exercise it for the good of morality instead of making it an instrument to serve party purposes.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think it necessary, in discussing this question, that we should show any party feeling in the matter at all. All I ask on the part of Nova Scotia is that the members from Quebec should treat us in the same way that we treated them. We have voted with them on this question, and all we ask now is that they shall return the compliment, and allow us the same provision they have asked for themselves.

Mr. AMYOT. I have heard with a great deal of attention the call that has just been made upon the loyalty of the members from Quebec in relation to this question. I am thankful to the members of this House who so unanimously acceded to the desire of the members from Quebec. We must remember that there is a clause in the British North America Act that provides for special laws for the Province of Quebec, and for uniformity of some laws in the other Provinces. To-day we came unanimously before the House, and asked for a special provision for the Province of Quebec; it was granted us, and we are thankful for it. Now, in reference to the other Provinces, we find there are two parties: We find a majority on one side, and a minority on the other side; and we, from the Province of Quebec, considering the principle that the majority should rule, think we will have to vote with the majority from the other Provinces.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to endorse the utterances of an hon. gentleman on this side with regard to the manner in which the Crooks Act has been administered. Two important cases recently occurred in my county which show how necessary it is that this Parliament should take action in this matter. In the village of Arthur, the chief hotel in the place, which had been in existence for a great many years, and was situated in the centre of the business part of the town, was refused a license, and the license was given to another house in a side street, with only two or three bedrooms in it, and without suitable accommodation such as should be possessed by a hotel. Another similar case occurred in the same village. Now, Sir, I am of opinion that a good License Act is the best Temperance Act that can be adopted in any country. Only the other day we had evidence given to this House that the sale of spirituous liquors had decreased in the Province of Ontario since the Crooks Act came into force; but that Act has fallen into disrepute by the partisan manner in which it has been administered by the Mowat Government. Another instance was given by the hon. member for West Durham, to show that a partial prohibition, such as the Dunkin Act, is a failure, and was proved to be a failure in many instances in Ontario. That Act was in force in the county of York, and the hon. member stated that in that county it was an entire failure.

Mr. McCARTHY. I only rise for the purpose of giving a denial, in as emphatic language as I can give it, to the statement made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Pater-son). I do not know whether it is Parliamentary to say it is untrue, but in as strong language as I can put it, I desire to express my sentiment in that direction.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It was not my intention to speak upon this question; but the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) made some remarks, the drift of which I cannot understand. He says we should look at this matter in no

party sense, but should give to Nova Scotia the same rights as we have given to Quebec. Most decidedly, there is not an hon. member in this House who would not say Amen to that. But if he wishes to be understood, that in Nova Scotia we should go back to the laws prevailing before Confederation, which means almost no License Law at all, it would excite the temperance people of that Province almost to rebellion. If that is the meaning of the hon. gentleman I can understand it, but on no other grounds is it comprehensible. I understand that in the Province of Quebec, the laws have been altered very little since Confederation, whereas in Nova Scotia, at almost every Session of the Legislature, the License Law is amended in some particular; and yet the suggestion is made that we are to sweep them all away and go back to the Acts before Confederation.

Mr. PATERSON. I just wish to say, in reference to the observations of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), any remarks I made I believed them to be perfectly true; but if I have done an injury to the hon. gentleman in saying what was not true, I should very much regret it. But I must still say that was the impression on my mind, that it is still my impression, and though I am anxious not to misrepresent the hon. gentleman—

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman made a charge against me, and I simply give it a denial. I did not enter into any detail, but simply gave it a denial. The hon. gentleman may accept it or not as he pleases—I do not care; but he has no right to go into it again and make a speech upon it without my having an opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has any personal explanation to make he can do so. He made a statement which the hon. member for Simcoe said is not correct, and there is an end of it. He cannot go on and argue the question again, and say that it was correct.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman need not have gone further, and made the statement that he did, and then prevent any reply being made.

Mr. BOWELL. Why?

Mr. PATERSON. He went the length of saying that he did not know whether it was Parliamentary to say that it was untrue.

Mr. McCARTHY. Precisely.

Mr. PATERSON. And the statement I made, if I remember what I said, was, that he, last night, in reading an article from the *Globe*—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking to the motion for adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion for adjournment. It has not been put; I have not heard it.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no motion before the Chair. All motions must be in writing.

Mr. BLAKE. That has not been the practice in motions for adjourning a debate.

Mr. BOWELL. It may have been the practice through courtesy to allow verbal motions; but in every instance where the attention of the Speaker has been called to the fact that a motion was not in writing, it has been ruled out.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is true, the practice has been to make verbal motions for adjournment; but there is no necessity for making this motion, as the hon. member for Brant cannot put himself in order on this motion by referring to the

personal question again, which has already been ruled out.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will allow me to try whether I cannot put myself in order on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Speaking to the motion to adjourn will not enable you to refer to the previous debate.

Mr. PATERSON. I think it would be unwise to adjourn this debate until there has been a little understanding as to what has been said in the course of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I am under the control of the House in my judgment as to whether I am correct; but if the hon. gentleman is going again to refer to what has taken place, he is not in order on this motion to adjourn.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire entirely to be guided by you, Mr. Speaker, and do not desire to place you in any false position at all. I was saying that I thought it inexpedient that this motion to adjourn the debate should prevail until there was an opportunity of replying to a remark that has been made in the course of this debate. I think before the debate is adjourned that that remark should be attended to, and there should be some explanation in reference to it—a remark that was made during the present debate, which is now moved to be adjourned; and I think it is expedient that the debate should be adjourned until that is done. The remark to which I refer was a statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, who, in replying to a remark that I addressed to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) when I said the hon. member for Simcoe, last night, in reading an article from the *Globe*, had done precisely what the hon. member for West Durham had done, and which the hon. member for Cardwell characterized as being unworthy of him, that he was reading an article and that he did not read the whole article, but threw down the paper, and the hon. member for West Middlesex rose and finished it. That, Sir, was what I said, that is what I believe, that I reiterate, and leave that to the judgment of this House, whether it be true, or whether it be not true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is the judgment and regulation of the House that the hon. gentleman went further, and that he stated that the hon. member for North Simcoe had read in that paper what was not in the paper at all.

Motion to adjourn debate withdrawn.

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

### After Recess.

Mr. VAIL. I do not rise to reply to any observations made by any hon. gentleman, but I desire merely to read one or two clauses from the License Law which was in force in Nova Scotia previous to Confederation. The third clause runs as follows:—

“Licenses may be granted by the Sessions upon the recommendation of the Grand Jury, except in the city of Halifax, where they may be granted agreeably to the Acts incorporating the same; but such recommendations shall be rejected in whole or in part by the Sessions, who shall have power from time to time to determine the periods at which licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors shall commence and expire; but no license to sell liquors shall be issued or granted to any person who now does or hereafter shall keep a brothel or house of ill-fame; but in any county in which the majority of the Sessions may be disposed to grant licenses to sell intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, they shall nevertheless withhold such license in any polling district when a majority of the ratepayers petition the Sessions against the granting of such licenses, and such decision shall remain in full force and effect until reversed by a majority of the ratepayers upon real or personal estate in any polling district where such action shall have been taken.”

Here is another very important clause in the Nova Scotia law, which is not contained in the Bill. It is as follows:—

“No license shall be granted to any person who shall reside or have his place of business within the limits of the railway, nor to any person who shall reside or have his occupation within any proclaimed gold

Mr. SPEAKER.

district, and all sales of intoxicating liquors within such limits, or within such proclaimed gold districts, shall be deemed as made without license, notwithstanding the seller may hold a license, and he shall be liable to all penalties and forfeitures incurred by those who shall sell without license.”

That I consider is a very important clause, and I should like to see it inserted in this Bill before it is finally passed. We find it is absolutely necessary in Nova Scotia for the proper working of the mines.

Mr. RICHEY. If the amendment which we are now called upon to consider is intended to embarrass the legislation which we are endeavoring to pass through this House, or if it were conceived with the intention of embarrassing the hon. members of this House who have been engaged in the draughting of this Bill, and those who have voted in all good faith for it in the promotion of the interests of temperance, then I am willing to concede that, to a very large extent, perhaps, it may be calculated to effect that object. I will not attribute such intentions to the hon. gentleman who has presented them—I will give him credit for all of that conscientiousness which I claim for myself in dealing with this question; but I would desire to draw his attention, and the attention of this House, to the fact that whilst with those two amendments before us; that which we have already passed touching the Province of Quebec, and that which we are asked now to enact with respect to other Provinces, it is just one of those cases where a very great distinction may exist, while the words embodied in the amendment may be very similar. There may be, with regard to sentences as well as to words, an appearance of similarity in sense, while the significance of the sentences as of words is altogether different. If I cannot demonstrate this in the course of a two minutes' speech, I shall have to be content to labor under whatever implication of unfairness any hon. gentleman may be willing to charge us with. Let us look at the position as it presents itself before us at the present moment. Constrained by the interpretation of the law, by the highest tribunal to which an appeal could be made, the Government of the Dominion have been called to the task of providing an enactment to regulate the traffic in intoxicating liquors, with a view to restrain that traffic and to prevent it from being carried to an undue extent; and this guiding principle has been before us in our effort at legislation in this particular: It is to embody in the Act which is to be passed by this House, as far as possible, whatever restrictions already are found to exist in the different Provinces of the Dominion, yielding only so far as may be necessary to effect the great object which we have in view by some degree of mutual concession in order to the attainment of the necessary uniformity. Animated by that principle when the hon. member for Laval presented his amendment and fortified it by the argument that we were withdrawing from the Province of Quebec restrictions existing at the present day, and which existed prior to Confederation, and still continued in existence; to maintain as far as possible the restrictions in the various Provinces, this House yielded. When the amendment which the hon. member for West Durham proposed is submitted to the House, it is, it is true, couched in the same phraseology; the text is the same, while the commentary is altogether different. Whilst we were told by the hon. member for Laval that these restrictions and these powers conferred on the municipalities to further restrain the traffic in intoxicating liquors, had been continued up to the present moment and existed at this day, there has not been, so far, an attempt to show that the powers conferred on municipalities before Confederation, were in the other Provinces continued and were existing to this day. The hon. member for Digby has come before us as the champion of Nova Scotia in this particular, and has cited an Act by which the traffic in intoxicating liquors was regulated prior to Confederation; but does



he not know that, in 1873, five years after Confederation, all those enactments were repealed, and that a new enactment was passed contained in the fourth series of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, chap. 75, by which the legislation of the Province before Confederation, and down to 1873, was swept away, and an enactment generally controlling this subject and affecting this traffic was passed in 1873. What, then, would be the position of this trade in Nova Scotia and in the other Provinces—for I find that the same fact applies to them all—if the amendment were adopted? I have before me the License Laws of the various Provinces. In New Brunswick an Act regulating this traffic was passed in the forty-first year of Her Majesty's reign; in Nova Scotia, such an Act was passed—as I have said—in 1873; in Prince Edward Island, an Act was passed in 1876; and we know, of course, as regards Manitoba, that the law there has also been brought into being since Confederation—so that now we are called upon, with regard to all the Provinces outside of Quebec, not to maintain existing laws, but to overleap them, as passed by the people's representatives, declaring their sentiments with regard to this trade since Confederation, and to go back to anterior legislation, which would work confusion throughout the whole system which we are endeavoring to inaugurate. I think we cannot place ourselves in that position, and that whilst there may be a semblance of unfairness in rejecting a resolution which is identical almost in phraseology with one which has been adopted, it is only a semblance of unfairness. There is the very essence of consistency in it, because we are endeavoring to maintain throughout the Dominion the same order of legislation. We have endeavored to embody in this Bill every material clause, and to apply to the whole Dominion all that we have found in the various Acts in force at the time it was submitted to us. The hon. member for Digby has gone further, and referred to the powers given to the Sessions; but how will this amendment touch that? It refers to municipalities. It is true that they may be the heirs of the Sessions, but here will come up the question of construction and interpretation. This is one illustration, still further that by adopting this amendment, we should work confusion in our whole system. The Sessions were not municipalities; which have since been formed, and are altogether a distinct organization. He has also referred to another enactment with regard to the sale of intoxicating liquors within the limits of railways; that is an enactment of the legislature, not a power, I take it, conferred upon the municipalities to restrain. This is one of the clauses which may be introduced into this Bill if we think proper; but it does not come within the purview of the amendment before the House. I trust that this explanation is sufficient to satisfy hon. gentlemen that in voting against this amendment as I feel bound to do, in maintaining the very principle of the Bill before us, we are not at all guided by a disposition to do one thing towards one Province and another with regard to the other Provinces, but as far as possible to have the same system applied to all.

Mr. ROYAL. I do not rise to speak on temperance, for which I have, moreover, no inclination; but, as we are to vote on this amendment, to state that if I vote against it I am not voting against the rights of the Provinces. Appeals have been made before six o'clock by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to members from Quebec, not to vote down the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Now, Sir, I do not believe that the Opposition constitute the Province of Ontario. On the contrary, I believe that the opinion of the Province of Ontario is represented by the majority of the hon. members from that Province in this House. Nor do I believe, on the other hand, that we have the right to revive a piece of legislation which has become defunct or has become superseded after a lapse of

time by an Act of the same Legislature. I am a member of the Committee which prepared this Bill, and though no doubt the larger share of the honor in connection with the Bill will fall to the lot of the Chairman of the Committee—so much so, that I believe that this Bill will be known in the future as the McCarthy Act—but I say as we have all been engaged in the preparation of that Bill, I believe it is our duty to save it from the confusion which would result if co-ordinate powers were established. We have already a plebiscite organized by which the municipality may decide on the question of whether liquor shall be sold or not. That plebiscite will work very well, but if the amendment is adopted another plebiscite will be established less perfect and less complete than this one. For these reasons I will vote against the amendment.

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

## YEAS:

## Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fleming,	McIntyre,
Auger,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Bain,	Geoffrion,	Paterson ( <i>Brant</i> )
Béchar, d,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson ( <i>Shelburne</i> ),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ross ( <i>Middlesex</i> )
Burpee ( <i>Sunbury</i> ),	Innes,	Scrivner,
Campbell ( <i>Renfrew</i> ),	Kestler,	Somerville ( <i>Brant</i> ),
Casey,	Kirk,	Somerville ( <i>Bruce</i> ),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland ( <i>Oxford</i> ),
Davies,	Livingstone,	Thompson,
De St. Georges,	McMillan ( <i>Huron</i> ),	Trow, and
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Vail.—18.
Fisher,		

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Amyot,	Dupont,	McDougald,
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	McNeill,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Massue,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	Methot,
Bell,	Poster,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Fréchette,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Bergeron,	Girouard (Jacques Ct'r),	Orton,
Bergin,	Girouard (Kent),	Quimet,
Billy,	Gordon,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Brecken,	Guillet,	Pope,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hackett,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Haggart,	Richey,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hall,	Riopel,
Carling,	Hawkins,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Caron,	Hickey,	Royal,
Cimon,	Homer,	Scott,
Cochrane,	Hurteau,	Shakespeare,
Costigan,	Jamieson,	Small,
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Smyth,
Coursol,	Kinney,	Sproule,
Curran,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cuthbert,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Daly,	Landry,	Tilley,
Daoust,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
De Beaujeu,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McDonald (Cape Br'tn),	Williams,
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth, and
Dundas,	McCarthy,	Wright.—105.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole to amend section forty-six by expunging the words "the majority" in line four thereof, and inserting the words "a majority of three-fifths" instead thereof,—and to amend sub-section eleven, by expunging the words "the majority" and inserting instead thereof the word "three-fifths."

He said: The effect of this amendment would be to provide in what is ordinarily known as the local option clause which

was introduced last night, that instead of a bare majority of voters three-fifths of the number of the voters who vote shall cast their votes in favor of the local prohibition in order to bring the clause into effect. The amendment is practically the same thing as the clause was in its original form, for I think it will be admitted that three-fifths of the votes polled will be about the same as a majority of the voters' list; but I think the expression of opinion which was given in this House last night as to the danger in the interest of temperance itself of allowing a mere accidental majority of voters polled, to make prohibitory enactment operative, will cause this amendment to be adopted.

Amendment (Mr. White) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Amyot,	Dodd,	McDougald,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,	McNeill,
Barnard,	Farrow,	Massue,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	Mitchell,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Orton,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Quimet,
Benson,	Girouard (Kent),	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Richey,
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hawkins,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Brecken,	Hickey,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Smyth,
Carling,	Kinney,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Caron,	Kraus,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Livingstone,	Vanasse,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Williams,
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
De Beaujeu,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth, and
Desaulniers,	McCarthy,	Wright.—88.
Dickinson,		

NAYS :		
Messieurs		
Allison,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Auger,	Foster,	McMullen,
Bain,	Fréchette,	Méthot,
Bécharde,	Geoffrion,	Montplaisir,
Bernier,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paint,
Fourassa,	Guillet,	Paterson (Brant)
Burpee (Sunbury),	Gunn,	Pickard,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hackett,	Platt,
Casey,	Hall,	Reid,
Casgrain,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Catudal,	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Cochrane,	Innes,	Royal,
Davies,	Jamieson,	Scriver,
De St. Georges,	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Desjardins,	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Dundas,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Dupont,	Landry,	Thompson,
Fairbank,	Lister,	Trow, and
Fisher,	McMillan (Huron),	Vail.—63.

Bill recommitted and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) moved :

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, in order to add the following as clause five to section forty-two of the said Act:—  
In the Province of British Columbia the provisions of clause one shall not apply until after a period of three years from the passage of this Act; but in the meantime the number of such licenses shall not exceed in number one for every two hundred of the first seven thousand of the population, and one for each five hundred over that number.

Amendment (Mr. Baker, Victoria) negatived on the following division:—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Amyot,	Dickinson,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Dodd,	Orton,
Barnard,	Dugas,	Patterson (Essex),
Beaty,	Fréchette,	Reid,
Bell,	Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Riopel,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Shakespeare,
Bergin,	Guilbault,	Smyth,
Billy,	Hall,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Taylor,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Mackintosh,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Williams, and
De Beaujeu,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville).—40.
Desaulniers,		

NAYS :		
Messieurs		
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMillan (Huron),
Auger,	Farrow,	McCarthy,
Bain,	Fisher,	McCraney,
Bécharde,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Benoit,	Forbes,	Méthot,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	O'Brien,
Blake,	Gigault,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Girouard (Kent),	Pickard,
Bowell,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Brecken,	Guillet,	Platt,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Gunn,	Pope,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Richey,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hawkins,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Carling,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Caron,	Homer,	Ross (Middlesex),
Casey,	Hurteau,	Scott,
Casgrain,	Innes,	Scriver,
Catudal,	Jamieson,	Small,
Cimon,	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Somerville (Bruce),
Costigan,	Kirk,	Springer,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Curran,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Cuthbert,	Landry,	Tilley,
Daly,	Langevia,	Trow,
Davies,	Lesage,	Vail,
Dawson,	Lister,	Wallace (York),
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Wood (Westmoreland) and
Dundas,	Macdonald (King's),	Woodworth.—95.
Dupont,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved :

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same by providing that sub-section 6 of section 46 be expunged, and the following substituted therefor:—

The votes of the electors shall be taken by ballot in the manner provided by "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878," and the several clauses thereof under the headings "The Poll"—"Scrutiny"—"Penalties"—"Preservation of the Peace"—"General Provisions"—"Prevention of Corrupt Practices"—and "Penalties and punishments generally" shall be read and construed as part of this Act, except where inconsistent with any of the provisions herein contained.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain whether all these clauses will harmonize with the clauses contained in the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have looked carefully over the provisions of the Scott Act or Canada Temperance Act which are embodied in the motion, and I see nothing inharmonious in them or that cannot be properly worked by adopting all the provisions of the Scott Act which I have enumerated, and which cover all the machinery for taking a vote by ballot and all the other accompanying safeguards. I have embraced in that amendment everything in the Scott Act which is applicable, and I see nothing which cannot be worked satisfactorily.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not conflict with any of the remaining provisions.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have added the words "where not inconsistent with anything in this Act." There is nothing inconsistent that I am aware of, but if there should turn out to be any different machinery in any respect provided—inasmuch as this clause introduced by

the hon. member from Rouville to some extent provides for the appointment of a returning officer, and so forth—if there is anything inconsistent, the provisions of the forty-sixth clause would prevail.

Bill recommitted and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole in order to amend the same, as follows:—

Provided that when under colour of any Provincial Law there are at the time of the passing of this Act more licenses issued, than by the limit provided by this Act is permitted, the same number of licenses may be issued until the 1st day of May, 1886, the limit not to exceed one for every full four hundred beyond one thousand of the population.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think if the hon. gentleman would accept the limitation to those municipalities in which more have been issued, so as not to make it general for the two next years, that it would not be unreasonable. We have recognized with regard to shop licenses the principle that the law would not go into force so as to destroy the property of people who have invested under the authority of the existing law. Now, for several years in Ontario, the law has been that for every 400 of population beyond a thousand there might be one licensed house. We thought one for every 500 was enough, and I think in the long run it will be found that our principle is the better one. But if my hon. friend would say that in those municipalities where more than the limited number of licenses prescribed by law is now issued, just as with regard to shops, I do not think it would be unreasonable to say that after two years they should continue to issue within the judgment of the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this goes to a vote I would like to make one or two observations. If this passes, especially on the ground on which it has been urged by the mover of the amendment, it will recognize the principle and doctrine of vested rights, and hereafter it will be impossible by any authority to lessen the number of licenses already existing without taking into account the vested interests of the persons who have been engaged in the traffic. If you go back to Great Britain, where the idea of vested rights is probably as deep seated as anywhere, you will find by a decision which was given not long since in the Court of Queen's Bench—

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

Hon. JOSEPH ADOLPHE CHAPLEAU, member for the electoral district of Terrebonne, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

Mr. FOSTER. I was proceeding to state that in Great Britain, where, perhaps, this idea is as deeply rooted as anywhere, by the latest decision given by the Court of Queen's Bench, the opposite to that idea was very forcibly brought out. The case was that of the Over-Garven Licensing Board. At the last session of that Board it was decided to strike off thirty-four of the licenses that had already been granted. There was nothing against the character of the persons or against the houses, which were properly kept, but on the ground of public utility these thirty-four licenses were struck off. An appeal was taken against the magistrates' decision, on the ground that it was interfering with vested rights, and the decision rendered by all the courts was that the Licensing Board had a perfect right, on the ground of public utility, to strike off those licenses. I say it would be attaching an unfortunate condition to the future action of Parliament, to declare that, although it might be held desirable in the public interest

that the number of licenses should be reduced, that the number could not be reduced except with regard to those limitations and conditions. I hope this will not be the decision of the House, and that we will not have this precedent before us to harass us in respect to future legislation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. gentleman's motion is directed more particularly to Ontario. The operation of this law in some parts of New Brunswick, take my own constituency as an example, will be to reduce, by one half, the number of licenses granted, and the result of adopting this amendment would be to make the law inoperative until 1886.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I observe in the Bill reported by the Committee, of which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) was an active member, that sub-section 2 of clause 75 reads as follows:—

No shop license shall be granted to any person to sell liquors in any store, shop, place or premises where groceries or other merchandize are sold, or exposed for sale, or in any store, place or premises, connected by any internal communication with such first mentioned store, shop, place or premises: Provided always, that this sub-section shall not apply to any licenses having a license at the time of the passing of this Act, prior to the first day of May in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety.

I should like to know on what principle the time for shop licenses has been extended to 1890, and the time for hotel licenses should not be extended to May, 1886. I think the case of hotel-keepers is a much harder one than that of holders of shop licenses. The latter are engaged in other businesses, but the hotel-keeper has only that to depend on, and his property is not adapted to any other purpose; and I submit, that these considerations should be duly weighed by the House. I think the principle recognized as applicable to shop licenses should be applied in a modified degree to the case of hotels.

Mr. ORTON. I see nothing unreasonable in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson). I do not think we should press hardly on persons engaged in this business, and it must be remembered that the law heretofore existing in Ontario practically encouraged men to engage in that business to a certain limit; and I think it is not unreasonable, when a certain principle has been extended in regard to shop licenses, that the same principle should be extended to those keeping houses of public entertainment. It is only asking two years grace for those individuals. Parliament should not act in a spirit of persecution, but in the cause of temperance it should act with leniency.

Mr. McNEILL. We have already recognized the principle of compensation with regard to shop licenses, and we should recognize the same principle in regard to the matter covered by the amendment. I supported the resolution of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) because I felt that a great number of persons would otherwise be driven into poverty. We should act in this matter as mercifully as possible, and there is no reason why we should put this Act into operation as cruelly as possible. Many people will be very much injured as regards their property if some such provision as this now proposed is not inserted in the Bill. I will, therefore, vote for the amendment with much pleasure.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I hope that the House will not adopt this amendment. We have declared ourselves adverse to this principle in the case of Victoria, British Columbia. We are trying to frame a law which will apply uniformly to the whole Dominion and be based upon principle; and now we are, instead of retaining that principle, continuously seeking to evade it and shirk it by various amendments and compromises. I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

Amendment (Mr. Patterson, Essex) negatived on the following division:—

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Amyot,	Dodd,	McDougald,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,	McNeill,
Beaty,	Farrow,	Massue,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Mitchell,
Benson,	Gordon,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Bergin,	Gunn,	Patterson (Essex),
Billy,	Haggart,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hawkins,	Richey,
Brecken,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Scott,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Shakespeare,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Small,
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Smyth,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Tassé,
Daoust,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
De Beaujeu,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Vanasse, and
Desaulniers,	McCarthy,	Wallace (York).—58.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allison,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Auger,	Forbes,	Méthot,
Bain,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Fréchette,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Geoffrion,	Paint,
Bernier,	Gigault,	Patterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gilmour,	Pickard,
Bourassa,	Girouard (Kent),	Pinsonneault,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Platt,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Guillet,	Popé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hackett,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hall,	Ross (Middlesex),
Caron,	Harley,	Roya',
Casey,	Holton,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Homer,	Somerville (Brant),
Catudal,	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Springer,
Cimon,	Keefer,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Kirk,	Trow,
Davis,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Dawson,	Landry,	White (Cardwell),
De St. Georges,	Langevin,	Williams,
Desjardins,	Lister,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood (Westm'land), and
Dupont,	McMillan (Huron),	Woodworth.—80.
Fisher,	McCraney,	

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, to amend clauses ninety-eight and ninety-nine, so that the offences therein defined shall subject the offender only to the payment of a penalty not exceeding \$20.

Clause ninety-eight is as follows:—

Any person who, having violated any of the provisions of this Act, compromises, compounds or settles, or offers or attempts to compromise, compound or settle the offence with any person or persons, with the view of preventing any complaint being made in respect thereof, or—if a complaint has been made—with the view of getting rid of such complaint, or of stopping or having the same dismissed for want of prosecution or otherwise, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be imprisoned at hard labor in the common gaol of the county or place in which the offence was committed, for the period of three calendar months.

And clause ninety-nine:

Every person who is concerned in, or is a party to the compromise composition off settlement mentioned in the next preceding section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be imprisoned in the common gaol of the county or place in which the offence was committed for the period of three calendar months.

Now, I believe that these clauses are too severe, especially when we consider that section ninety-one declares that any person who sells liquor without a license or otherwise than under the provisions of this Act, shall be subject to a penalty not to exceed \$50. I therefore move that clauses ninety-eight and ninety-nine be amended, so as

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

to subject the offender only to a penalty of \$20. I think that the penalty ought to be less than that of a person who sells without a license. I must say that clauses ninety-eight and ninety-nine are most extraordinary indeed. Today, under the Criminal Law of England, which is the law of this country, a man may compound a misdemeanor without committing a crime; but here, although the offence compounded is not a crime, still the compounder, whether the principal or not, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. \$20 is a very small penalty.

Mr. GIROUARD. It is small, but we must consider that the principal can only be fined at the outside \$50, and he may be fined 50 cts. or \$1. It is most extraordinary that a party compromising an offence which is not a crime, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be sent to gaol for three months. It seems to me that in a case of this kind, the second party should be subject to a penalty about one-half of that of the principal offender.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Make the penalty the same as in the other case—not to exceed \$50.

Mr. GIROUARD. Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the motion be amended by adding the amount of the penalty shall not exceed \$50?

Bill recommitted and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved :

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend it by expunging sub-section 5 of section 42, and to substitute the following therefor:—The Board may authorize the granting of two additional hotel licenses beyond the number limited by this Act, in a locality largely resorted to by travellers or visitors.

He said: I think that in the case of towns like Windsor in which there is a large visiting population, the principle which applies ordinarily in deciding the number of hotels should not be enforced. I do not think that in estimating the hotel population for a town of that kind you should only include the actual number of resident inhabitants. I believe that, at all events, it would be perfectly safe in such cases to leave the matter to the discretion of the Commissioners.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I fear that in passing this amendment in its present form, we will open a door to all sorts of applications for an additional number of hotels. Special provision is made in the Bill for Niagara Falls, which is, of course, an entirely exceptional place; and also for watering-places during six months of the year, but I do not think that such exceptional circumstances apply in the case of Windsor.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the amendment is entirely too vague in its terms. Besides, who is to decide what places are largely resorted to?

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the matter might be decided on by adding in the second sub-section after the words "Niagara Falls," "two hotels at Windsor."

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see why, because you make an exception in the case of Niagara Falls, which is one place in the world, we should make also an exception for Windsor. If we do, we will find other hon. members asking for similar exceptions.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I think the position of Windsor, which is the Canadian terminus of two great railways, and opposite a city of between 200,000 and 300,000 of a population is so exceptional that it could not be made a ground or precedent for other amendments of the same kind. The principle adopted by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches seems to be not to allow any amendment they can prevent. I do not see that there is any consistent

temperance principle carried out in the matter. I think some allowance should be made for these very exceptional cases.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I wish to move an amendment, merely for the purpose of making the Bill workable. The amendment of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) provides for prohibition on a vote of the majority, but there is no provision made for repealing the prohibition in case it should be required. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Gigault:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend sub-section 11 of section 46, by adding thereto the following words:—And each and all of the provisions of this section shall apply to the proceedings to be taken in reference to such repeal, and that the words "or February" be added after the word "January" in sub-section 2 of the said section 46.

Bill recommitted and reported.

Mr. McCARTHY moved:

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole, in order to amend the Bill, as follows:—That all the words in section 39 after the words "at their discretion" in line 34 down to the words "and such License" in line 37 be expunged, and that a new Clause be inserted as follows:—

On the trial of any information or complaint against the provisions of this Act, the person charged, or husband of such person shall be competent and compellable to give evidence as a witness in the said matter;—That the following changes be made in section 46: "The word "Parliamentary" shall be expunged wherever it occurs; the words "or Chairman" "and registered" shall be expunged in sub-section 2; the words "Chief Inspector" shall be substituted for the words "License Inspector." The word "five" shall be substituted for the word "four" wherever it occurs in section 46;—as to the hours named for polling and voting days the word "qualified" shall be expunged in sub-section 5.

Bill recommitted and reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, to amend section 74 by expunging the words "to be consumed on the premises," and by adding to section 82, the following:—

When any Inspector, policeman, constable or officer in making or attempting to make any search under or in pursuance of the authority conferred by section 81 of this Act, or under the warrant mentioned in the last named section, finds in an unlicensed house or place, any liquor which in his opinion is unlawfully kept for sale or disposal contrary to the said Act, he may forthwith seize and remove the same, and the vessels in which the same is kept, and upon the conviction of the occupant of such house or place, or of any other person, for keeping liquor for sale in such house or place without license, the Magistrate making such conviction, may, in and by the said conviction, or by a separate or subsequent order, declare the said liquor and vessels, or any part thereof, to be forfeited to Her Majesty, and may order and direct that the said Inspector, policeman, constable or officer shall destroy the same or any part thereof, and the Inspector or other person as aforesaid shall thereupon forthwith destroy the same or part thereof as directed by such conviction or order.

He said: Section eighty-two is to provide for the destruction of liquors in connection with the search clause. That has been omitted and a new section substituted. Section seventy-four reads in this way:—

Any licensed person who allows to be supplied in his licensed premises, by purchase or otherwise, to be consumed on the premises, any description of liquor to any person apparently under the age of sixteen, &c.

You will notice that limits a person to selling or supplying to be consumed on the premises, but that would defeat the whole object of the clause against selling to minors, and it is to amend that as well. I propose to strike out the words "to be consumed on the premises." The other is a very important one in connection with places where a prohibitory law prevails, and where some person is appointed to sell for medicinal purposes. It is found that some physicians of a not very respectable class make a traffic out of selling prescription certificates and in a sort of league with the person who sells, dividing the profits annually, and defeat the purposes of the Act. This is to provide a penalty for the physician who shall traffic in certificates in that way, on conviction at the proper tribunal.

Mr. DAVIES. As clause seventy-four now reads it forbids the sale of liquor to any person under sixteen years of age, if that person is not a resident of the premises, or a lodger or traveller; but it does not prohibit the sale to minors who may be living in the tavern. The hon. gentleman proposes to strike out the words "to be consumed on the premises." That will prevent any young man of fourteen or fifteen years of age being sent to a liquor store to buy for his master. I think the hon. gentleman would meet his object better if he strikes out those words which allow liquor to be sold to a minor if he is a boarder, lodger or traveller. I do not know why it should be right to sell to a lad of fourteen if he lives in a tavern. I think the whole system of selling to lodgers is wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. As the clause now stands it allows a licensed person to sell to boys or girls under sixteen years of age indiscriminately, provided they do not consume it on the premises. I think that is a very strong objection and ought to be removed. With reference to being able to supply it to those who are residents on the premises, there is an objection to that, the hon. gentleman says, too. That is obviated to a certain extent by the fact that those who are residents in a hotel are probably under the supervision of parents or guardians.

Bill recommitted and reported.

Mr. GIGAULT moved:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same by adding to section 7, as sub-section (e) the following:—The Board may in granting a license to an hotel-keeper, authorize him to sell liquors in quantities exceeding one Imperial quart, and not exceeding one Imperial gallon, at any time to any person, said quantities not to be consumed on the premises.

He said: In the Province of Quebec there is no limitation as to the quantities of liquor which may be sold by hotel-keepers. In many of our municipalities we have only an hotel and no store, and if we adopt the Bill as at present claimed and not give the right to the Board to authorize hotel-keepers in certain cases where there is no store, to sell liquors in quantities exceeding one quart, it will be a very great injury to the cause of temperance.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FLEMING moved:

That all the words after the word "that" in the said motion, and to insert the following instead thereof:— "The Provincial Legislatures have since Confederation exercised Legislative powers in the regulation of the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the hours and certain other incidents of the sale.

That the Appeal Courts of Ontario and Quebec have each decided in favor of the exercise by the Provinces of the Dominion of the Jurisdiction, and this Appeal Court has further determined that the judgment of the Privy Council in Russell and The Queen does not decide that the Provincial Legislatures have not this Jurisdiction.

That the questions involved are now under the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada, and will shortly be brought under the consideration of the Privy Council.

That the Parliament of Canada should not assume jurisdiction as proposed by the said Bill until the question has been settled by the Court of last resort.

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

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Auger,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Bain,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Béchar,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Barpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Catudal,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Davies,	Livingstone,	Trow, and
De St. Georges,	McMillan (Huron),	Vail.—43.
Fisher,		

NAYS :  
Messieurs

Allison,	Dundas,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Dupon,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Méthot,
Beaty,	Fréchette,	Montolaisir,
Bell,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jacq. Cartier),	Orton,
Benson,	Girouard (Kent),	Onimet,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Reid,
Brecken,	Hall,	Richey,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Royal,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Scott,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Kinney,	Small,
Cimon,	Kranz,	Smyth,
Cochran,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Landry,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Tilley,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	White (Cardwell),
De Beaujeu,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Desaulniers,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Woodworth, and
Dodd,	McDougald,	Wright.—90.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved :

To leave out all the words after the word "that" in the said motion, and to insert the following instead thereof:—

The general understanding since Confederation has been that under the Constitutional Act the Provinces have jurisdiction over the regulation and restriction of the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, the hours of sale, and certain other incidents of the business.

That the local character of the questions, and the use of the local machinery and institutions in dealing therewith, show that the public interest will be best served by the continuance of Provincial jurisdiction over these matters.

That a question as to such jurisdiction having been raised in the Gracious Speech from the Throne, the action of this House should be in the direction of procuring the removal of doubts by the establishment of the Provincial jurisdiction, instead of assuming jurisdiction as proposed by this Bill.

Amendment negatived on same division as the last.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Mr. DAVIES. I had hoped that the hon. Minister of Railways would have seen his way clear in conjunction with the Postmaster-General, to put an item in the Estimates to carry out the contract with Prince Edward Island concerning the carriage of the mails. I had all along hoped that something would be done, during this Session, in this connection. Water-boats for next season would cost only \$2,000 or \$3,000; and we know that, this season, a dozen persons really lost their lives from want of a water-boat. I thought that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would be quite satisfied to carry out the agreement, but I see nothing for it in the Estimates. We also need water-sheds, which can be built with the sum mentioned. I understood that, in connection with summer communication, something would be done to give an additional subsidy to the steam-boat company to induce them to put an iron steamboat on the route. I hope that the Government will not forget these matters. As far as the winter service is concerned, I think that a universal wail of complaint will go up from the people if something is not done to place this service on a better footing next year. Another season should not be allowed to pass without carrying out the contract with Prince Edward Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, with reference to this matter, that we have already stated to the House that,  
Mr. FLEMING.

pending the construction of the railway connecting the two capes on both sides, the contract has been extended, or the existing contract continued, for steam communication with Prince Edward Island, and it was not proposed to interfere with that communication until we were in a position to take up the whole question in connection with the new and altered circumstances under which the Government will find themselves after we have these means of communication with the Island. So far as the sheds are concerned, for the protection of people at the capes, I think they will be provided in connection with the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway to Cape Traverse. I think there will be no difficulty in providing the wharf accommodation on that side, and probably in the meantime some similar provision may be made for the other side. The question of improved communication in the meantime by means of ice-boats is engaging the attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and will be considered in connection with the arrangements for the future mail service on the Island.

Mr. BRECKEN. Water-boats have been provided during this last season. The ice-boats are not more than sixteen or seventeen feet long, and when they are laden with mail bags and passengers they are not quite safe. Late this season the Postmaster-General placed a water-boat at the service of the mail carriers, when the matter was represented to him. These water-boats are open boats of twenty-five feet keel, perhaps, involving a cost for construction of perhaps \$4,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How did they succeed?

Mr. BRECKEN. Very well, I believe, though if there is a rough sea, there is occasionally some danger of their being swamped.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the Minister will continue this service, for it is obvious that while these hardships have to be undergone they should be mitigated as far as possible.

Motion agreed to: and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

372. North-West Territories.—To provide for the establishment of Indian Industrial Schools. \$44,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to establish three Indian industrial schools in the North-West. The Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West has sent a memorandum upon this question, in which it is stated that in order to educate the Indian children it is necessary to have these schools. They have succeeded very well in the United States, and it is quite likely that they will succeed here as well. The fact is, that if you wish to educate these children you must separate them from their parents during the time they are being educated. If you leave them in the family they may know how to read and write, but they still remain savages, whereas by separating them in the way proposed, they acquire the habits and tastes—it is to be hoped only the good tastes—of civilized people. The intention is to have three of these schools, one at Battleford, another about Qu'Appelle, and a third in another portion of the territory, I believe in Treaty No. 6. The industrial school at Battleford will be a Protestant school, and the two others being amongst Indians belonging to the Roman Catholic faith, will be Roman Catholic schools. Some of the buildings which are now erected in Battleford will be appropriated for the purposes of the industrial school at that point. At Qu'Appelle we think that the sum of \$6,000 will be sufficient for the present for the building to be erected there. Then, at the other place, we think that by putting the school near the river we may get the timber down the river to make the building of logs which would be sufficient for the present until the country is more opened. There will be a principal to each

of these schools who will be paid say \$1,200 a year, an assistant \$800, matron \$400, farmer \$60 per month, and a cook \$240, or altogether \$3,360. Food and clothing for say thirty children will be about \$450, and for equipment, &c., there will be from \$1,500 to \$2,000 more. The three schools will cost about \$43,000 or a little more, and it is intended to devote \$1,500 of the balance for the encouragement of the industrial school which has been established by the Bishop of St. Albert, Monseigneur Grandin, who has done a great deal for the civilization of the Indians and who has been left entirely on his own means for the support of an industrial school, some other educational establishments and an hospital. The sum of money that will be given to that industrial school will be at the rate of \$30 or \$40 per pupil.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the permanent establishment of each of the schools will cost about \$9,000 a year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps a little more—about \$9,500.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is for thirty children?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For thirty children, as a beginning; but the same staff would do for forty or fifty. With the three schools, however, together with the Bishop's establishment, 120 children altogether will be provided for. We think that is a good beginning, and if we succeed in educating these, there will be an inducement for others to go to the schools.

Mr. BLAKE. The cost of maintenance seems to be extraordinarily large—\$150 for each child. It is quite obvious, from their station in life, that it would be not a kindness, but a cruelty to provide for these children for other than the simplest manner, both as to food and clothing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That covers everything—food, clothing, light, fuel, and so on.

Mr. BLAKE. But still it seems a very large sum. What is the hon. gentleman's general scheme of education for these children? Is it proposed to educate them in some particular handicraft, or the cultivation of the soil? And are both sexes to be taken into the school?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I understand, these schools will be for male children, and the principal occupation taught them will be the cultivation of the soil. For instance, at Battleford there are 30 acres broken, and 160 acres fenced. The intention is to have a larger reserve for these schools, where the boys will have every opportunity to learn the art of agriculture. They will also be taught the rudiments of education.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the minimum age of admission, and the general length of a course?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot state the minimum age. It will be, I suppose, about ten years, and, as in the industrial school of the Bishop, they will remain until they are sixteen or eighteen, or perhaps twenty. They are taught then, as in the ordinary schools, to read and write, and arithmetic, as well as a trade of some kind—generally the cultivation of the soil; and when they leave the school, they receive a small sum of money to enable them to buy implements and to engage in agriculture on their own account. I have no doubt that we shall find it proper, when these boys come out of the school, to give them a homestead, and try to settle them and make them good citizens. The civilization of these Indians will, no doubt, become rapid, as they will see the new settlers establishing themselves around them. If these schools are to succeed, we must not have them too near the bands; in order to educate the children properly we must separate them from their

families. Some people may say that this is hard, but if we want to civilize them we must do that.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, this is a very interesting experiment. I have not read the account of what has been done in the North-West, and I do not happen to know what has been done in the United States. But the hon. gentleman ought to remember that the Indian, as the white man, is likely to have a better half when he becomes an adult. If the hon. gentleman is going to leave the young Indian girl who is to mature into a squaw to have the uncivilized habits of the tribe, the Indian, when he marries such a squaw, will likely be pulled into Indian savagery by her. If this scheme is going to succeed at all, you will, unless these Indian bucks are to be veritable bachelors all their lives, have to civilize the intended wives as well as husbands. I have known in my early life two Indians who were at the Upper Canada College—the place where I received my early education—for a number of years and were as civilized, apparently, as any of the white people I am now addressing, but the wild blood was in them and both of them ultimately, after a number of years of civilized life in Toronto, went back to the habits of the tribe, showing how difficult it is to eradicate that hereditary taint.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt the Government will have to provide for the education of the girls as well as the boys. The experiment of Bishop Grandin's industrial school is complete, because he has also here a large school or convent where girls are educated, so that when the young men come out of the industrial school, say at twenty or so, they marry the girls from the convent and settle on lands in that neighborhood; and the bishop told me these settlements are all thriving, and the success is complete. Having that example and the report of Mr. Dewdney of similar success in the United States, we must expect that, with a little attention, we will succeed in this.

Mr. BLAKE. We ought to have at once a capital and an annual account opened, so as to see how the experiment succeeds; and we should see that this interesting experiment is accompanied by full and detailed reports.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I recognize the fact, that the Indians have a claim on this continent, and that a Minister dealing with votes of this kind must be treated in a generous manner. In my county there are 3,000 Indians, and they have among them a large industrial institution and ten or eleven schools. For twenty-five or thirty years the experiment of educating them has been carried on with a varying degree of success; but what I desire to call the attention of the hon. member to is, that according to the experience in my county, after receiving a good education, these boys are taught handicrafts, to till the soil, and some are to be found in the medical profession and among the clergy—their after life on their reservation is not calculated to enable them to take full advantage of their training. Girls are taught house work, they are taught to sew and knit, and while some have left the reserve and gone out and have taken a very creditable position in society, the fact has been that many of them, I dare say a great majority, when they leave the industrial schools, go back to their own lands. Others are settled so thickly in this one township, all the lands being held in common, the tribal relation existing, no man owning his own land in fee simple, that the energies the white people feel, and that the red man would feel if he possessed the same liberties of the white man, become dwarfed. There is no stimulus to energy, there is nothing to incite them to go forward and upward in life under their present condition, and the only way in which they can hope to do that is to strike out for themselves and go out into the world. But our Indian law comes in and entails a penalty upon them for so doing—and I may be allowed perhaps to refer to that point in our Indian law.

Our Indian law has been improved, in my judgment, somewhat. It is not so many years ago that the Indian law on the Statute book was, that if any Indian woman lived in a state of adultery with a white man and had issue, all her children were upon the pay-roll and received their share of the annuities; whereas, if she married according to the laws of God and man, our law stepped in and cut off her children, and said they should not receive their money. I had occasion to raise my voice in that behalf, and am glad to say that that law does not exist in its full vigor at present. Another clause is that an Indian possessed of more energy and educated at these establishments, and wishing to find scope, and development, and better chances of success, if he went to the country to the south of us, as many of our young men do, our Indian law still comes in and entails a penalty upon him for going away, and forfeits his annuity moneys, which are his moneys and belong to the tribe. I am not sure but that even yet, if they leave the reserve and go to another part of Canada, our Indian law cuts them off. But it still remains that if an Indian woman marries a white man she now can receive her share of the annuity moneys, but the issue are not allowed to participate, our law entails a penalty upon them; and I for one do not hesitate to say that instead of being in favor of keeping the Indians as Indians, of keeping the Indians to themselves, and so framing a law that if an Indian steps outside the reserve or tries to find a white man or a white woman with whom to mate, I for one say the law should throw no obstacle in their way at all. Some of the finest specimens of manhood are what are known as half-breeds. Why, under our Indian law, they should have a penalty entailed upon them, I have been unable to conceive. I think the only solution of the Indian problem of this Continent is this: that the sooner you can bring the Indian up to that standard which would warrant you in giving him all the rights and liberties that are enjoyed by his white brethren, and entrust him with all the responsibilities of citizenship, the sooner you will solve that problem. I see no solution of it in shutting them up in reserves and maintaining the tribal relation for all time to come. I am glad to hear the Minister say—I gather that from a remark he made—that he contemplates that the Indian of the North-West, if he proves himself fit, may have a homestead given to him. It seems to me that is the right direction. I am very much inclined, I dare say more than other members of the House, to support the hon. Minister in that step. It is expensive, no doubt, but it is expensive to feed Indians, it will be expensive to feed them for years to come, and I for one believe that we must not enter upon a policy of the extermination of the Indians. They are here and they must be treated in that way. I believe a step in the direction of relieving ourselves of the support of these Indians is to give them facilities such as they shall not feel themselves forced to go back again into that condition out of which they were taken.

Mr. DAWSON. There are quite a number of Indians in my constituency—as many as 10,000, I believe,—but they are not quite so thickly settled as they are in the constituency of the hon. member who has just spoken. We have had some experience with these industrial schools, and they have been successful so far. On Manitoulin Island and at Sault Ste. Marie there are schools both for boys and girls that have been exceedingly successful. With regard to what my hon. friend says of the tribal system, however badly it may work in his constituency where the Indians are probably further advanced and more thickly settled, its abolition would not certainly work well among the Indians in Algoma, and I do not think it would work well in the North-West. The tribal system is, in my opinion, the true protection the Indians have against the encroachment of the white man. If they had the fee simple in their own hands they would not be able to protect it and it would be taken from them. I

Mr. PATERSON (Braut).

think it would probably help the civilized Indians a great deal if they had the franchise conferred upon them. The Indian, even though he lives upon the reserves, should have his own ground separate from the others, and if he becomes a good citizen and industrious, there is no reason why he should not have the franchise. It would tend to elevate him in his own esteem, at least, and there is a great deal to be said in that respect.

373. To provide the salaries of two additional Indian Agents in British Columbia.....\$2,400.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are two additional agents for the north-west coast of British Columbia, including Queen Charlotte's Island and up as far as the American settlement.

375. Consolidation of the Dominion Statutes.....\$10,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in connection with the consolidation of the Statutes that has been begun by Mr. Cockburn. We think that preliminary work will be advanced far enough to allow the Commission to be appointed during this year. I understand from the hon. First Minister, that the intention is to appoint three Commissioners, one speaking the French and two the English language.

Mr. BLAKE. When a vote is asked for the creation of a Commission of this description, it is proper that we should be informed as to what is the intended scale of remuneration. At the present time there is a Commissioner who is being paid at the rate of \$4,000, and a Secretary being paid \$1,500.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give this information at present, but will do so to-morrow.

379. To aid the Geographical Society of Quebec in their explorations of the St. Lawrence, Labrador and James' Bay.....\$300.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I saw the president of this society, Colonel Rhodes, to-day, and he explained to me that the society expected a much larger sum than \$300. I explained that we had seen that the Quebec Legislature had given \$300, and that we accordingly recommended the same amount. He explained that for that small sum only limited explorations could be made, and that if explorations were to be undertaken in the country north-west of Lake St. John, and towards Lake Mistassini, which is reported to be as large as one of the great lakes in Ontario, and on to James' Bay, it would be a very important work, and a large sum would be required. The Government, however, ask Parliament to vote only \$300 this year.

Mr. BLAKE. While it may be a very good plan to assist a society, yet, if a large sum is to be voted by Government, the exploration might as well be conducted by Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I told the president of the society that if a large sum was ultimately to be expended, it would be questionable whether the Government should not undertake the exploration themselves.

380. To provide for an annual allowance to the widow of the late Sir George E. Cartier.....\$1,200.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this intended to be a permanent amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The fact is, the position of Lady Cartier and her daughters is such that we thought it necessary to ask Parliament to vote this sum.

381. To provide for a gratuity of six months' salary to the widow of the late Frank Shanly...\$3,250.00

Mr. BLAKE. I should like an explanation of this item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is known that the late Mr. Frank Shanly was appointed for the purpose of adjusting a



large number of important claims connected with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and while so engaged he suddenly died. He died on his way from Toronto to the seat of his duties here, and I regret to say that, being cut off very suddenly, in the prime of life, he left his family quite unprovided for. Under those circumstances, we thought we might properly ask for a grant of six months' salary for the benefit of his family.

Mr. TROW. How long was he in the employ of the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not very long, but he was in the employ of the Government at the time of his death.

Mr. BLAKE. We all regret the sudden death of Mr. Frank Shanly, and if this matter is to be disposed of mainly as a matter of sentiment, not a word would be said. But Mr. Shanly was City Engineer of Toronto, with a salary of \$3,000 a year when the hon. Minister transferred him to the service of the Government at a salary of \$6,500, and his son was his private secretary for a portion of the time, and drew an additional salary. Now, I can understand no principle on which, in that respect, a gentleman who was transferred from a salary of \$3,000 to \$6,500 and who filled the position for two or three years, we should be called upon to disburse the public funds to the extent of \$3,250 as a gratuity. I do not know whether the usual two months' allowance considered proper in such cases, was payable to the family.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It has not been paid.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose, because he was not considered to come within the regular Civil Service, if this case is not thought to come within that provision, it is *a fortiori* that does not come within a six months' allowance of this kind. The precedent which the hon. gentleman is setting seems to me to be attended with the greatest inconvenience. Here is an officer who received a very large salary, and it is proposed in this particular case to pay six months' salary to the family. We have been losing officers by death at the rate, perhaps, of fifty or sixty a year in the Civil Service; and we have been giving to those entitled to it under these rules the two months' allowance. We have not heretofore departed from this rule. On what principle should we depart from it now in the case of an officer whose salary was \$6,500, and not depart from it in the cases of the vast mass of officers whose remuneration is so much less, and whose capacity in consequence, for leaving their families provided for, is so much worse than that of an officer earning this amount of money. It seems to me that there is really no justification for this expenditure of the public funds.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this late period of the Session, and in the absence of so many members of the House, I do not feel disposed to press this item against the opinion expressed, and will withdraw it.

383. To refund to the Merchants Bank, in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of Merchants' Bank *vs.* Regina, amount of dues paid by that bank under protest.....\$2,109 21

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be remembered that a vote was taken in former resolutions to pay these costs. This money was paid under protest against the decision of the court in that case, which concerns Skead's timber.

384. To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies of his office..... \$2,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this permanent?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The appointment is for three years altogether; one year has elapsed and this is the second year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. According to the returns on the Table, it appears that Mr. Fabre is confided with certain duties; and that he was required to report on what he has done, but he has done nothing at all during the past year. He has

not even complied with the instructions which he has received. I do not think he ought to be continued in office.

Mr. BLAKE. Did he not draw his salary?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Oh, yes! He was paid a portion of his salary in advance, and is now paid monthly. He is also engaged by the Government of the Province of Quebec, who give him \$3,000 a year; so he obtains \$5,500 per annum to live in Paris. But what has he done? Well, he has done one thing: he has procured what we may call, one immigrant for the Province of Quebec, although this person proved not to be an immigrant. He was taken in by an individual from Montreal, who asked for a passage; and Mr. Fabre advanced him money to return to Montreal, where he boasted of having taken in Mr. Fabre. This is the only service which, to my knowledge, he has furnished the Province of Quebec and the Dominion. Under these circumstances his services might easily be dispensed with. If he were present I would say much more, and something which is very true, and which is too true for his reputation.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain, after this statement, what Mr. Fabre ought to have done, and what he has done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Three months salary was advanced in order that he might reach his destination and settle down there. I have no doubt that it took him nearly a month, after his arrival, to settle down, and in making the advance we ran a slight risk of his life. Mr. Fabre went to Paris not only to look after the business of the Dominion, in giving information to intending immigrants with reference to Canada, but also to Canadians who visit Paris; and he is also employed by the Quebec Government. Were it not for this fact \$2,500 or \$2,000 a year would not induce him to go to Paris in that capacity. Mr. Fabre is to report to us as to his doings in Paris, whenever this is required or may be useful to Canada. He is already in communication with the Government; and I have no doubt, from what I have heard, that he has performed his duties as well as could be expected under the circumstances. When he went there first enquiries about Canada were not so numerous as they are now, and I have seen several Frenchmen who came from Paris and who obtained information at Mr. Fabre's office; and I have no doubt that this will increase. You could not expect that at the beginning he would be as useful as he must be in the future. At all events, this experiment is to be tried for three years. The first year has passed, and I am confident that the second year will give us still better results, while I hope that the third year will be so satisfactory as to induce us to continue this position. If we find we do not get value for our money, we can abolish the office; but I think it is only proper, that in the capital of France we should have an agent. We have agents in other countries, and it is only due to that portion of the population of Canada who speak the French language and whose origin is such that he is enabled to give to his compatriots on the other side of the ocean all possible information about Canada, the French Canadians, and the institutions and lands of that Province, modes of communication, and so on. All this information Mr. Fabre is in a position to give, and gives.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one position which the hon. gentleman takes in which I think he is most secure, and that is that more is likely to be done the second year than the first for the simple reason that it would be very difficult to show results less than nothing at all. Of course we all rejoice that something is being done in the direction which the hon. gentleman mentions, but still I do not think that the choice was a wise one. Mr. Fabre is a very pleasant companion, but he is a very brilliant and versatile writer, and in the times gone by I have read with great pleasure the articles he wrote for his newspaper in which he gave me undeserved

praise as well as subsequent articles in which he gave me, as I thought, undeserved condemnation, though of course that may have been a mistake on my part. Though I have enjoyed his pleasant companionship and society as well as the products of his brilliant pen, I never heard or read anything in particular from him to induce me to believe that he was exactly the sort of person who should be appointed to perform the duty which the hon. gentleman says he is expected to discharge. I rather suspect that he is perhaps a little fond of Parisian society, and I should fancy that he may share the notion of some Americans that Paris is the place that Americans go to when they die. I rather think that there is perhaps one person who will be gratified by this joint offer, and perhaps only one, and that is Mr. Fabre himself. For my own part I do not join in the expectations of the hon. gentleman as to the results which will follow Mr. Fabre's appointment. I have no doubt we will have a brilliant report, but I fear it will be full of nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. I saw Mr. Fabre in his office last summer, and was strongly convinced of the necessity of having such an office in Paris, as nearly every day I was there gentlemen were calling to get information about Canada. Mr. Fabre has a large office, he has large maps of Canada on his walls, he receives all our newspapers, and he is in a position to give every possible information about this country. Not only is his office useful to enquirers about this country, but it is a very convenient and useful place to French Canadians who may visit Paris. In fact, while I was there, I thought that his salary of \$6,000 was not near large enough. I have no doubt that the expectations of the hon. Minister of Public Works will be fully realized, and that the services of Mr. Fabre will be worth a great deal more than \$6,000.

392. Additional amounts required for land guides, &c. \$7,500.00

Mr. BLAKE. What is the reason for the employment of these additional guides?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is on account of the large number of immigrants who are going into the country, and the necessity of having guides to convey them to their destination.

Mr. BLAKE. How many more are to be employed?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Six or seven.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the present staff?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I could not say, but I think about eleven.

393. Legislation—To pay to F. Houde, M.P., the amount of his Sessional indemnity..... \$1,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Houde came here the first day of the Session, and was sworn in, but, after a few days' attendance, he had to go to his lodgings on account of sickness. He returned to the House again, but he had to leave altogether and seek a milder climate, in order to try to save his life. Under these circumstances, we thought we might ask Parliament to do as had been done before in similar cases, and pay the full amount of his indemnity.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure we all sympathize with Mr. Houde in the serious illness I am sorry to hear he is suffering, and I do not rise for the purpose of objecting to this vote under such painful circumstances. But I know there are other instances of members who have been similarly attacked by serious illness, and who, I believe, were not dealt with in this way. That is the difficulty in this class of votes, though it is impossible for me to do otherwise, feeling as I do about Mr. Houde, than to express my acquiescence in the vote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I knew of no other case than that of Mr. Houde's or I should have been happy to

Mr. BLAKE.

have included them in the vote. There was one case, but unfortunately, the gentleman in question was absent at the beginning of the Session, so that he did not take the oath and therefore was not entitled to the indemnity. It was only later that he came here and was sworn in, and since that I understand there is no difficulty about his indemnity down to a late day.

Mr. TROW. I know that one hon. member, the hon. member for Digby, started to come to the Capital, was taken ill by the way and had to go to Florida, where he remained for several weeks, and then returned to this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not alluding to the hon. gentleman. I was thinking of another with regard to whom it had been observed to me that he had not been sworn in, and, therefore, under no circumstances could he receive the indemnity. However, if it was the desire of the House that the member in question should be paid, the matter might be taken up.

Mr. DESJARDINS. If the hon. member for Digby started from home to come here, and was prevented by illness from arriving, I think that should be taken into consideration by the House.

394. For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway to Dartmouth, provided the municipality of Dartmouth undertake the payment to the Government of the amount of \$4,000 per annum for twenty years, or so much of that amount as may be required in addition to the net revenue to pay 4 per cent. per annum on the sum expended .....\$110,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There has always been a very great desire on the part of the inhabitants of Dartmouth that they should have connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Dartmouth is an enterprising town on the eastern side of the harbor of Halifax, opposite the city. It is the point where Major Robertson, who made the survey for the Imperial Government, located the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. It is the point which Peto, Brassey & Betts selected as the terminus when they were expected to construct the railway. The terminus was located, however, by the Government of Nova Scotia, on the westward side of the harbor. The result is that the town of Dartmouth has had no direct communication with the Intercolonial Railway. Various means have been devised for carrying a line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Dartmouth; and the syndicate which contemplated taking up and consolidating the Nova Scotia railways, proposed to build a branch, for which the town of Dartmouth agreed to provide a certain amount of aid; As is known to the House, this arrangement fell through; and it is now proposed to project an extension from the Intercolonial Railway at Richmond to Dartmouth, by the construction of a bridge across the Narrows. The municipality of Dartmouth have obtained legislation, by which they are enabled to pledge \$4,000 a year for twenty years, or so much of that amount as will be necessary to pay 4 per cent. on the cost of extending the line over the net profits from the operation. Under these circumstances, taking into consideration that there is a large water side at Dartmouth, that there is an enterprising town, that it possesses a very extensive water-power, that there are already a number of factories there, and that a large sugar refinery, involving the expenditure of a large amount of capital, is about to be constructed by a body of British capitalists—we believe that the extension of this branch into the town of Dartmouth will not only be attended with very great benefit to the town, but will furnish a volume of traffic that will be highly remunerative to the road. My own opinion is that this arrangement will be a very good one for the Government, because, practically, the cost of constructing the road will be

borne by the municipality of Dartmouth, and I believe the trade and business sent from that town over the Intercolonial Railway will make it one of the most profitable portions of the road. I have no doubt that this vote will meet with the hearty approval of any gentleman who is acquainted with the circumstances.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the length of the mileage?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The proposal is to spend the \$110,000 which will cover the extra expenditure to a point called Black Point, two miles in length, and three miles more will be constructed as sidings to the sugar refinery by the parties who build the road, as was done on the Halifax side for the cotton factories.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, it will cost about \$55,000 a mile?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

397. Harbors and Rivers, New Brunswick, for extended railway wharf accommodation at Carleton, St. John, N. B. .... \$10,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is to afford increased facilities at the railway terminus at Carleton, on the western side of the harbor. There are two railways connecting there, the Grand Southern and the Carleton Branch, which is connected with the Western Extension of the European and North American Railway, and this is to afford increased facilities for the discharge of freight in the river.

Mr. BLAKE. Have these railways no wharves?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have a small wharf, but it is not sufficient for the extensive business expected there.

Mr. BLAKE. Why do they not build their own wharves?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We think the public have an interest in providing accommodation there as on the opposite side of the harbor.

Mr. BLAKE. That is where your own railway is. Is this on account of that \$40,000?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not on account of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I see. It is a composition of the hon. gentleman with his indignant constituents which he pays—at least what we pay.

399. { Midland Harbor ..... \$10,000.00  
Consecon ..... 3,000.00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very large sums are being expended at Midland Harbor by the Midland Railway Company, in making piers, &c., but the harbor requires deepening and we ask for \$10,000 for that purpose. In Consecon dredging was begun, and unless we continued the work, the money expended would be of little use. In Midland Harbor, the depth of water is 14 feet, I think.

401. To meet costs of litigated matters..... \$5,000.00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We thought it best to have a vote of this kind. There may or may not be any such expenditure, but it was thought better to have this vote than to require a Governor-General's warrant.

Mr. BLAKE. Cases which may arise out of transactions connected with particular works should be charged to them either as part of Capital or Revenue Account. We ought not to create a new branch of Miscellaneous, which may absorb some portion of the expenses which heretofore have been placed against the works to which they belong.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of these costs are not connected with works. We have had several to meet, and which I have had to ask special votes for; but the intention is not to separate the costs from the works to which they apply.

402. To make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island, who were British subjects, the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil in the year 1871, under the arrangements entered into in advance of the legislation necessary to bring the Treaty of Washington into force, by which arrangement United States fishermen were granted liberty to fish in the territorial waters of Prince Edward Island, on the understanding that the President of the United States would ask Congress to refund these duties, which arrangement the President subsequently declined to carry out, on the ground that the proposal contemplated the united action of all the British North American Colonies, which was not had, and that it would not be practicable to separate the colonies or carry into effect for one what the President was willing to effect for all, it not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission..... \$30,086.10

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman give the names of those merchants?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not remember them, and the hon. First Minister is not present. There must be twelve or fourteen of them.

Mr. DAVIES. The man who has the largest claim has been omitted from this vote.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He may be a United States citizen. The injustice was done by the United States Government, and to that Government United States citizens should look.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Hall and Mr. Merrick are American citizens who have done more to develop the fisheries than any other merchants, and have given employment to more men.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think Mr. Hall's name is in the list.

Mr. DAVIES. The statement "it not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claims of those merchants." That is absurd. There was no claim which could have been put before the Halifax Fishery Commission, because that Commission was to establish what damages were payable by the United States to us for the right to fish in our waters from 1873 to 1885, whereas this claim for refunding the duties dates from 1871. They do not come within the purview of the arbitrators at all, and we would have been ashamed to ask them to be so considered. Therefore, it ought not to stand here in the record that there was a claim which might have been put before the Commission, but in the public interest was not pressed. There was no such claim which could have been put before the Halifax Fishery Commission. It was not kept back, and it did not come within the purview of the award at all. Those gentlemen have a good claim against the United States, there is no doubt about that. They have violated a solemn compact on the grounds, as it is alleged, that because Prince Edward Island came into the arrangement and joined Canada, they did not consider themselves bound to carry out the compact with Prince Edward Island. I do submit that if you are going to acknowledge the claim, if you are going to pay these people, it would be a manifest injustice to pay some of them and not the others; at any rate, I would like to know who they are.

Mr. BLAKE. I really think this is most unsatisfactory. Here is a vote for a very large sum of money brought down the last working day but one of the Session. The hon. gentleman has not given the name of a single individual; he has not told the means by which this sum is assessed, and he has given no information why Canada should pay a shilling of this vote. My hon. friend who has just spoken, was one of the Canadian Council at the Halifax Commission, being

specially retained as one familiar with Prince Edward Island, and my hon. friend informs the hon. gentleman that this statement of a reason for this vote is totally impossible, and the dates are enough to prove it. The earliest point was at a date two years subsequent to the period of the supposed accrual of this claim. The claim could not be brought before them, as the arbitration began long before this claim had arisen. Anybody will know who remembers the arrangement and the treaty, that the claims for damages which were prescribed for investigation, could not possibly include this. My hon. friend says that this claim, which was a claim against the American Government, could not be pressed, because it was inadvisable in the public interest. My hon. friend says that he, as one of the Council, and the Canadian Commissioner were both agreed, it was not a claim that could be pressed, because there was nothing in it as against the United States Government under that reference. This claim is ten years old, and yet the hon. gentleman is not in a position to inform us on any of the points on which the House is entitled to have information. Under these circumstances, I think it would be better to withdraw this item, make further enquiry upon it and present it to Parliament at a subsequent Session, if upon further enquiry it be deemed fitting to present it to Parliament at all, but with data which would enable us to vote it intelligently. Why was this claim not brought forward before? Why was it not submitted for consideration earlier? If it was to be done at all, surely it ought not to be done in a corner at the last hour of the Session and without any explanation. If it is a claim at all, it is a claim to the fair consideration of another foreign power, the United States, on the part of certain inhabitants of Prince Edward Island, by virtue of certain arrangements made between the Island and the United States before ever the Island joined the Confederation. If, then, there was a claim against the Island Government itself, it might be said: "Oh yes! Charge that to the Island; we are bound to pay all the obligations of the Island." But it is not pretended this is any obligation against the Island. It is said it was not advisable in the public interest to press this claim before the United States Government; therefore, we are bound to put these parties in as good a position as if we had pressed it. Now, that statement is entirely without foundation, for it is clear there can be no new claim under the Halifax Commission and the Washington Treaty. Therefore, since we have not the names, since we have not the amounts, since we have not the principles of calculation, since we have not a single statement to indicate to us that this claim, which was so long deferred, should now be presented, I must repeat the suggestion I made, that the proper course would be to withdraw this item for the present and bring it forward at another period.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I very much regret that the state of health of the leader of the Government was such that he had to leave the House, shortly before this vote came up. The whole subject has been very carefully considered by the hon. Minister of Justice, and this memorandum was prepared in order to give full explanation on the position of the matter after the consideration of the whole question. He may have had special reason for inserting the last three or four lines, because it was alleged by the Nova Scotia Government that this question was considered in the claim. Now, the Chief Commissioner, Sir A. T. Galt, says it was not considered. He takes exactly the same view as the hon. member—it was not considered desirable or advisable to bring it up there, but the hon. member from the Island knows that some parties who were there as witnesses had claims and interests and were very anxious to press the matter. But Sir, as the hon. member from the Island is familiar with this whole matter, was employed by the Government to look after the interests at the time, and as he expresses a doubt about the propriety of

Mr. BLAKE.

pressing it, and as the leader of the Government is not here to-night to give the explanations he might be able to give, I will withdraw the vote for the present.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman must not understand that I request him to withdraw it—I merely want information. If it is a claim which the Government can pay I want to see the parties all paid equitably; I do not want to see one-half paid and the other left out in the cold. It is well known that some of the parties are influential supporters of the Government, and it is equally well known that some of them are influential opponents of the Government; and it has been intimated to me that the one class are to be put in and the other class to be left out. The information may be wrong. I am not pressing the hon. Minister to withdraw the claim, but to tell me who he is going to pay.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The parties have presented the amount of the claim which they suppose is legitimately due them, but there are American citizens who have claims nearly equal to the sum of those put in the Estimates; but after consideration the Government arrived at this conclusion, that American citizens, fishing in Canadian waters, should not be paid out of the funds of the Dominion Treasury a debt which should have been paid by their own Government, and the hon. gentleman objected, in his first statement, to the payment of this amount, unless Americans were included in it. The insinuation of the hon. gentleman that certain politicians who are supporters of the Government, were to be paid, and those who were opposed to the Government, were to be left out, was unworthy of him. I do not know anyone, except Senator Howlan, who is a claimant, and who would come in under the vote. I never heard such an idea before intimated, that a gentleman belonging to the Island, who is a British subject, having a claim which was held to be a just one, and which the Government decided to pay, should not be paid the amount due on account of his politics. Such is an unwarrantable assertion.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not make that assertion; I said it was intimated that such was intended to be done.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a Parliamentary way of making a statement, as everyone understands.

Mr. BRECKEN. I happen to know a little about this matter, because I brought it to the notice of Parliament, I think, in the Session of 1879. With respect to the American gentleman, I would be very sorry to say anything which would prejudice the claim of anyone; but he was an American citizen engaged in the fishing business in the Island, and I know him well, and I quite agree with my colleague that he is a gentleman who did a great deal to develop its interests, and put a good deal of money into circulation. He was an American citizen so much, that during the winter his family resided in the States. He has ceased to do business at the Island, and resides across the lines. Mr. Merrick, his partner, is doing business at the Island; he has a fishing station at Rustico, and a fish market at Charlottetown; but Mr. Hall never lost his American citizenship, and he and his family have left the Island. With regard to the other claimants—I am now speaking from memory—Senator Howlan is one, and the present Postmaster-General is another.

Mr. DAVIES. The present member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) is one.

Mr. BRECKEN. His brother, the Postmaster-General of the Island, is one. I am not sure whether Senator Carvell is one or not; but at the time I urged the claim, I urged it on behalf of all. I am not sure whether Senator Carvell is one or not; but the Postmaster-General and Senator Howlan are two of the largest; I believe there are several other small claimants, but I am not prepared to mention their claims. I believe the amount mentioned in the report will

cover all the claims, with the exception of that of Mr. Hall. When I urged the claim objection was taken that it was a compact. I was in the Island Government when the proposition was made by the Americans. At that time our codfish was liable to a duty of \$2 a barrel, and a distinct understanding was arrived at with the Washington authorities that this duty was to be returned; but that Government subsequently objected to carry out the contract on the ground that it was made with the Dominion and they were unable to deal with separate Provinces. I never heard, and I would be very unwilling to believe, that this sum is intended merely for a few political partisans.

Mr. BLAKE. It was I who objected to the vote passing upon the information furnished; I suggested that the hon. Minister should withdraw it, and I am quite prepared to take the responsibility.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. You were not alone.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) asked for information and stated his view. I stated my opinion to the House that it was not proper for the Government to ask the House on this information to pass the vote; and the hon. gentleman said he could not give further information as the hon. the First Minister was absent, and the hon. Minister of Finance proposed to withdraw the vote for the present. Early next Session, earlier than the hon. gentleman brought down the Estimates this year, he will be able to bring down the necessary information which will enable the House to form a judgment on the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). In regard to these claims, I may say, that while there are only perhaps a dozen gentlemen in whose names they stand, these gentlemen represent a number of the fishermen of the Island. That season the fish was bought from the fishermen on the understanding that when the duty was returned the fishermen would receive that refund, and the shippers of the Province are still held accountable by the fishermen for every dollar should the amount be returned. I dare say the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who represented Prince Edward Island at the Halifax Fishery Commission, knows the names of those gentlemen better than I do, because a list was handed to him at the time, and he would therefore be conversant with the names. At all events he seems to have met, although the claims for the refund of duty were not admitted, still they were presented at the Halifax Commission, and the United States Government now comes forward and says they were considered at that Commission; and as the money has been received by the Dominion, I think it is nothing but simply justice to those who paid the duties on the good faith of the American Government that the money would be refunded, that the amount should be repaid. I consider it would be a very great hardship if this were not done; I do not speak from personal interest but from a sense of justice to the fishermen, and I think a very great wrong will be done if this matter is left over for another year. I must say, further, that I think it is very improper on the part of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to try and insinuate that this vote is to be handed over to political supporters; it is a most unworthy assertion, and I would not have expected it from him.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not know when I rose what the names were. The hon. gentleman says they were handed to me in connection with the Fishery Commission. That took place many years ago, and I did not take special notice of the names. When I rose a few moments ago it was for the purpose of asking information, which I was desired to ask by an hon. gentleman, and which I would have asked, at all events, on my own account. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) has told us that these gentlemen are only to act as the medium through which

the money is to be paid to others. Who are those who are going to receive the money ultimately, for we must not vote money in the dark? I do not think I offered any unfair or unjust opposition to this vote. I do not think it fair for him to lead the House to believe that I wish to withdraw it. The only part I objected to was the statement of fact from what came within my knowledge, and I thought it right to bring this to the notice of the hon. gentleman. It was not considered in the public interest to place that claim before the Fisheries Commission. I am aware of Sir A. T. Galt's opinion on it; but, as a lawyer, I could not stand up and contend that this claim should form part of the damages against the United States. I think that the claim of these merchants against the United States is a thoroughly good one, morally, but there is no legal mode of enforcing it. It is too bad that, simply because I asked for the names, I should be taunted with unjust motives. Why does the hon. gentleman withdraw it? He says that it was thoroughly well considered and advised on by the Minister of Justice. Then why is a mere question asked by me sufficient to enable him to withdraw it?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman went a great deal further than asking a question, because he said that one of the items was entirely preposterous, and should not be here; and he went on to say why.

Mr. DAVIES. I said that a statement of fact should not be here, because it was not a fact.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that one item should not be here, as he knew about it; and I think that there are few gentlemen in the House who did not so understand him. He objected to it because he believed there was no claim; and if there was no claim, there was no reason for voting this money.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Will this matter be laid over until next Session?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be withdrawn for the present Session.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the Government allow the parties holding these claims to go before the courts with them in the meantime?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If they ask this, I think the Government would not object; but I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should make this proposition. All I can say is, that objections have been taken to this vote at this particular time, and complaint is made that the American citizens should have been included. This does not affect the position of the Government towards these parties, unless they think proper to go before the courts, instead of leaving the matter in the hands of the Government.

Item withdrawn.

453. Amount required to provide for the salary of  
Inspector of Tobacco Manufactories. .... \$800.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this a new officer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is a new office. \$500 are required to increase the salary of the Collector made Inspector from \$1,200 to \$1,800, and \$200 to increase the salary of the man who replaces him from \$1,000 to \$1,200. It is considered necessary that we should have a uniform system all over the Dominion in relation to carrying out the changes recently made in the law. We merely change the positions of two officials but do not increase their number. These men will not be replaced, and this will be a saving.

#### FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. BOWELL. The Senate in its wisdom has made three amendments to Bill (No. 101) further to amend the Fisheries Act. In the first clause, after the word

"vested" in the fifteenth line, they have added this proviso: "provided that in case of individuals who are riparian owners no fee shall be charged for such license." In the second clause, after the word "apparatus" in the first line, they have added, "other than rod or line;" and in the twenty-fifth line the same words are added after the word "apparatus." I intimated originally that the intention of the Government was to include rod and line fishing. I propose to accept the latter two and to disagree with the first amendment, for the reason that there is nothing compulsory in the second clause which places riparian owners, or those who have fisheries under grants originally from the French Crown, respecting the taking out of licenses. All that we provide is in case of riparian owners, or the owners of the fisheries to which I have referred, that it is desirable that they should come under the provisions of the Fishery Act, by which their individual property could be protected, and I think that those who take out licenses should pay a small fee for contributing that amount for the protection of their own property. If that proviso be accepted then it lays down the principle that they demand a license fee, and at the same time if the revenues or such of them as may be necessary, are used in the protection of their property there is nothing to prevent the owners of these fisheries, whether of the one class or the other, from fishing at any time except the close season. The Government or the Department does not propose to interfere with that right, but it was thought proper that they should take out a license and thereby come within the meaning of the Fishery Act and receive all the protection they did give them in the preservation of fish. I, therefore, move that the amendments be now considered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BOWELL moved to disagree with the first amendment, for the reason that the taking out of a license is not compulsory on riparians, or special grantees of the French Crown, whose interests will be protected under the Fishery Laws as the holder of said license.

Motion agreed to.

#### BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was introduced and read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:

Bill (No. 144) to amend an Act of the present Session respecting Booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts, or otherwise.—(Sir Hector Langevin).

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 23rd May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to propose a motion without having given previous notice of it, but when the House learns what the motion is, I have no doubt they will gladly support it without any previous intimation. When

Mr. BOWELL.

I tell you it is an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing our regret at his early departure this season, and our regret that we will not have the pleasure and happiness of meeting him as Governor General at our next Session, I am quite sure the House will cordially respond to the call. When we heard that Lord Lorne was appointed to hold the great office of representative of Her Majesty in Canada, we rejoiced that the selection had fallen on the scion of so illustrious a race as that of Argyle; and I, with every countryman of mine, rejoiced that the son of McCallum More should be here to represent the Queen. That pleasure was increased by the knowledge that he was to be accompanied by Her Royal Highness the daughter of our Sovereign. Though our expectations were high, I am glad to believe that the country, and this House as the representative of the country, believe our expectations have been fulfilled. From the time he first assumed office until now he has devoted himself with great industry, energy, and ability, and, I am glad to say, with great success, in forwarding all the interests of this country, not in a mere *dilettante* perfunctory way, but in a searching manner, earnestly enquiring into the position of the country, its capabilities and resources, and the best way of advancing all its interests, material, intellectual, moral, and artistic. He has not spared himself. He has visited every Province of the Dominion, not as a mere traveller, but as one anxious to make all enquiries fully to inform himself of our wants, wishes, and aspirations. Now that he is leaving us, we must express our regret at his departure. We regret extremely to lose, also, as a matter of course, his illustrious consort. During the short time her health has enabled her to be with us, she has endeared herself with everyone with whom she has come into contact by the kindly and sympathetic manner with which she has viewed both men and things in Canada. We must not forget that although we have been deprived of much of her presence, and of the light such a presence casts around the metropolis, the accident which caused her absence was occasioned by her attending to her duties as the wife of the Governor General, in coming to be present at one of the official ceremonies, the duty of presiding at which was cast upon Lord Lorne and herself as his consort. Without further praise, as my present indisposition prevents me from dwelling longer on this subject, I shall move, seconded by Mr. Blake:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, expressing the desire of this House, on behalf of those whom we represent as well as on our own, to give expression to the general feeling of regret with which the country has learned that His Excellency's official connection with Canada is soon about to cease; and that we are, however, happy to believe that in the Councils of the Empire in the future, and wherever opportunity enables him to render her service, Canada will find in His Excellency a steadfast friend with knowledge of her wants and aspirations and an earnest desire to forward her interests; and that His Excellency's zealous endeavors to inform himself by personal observation of the character, capabilities, and requirements of every section of the Dominion have been highly appreciated by its people, and that we feel that the country is under deep obligations to him for his untiring efforts to make its resources widely and favorably known; and that the warm personal interest which His Excellency has taken in everything calculated to stimulate and encourage intellectual energy among us, and to advance science and art, will long be gratefully remembered, and that the success of His Excellency's efforts has fortified us in the belief that a full development of our national life is perfectly consistent with the closest and most loyal connection with the Empire; and that the presence of His Illustrious Consort in Canada seems to have drawn us closer to our beloved Sovereign; and that in saying farewell to His Excellency and to Her Royal Highness, whose kindly and gracious sympathies, manifested upon so many occasions, have endeared her to all our hearts; and that we humbly beg that he will personally convey to Her Majesty the declaration of our loyal attachment, and of our determination to maintain firm and abiding our connection with the Great Empire over which she rules.

Mr. BLAKE. I have great pleasure, in the discharge of my duty as representing those who sit on this side of the Chamber, in seconding the motion of the hon. gentleman, and in concurring entirely both in those words of compli-

ment and expression of kindly feeling which the hon. First Minister has asked us to express towards His Excellency on the occasion of his approaching departure. Hon. gentlemen opposite, of course, have, from their connection with His Excellency as our responsible advisers, the opportunity of speaking with a greater knowledge as to the discharge of his political duties than those who have not that opportunity. But viewing His Excellency's conduct from the position we occupy, we can cordially concur in the sentiment that he has been a good constitutional Governor, and that, so far as his public conduct has enabled us to judge, he has fully realized and acted upon those great principles of responsible Government which are so dear, equally in this and the Mother Country, and which form, in the opinion of both, the vital element of their system of Government. It was my good fortune some years ago, in another place and capacity, to present an Address of congratulation to His Excellency, in which he was reminded, by the corporate body I was representing, that it was to the Duke of Argyle, one hundred years or more ago, that we are indebted, as history relates, for the first assertion in the Legislative Council of the Empire of the great principle that no act of State could be performed except by some person who is actually responsible to the representatives of the people in Parliament—for that was the essence and vital principle of responsible Government—and in which was expressed the opinion, since fully realized, that His Excellency's administration would be carried on, on the principle expressed by the representatives of the great and illustrious title which some day or other His Excellency will be called on to assume. The Governor of Canada has, as this Address indicates, many important duties to perform. Those duties His Excellency has assiduously attended to; and, in the spirit the hon. gentleman has expressed, we have every reason to believe that he has devoted his time, his energies, his ability, his intellect, to the thorough understanding and comprehension of the situation of this country, to an attention of its physical and moral position, and to enabling himself, as far as his high position would permit, to give fit expression to what our wishes, wants and aspirations are here, during the discharge of his high duty, and hereafter in the councils of his country, to which he will, no doubt, shortly be called, and in that expression which will be of great use to us—not an expression of indiscriminate praise, which we do not want, but the judicious expression of such a measure of praise and approbation as may convince the public whom he addresses that they are the sentiments of his heart based upon a thorough comprehension of all the circumstances of this country. The hon. gentleman has alluded to His Excellency's illustrious consort, and to the representative of the Queen, by office and by birth, to her illustrious daughter. We are glad to send this Message back. We are here in a democratic country, where the throne is not supported by those arrangements of society which are supposed, in other lands, to be essential to a monarchy; but there exists here in the minds of the people a firm, thorough and fervent—because a reasonable—loyalty to that system under which, if they do not entirely regulate their affairs, at any rate they have the most perfect measure of self-control and of self-government. Sir, I heartily concur in the motion which, I have no doubt, will be unanimously adopted by this Chamber.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation). I will take the liberty of expressing, in French, the sentiments which have been so happily expressed in English by the two hon. gentlemen who spoke before me. Their sentiment towards the Governor-General and Her Royal Highness the Princess are in conformity with mine, and I make it a duty to add, with those of all the French-Canadian members in this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker: It was my intention, after you had moved the adoption of

the Address just laid before you, to say a few words on the subject when my hon. friend on the other side of the House rose. The Governor-General, who is about to leave us, will, I believe, see with pleasure the special representatives of 1,500,000 of French-Canadians, long since brought, in consequence of political events, under the British rule, unite with their fellow-citizens belonging to other nationalities in the expression of the sentiments just uttered by the leaders of the two great political parties of this country. French Canadians do appreciate, as well as any other race, the benefits of the British Constitution by which we are governed. And when we behold the representative of our Sovereign in this country, our Governor-General, abiding strictly, during the five years of his administration, by the true principles of the English Constitution, it becomes a duty for us to join with the hon. members who have just now spoken, and say that we wholly approve of his administration, and deeply regret to see him depart from among us. We regret it the more because he is accompanied by the daughter of our gracious Sovereign. The Princess, who lately came a stranger in our midst, will leave, on her returning home, as many friends as there are women, and I may well say, as there are men, in Canada. We have all regretted to see her absent for so many long months; but we know that she also regretted to be away from the country at the head of which the Queen had placed her husband. When we saw her come back, her health perfectly restored, to resume the lofty position she occupies, we all felt rejoiced at it, and the only shadow that marred our joy was the thought that she would ere long return to the country justly endeared to her. But we are all aware that she and her illustrious husband have made Canada their home of adoption; and if there lives a Canadian who loves Canada, it is surely His Excellency the Governor-General. I will add nothing more, Mr. Speaker. I merely wish to convey, in the name of my fellow-citizens of French origin, the expression of our deep regret at the departure of Lord Lorne and of Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the resolution be referred to a Select Committee composed of Mr. Blake, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. A. C. Macdonald, Mr. Vail, Mr. Casgrain, Mr. Barnard, and the mover, to prepare the draft of an Address in accordance with the said resolution, and report the same to this House forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the Select Committee, reported the draft of an Address, as follows:

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR JOHN DOUGLAS SUTHERLAND CAMPBELL (commonly called the Marquis of Lorne), Knight of the Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same, &c., &c.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled desire on behalf of those whom we represent, as well as on our own, to give expression to the general feeling of regret with which the country has learned that Your Excellency's official connection with Canada is soon about to cease.

We are happy, however, to believe that in the Councils of the Empire in the future, and wherever opportunity enables you to render her service, Canada will ever find in Your Excellency a steadfast friend with knowledge of her wants and aspirations and an earnest desire to forward her interests.

Your Excellency's zealous endeavors to inform yourself by personal observation of the character, capabilities and requirements of every section of the Dominion have been highly appreciated by its people, and we feel that the country is under deep obligations to you for your untiring efforts to make its resources widely and favorably known.

The warm personal interest which Your Excellency has taken in everything calculated to stimulate and encourage intellectual energy among us, and to advance science and art, will long be gratefully

remembered; the success of Your Excellency's efforts has fortified us in the belief that a full development of our national life is perfectly consistent with the closest and most loyal connection with the Empire.

The presence of your illustrious Consort in Canada seems to have drawn us closer to our beloved Sovereign; and in saying farewell to Your Excellency and to Her Royal Highness, whose kindly and gracious sympathies, manifested upon so many occasions, have endeared her to all hearts, we humbly beg that you will personally convey to Her Majesty the declaration of our loyal attachment and of our determination to maintain firm and abiding our connection with the Great Empire over which she rules.

The Address having been read the first and second time,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said Address be engrossed, and sent to the Senate for Concurrence.

Motion agreed to.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GIGAULT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I see that in the *Minerve*, and in almost all the newspapers, it is reported that I voted against the motion made yesterday by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). That is not correct, as I voted for the motion, and it was the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault) who voted against it.

#### SALARIES OF MESSENGERS.

Mr. ROYAL. Last year, at about this time of the Session, I was requested to lay before the House the claims of the messengers. I did so, and the Government very kindly assented to the expression of opinion given by many hon. members, and granted, if I am well informed, a bonus of \$25 each. This year I have been requested to bring the same matter before the attention of the Government, as the bonus was only for that year alone. It is needless for me to dwell on their zeal, activity, and attention. While the messengers of the Senate, I suppose on account of the august dignity of their masters, are paid \$250 a Session, our messengers, in consequence, I suppose, of our democratic position, are only paid \$200, although their services are much more onerous, and they are compelled to work longer hours. As we had shown such a great degree of disinterestedness in not increasing the sessional indemnity by \$500, I think the least we could do would be to perform this act of justice to the messengers. I hope the Government will not only give a bonus this year, of from \$25 to \$50 each, but that the salaries of the permanent messengers will be increased to \$250, and thus place them on the same footing as the messengers of the Senate.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). My general disposition during the Session has been to oppose all increases in expenditure. When the matter of the salaries of the Senate messengers was before the House, I called attention to the fact that they were paid \$250, while our messengers received only \$200, and that this position was not only an anomalous one, but an unjust one. If any discrimination should be made, it should be in favor of our messengers, as they do more work and are employed longer hours. If the Government could see its way clear to equalize the salaries in proportion to the duties, I think a very great act of justice would be done to the messengers. And while holding myself at liberty to criticize unnecessary increases, I will not express censure at any reasonable increase given to the messengers.

Mr. CASEY. I have pleasure in adding my testimony to the good work performed by the messengers, whose salaries for a Session of this length are too small.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I would suggest that when the Government are considering the increases of salaries, they should consider that of an increased indemnity to members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite recognize the fact that our messengers do more work, are up later at  
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

night, and probably earlier in the morning, than are the corresponding officers of the Senate. The messengers of the Senate have greater dignity; they belong to a more dignified body than this, and I suppose that they ought to get more pay. However that may be, I am democratic enough to put usefulness before dignity, and if our men are harder worked and are of greater use to the community than their comrades in the other House, their case ought to be considered. The Government will take it into consideration. It is not worth while for us to open a discussion now on this subject and take a vote on the matter; but if the House will leave it with the Government, they will see that these people are properly remunerated, and ask the House to cover the expenditure by a vote next Session.

#### ONTARIO HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 124) respecting the High Court of Justice for Ontario said: This Bill, which is from the Upper House, affects the High Court of Justice of Ontario. Some portions of it, in my opinion, are an infringement on the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. That portion of it, however, which affects or relates to proceedings in criminal cases, I will ask to be struck out. I believe that this has been communicated to the Attorney-General of the Province of Ontario, who has assented to it. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### THE FACTORY BILL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in moving the discharge of the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 117) to define certain offences against persons employed in factories, said: I do so for the purpose of stating a few amendments that are proposed to this Act, and which will be disputed during Recess and taken up on the reassembling of Parliament. One amendment is to provide that when not more than twenty persons are employed in a place the law will not apply to it. There has been some little doubt as to the powers proposed to be given to the Inspector, unless under some regulation, as to right of appeal to some party; and, therefore, it is proposed that the Governor General in Council may make regulations under which it will be lawful for the Inspector in case an accident occurs, &c. It has been suggested that this Commission should be placed under the care and direction of some one of the Ministers, and that an appeal should be had from the Inspector to the Minister, and an amendment will be made in that direction. The Bill also provides that if any accident or fire occurs in a factory and causes death to any person employed therein, or serious bodily injury, whereby any person employed therein is prevented from working for more than forty-eight hours, &c. It is proposed to extend that time to six days. These are the amendments that are proposed in the Bill that will be introduced next Session. They will be printed and sent to hon. members, with the documents they refer to.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill as reprinted was sent to hon. members a day or two ago, and I have only been able to look at it hurriedly. I will not attempt to enter into a discussion of the original Bill, or of the alterations. I will only say that I believe the original Bill to have been very defective indeed, and I believe that every one of the alterations to be made are not improvements in any shape or way. It is quite clear that these alterations have been made in one interest, and in one interest only.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.



## INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The following Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act 36 Vic., chap. 4, intituled: An Act to provide for the establishment of The Department of the Interior and to amend The Indian Act, 1880.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

## NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS IN MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 140) to legalize proceedings taken for the naturalization of certain aliens in the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why the provisions of the Bill should be exceptional for the Province of Manitoba. If the same difficulty has been experienced in other Provinces, I do not see why the Bill should not also be applied to them. No harm could result.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that would confuse matters. This Bill is to meet a specific evil in a particular locality. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is quite right that it might be extended to other Provinces; but I think that might be left over until next Session.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BLAKE moved:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, to amend it by making its provisions applicable to all the Provinces.

I will not take the trouble to divide the House on the motion.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the discharge of the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 107) respecting the Electoral Franchise, said: Since this Bill was distributed, after full consideration it has been decided to considerably enlarge the franchise. It has been represented, for instance, that the clause in the Bill, as originally introduced, providing that tenants in cities and towns should have an annual lease, would affect a great number of voters among the working classes and others, as a large number rent their houses by the month. The clause is therefore amended to give the franchise to a tenant who pays a monthly rental of at least \$2, a quarterly rental of at least \$6, or a half-yearly rental of at least \$12, provided that he has been in occupation for one year. Then the real property qualification in counties has been reduced from \$200 to \$150. It has been strongly urged upon the Government that in the Maritime Provinces a great many fishermen would be excluded by this Bill, owing to their property consisting principally of boats, nets and tackle. So I propose that a clause be inserted to include in the franchise every fisherman who is the owner of property, such as a boat or tackle, of the actual value of \$150. These are the enlargements on the Bill as it now stands. The Bill will go before the country, and will be submitted next Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to observe that, without public discussion, this Bill has been found so very defective as it was originally. I believe that in the city from which I

come, from 6,000 to 8,000 voters would have been disfranchised if it had passed as it was originally proposed.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

## PENITENTIARIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 111) to amend and consolidate the laws relating to penitentiaries be discharged, and be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole to amend clause fifty of the said Bill. He said: I propose this amendment in consequence of the objection of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who objected very strongly to convict labor. The answer was that there were several contracts, but I find there is only one we know of, and that will exist for three and a-half years yet.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has adopted my suggestion, but I am surprised at his statement that there is a contract made for three and a-half years. This is most improper. When last the subject was before Parliament it was understood that no further contract would be entered into of long endurance, and I am astonished that this contract should have been made. When was it made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was unaware of the fact until I heard the discussion when this Bill was up before. It is a contract in writing for five years, of which three and a-half have yet to expire.

Mr. BLAKE. It is extraordinary such a contract should have been made without notice being given to the Government, or to Parliament.

Bill recommitted, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 375,

Consolidation of the Dominion Statutes.....\$10,000.00

Mr. BLAKE. It was promised we should receive further information on this subject on Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The idea is to issue a Commission, of which the hon. Minister of Justice shall be head, and there will be a gentleman of the Bar from Lower Canada. The Deputy Minister of Justice will be on, or be Secretary, of the Commission; he has consolidated the Statutes of New Brunswick and is conversant with those of Nova Scotia. There may be another on it; that is not settled. As regards the payment to the Commissioners no decision has been come to. It will have reference very much to what the Special Commissioners have done in Ontario.

## NATURALIZATION ACT OF CANADA, 1881.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the 2nd of March last Mr. Weldon enquired: "Whether it was the intention of the Government to issue a proclamation putting in force a Naturalization Act of Canada, 1881, and when?" My reply was: "I may say that the proclamation has not yet been issued, because correspondence has been going on with the Imperial Government, and we expect shortly an answer to the last communication." My answer was based on information I got from the Department of Justice which I now find was erroneous. I now find that the answer had arrived, but it had been mislaid, and, therefore, an erroneous communication was made to the House. I may say further, that probably the proclamation will shortly be issued.

## SERVICES OF THE LATE JUDGE FISHER.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When the vote was taken for \$2,400 to pay the widow of the late Judge Fisher for extra

services rendered by him to the Government, under commission from 1870 to 1881, the question was asked as to the number of cases which had come under his consideration, and I could not give the information. I telegraphed to Fredericton to get the information, and received for answer that there were thirty-two cases before the court, and decrees were granted by Judge Fisher in twenty-five cases.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*,—That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1883, the sum of \$3,163,591.61 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. *Resolved*,—That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1884, the sum of \$31,181,836.15 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions reported.

#### SUPPLY BILL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 128) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1883, and the 30th June, 1884; and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Bill read the first time.

On motion for second reading.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to take this opportunity to say a few words, more particularly addressed to the hon. Minister of Customs. I have, at different times, brought before the hon. Minister and the House the necessity of some plan being adopted whereby our manufacturers, who are exporting goods to foreign countries, may be able to receive drawbacks a little more regularly than has been the case in the past. Now that the House is about rising, and I may not have the pleasure of seeing the hon. Minister until another Session, I desire to enforce on him the necessity of taking such steps as he can to make the system workable, consistent with maintaining the interests of the country and preventing everything in the shape of fraud. I have pointed out that the hon. Minister, on several occasions, was obliged to relax the resolutions, and upon consideration he will find that the system operated in the same way with respect to other manufacturers. I press this subject on the attention of the House more particularly, because I think we have a right at a period when our manufacturing industries are being very largely developed and increased. We have engaged in these industries men of great enterprise and possessed of a considerable amount of capital, and we can readily understand that in a country with four millions of people there may be danger from undue stimulus being given in the direction of over-production, which would prove unfortunate if a time of depression should occur. It is, therefore, desirable that our manufacturers should be able to enter foreign markets and compete successfully with other nations. I am happy to say that has been the case with Canada in the past, and I hope it will be still more in the future. I know with respect to manufactured goods shipped to foreign countries, Canada, considering her population and wealth, may well be proud of the position she has occupied, and when it is remembered that she has already her manufactured products selling in thirty-two different countries, the House will see that it is possible for our manufacturers to enter into competition with those of

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

other nations. But in order to do so, they must have as fair an opportunity as other countries have, and it is to that point I desire to address my remarks. If our manufacturers are hampered with duties on raw materials, which their competitors have not to pay, and with a system of drawbacks, designed for the purpose of placing them on an equality with the manufacturers of other countries, it is of the first importance that it should be so arranged that the drawback system can be given effect to. I believe we may look for an extension of our foreign trade—I am sorry, however, to observe that during the last two or three years it has not equalled that of former years. Many firms are laboring under great disadvantages, to some of which I desire to draw attention. We have no consular agents in foreign countries, and when our manufacturers attempt to open up trade with such countries, as a firm in my own city has opened up trade with Chili, Russia, Austria and Hungary, they have not the advantage the American manufacturers have in having a consular agent there whose special business it is to promote those manufacturing interests and take the representatives of American manufacturers by the hand. True it is that we have English consular agents there, but it is hardly to be expected that the same attention and time will be bestowed by them in promoting the interests of Canadian manufacturers as of British manufactures, and the answer is sometimes made, I have been informed, that Canadians have erected a tariff against British manufacturers; and while Canadians are British subjects in one sense, yet the consuls consider it to be their duty more particularly to promote the interests of British manufacturers. I believe, however, in many lines of manufactured goods, to-day, notably in machinery, the portable saw mill and machinery of that class, which have been introduced into many countries, our goods are far superior for the purpose for which they are designed than any goods produced either in England or the United States, and which can be sold—if our manufacturers are placed on the same terms as others, notwithstanding disadvantages from enhanced cost of freight, and the fact that they have not strong friends at court, if I may use the expression—at less price. I feel that if there is anything which stands in the way of our manufacturers being able to compete on fair terms with the manufacturers of other countries it is our bounden duty to remove them, if possible. We know that the task is a difficult one, that the whole drawback system is difficult, but we must address ourselves to the task. I feel sure, from conversations I have had with the hon. Minister, that he will devote himself to the task; and I believe that if he does devote himself to the task, he will find himself enabled to place them on an equality with other cases in this respect without opening the door for any fraud which he might fear might be occasioned by the relaxation of the rule. I need not point out the difficulties in the way. They are known to the hon. Minister. I have just taken this opportunity, when a wide latitude is allowed hon. members, &c., to speak on any subject, which they may deem important at all—deeming this, as I do, a very important subject, to enforce once more for the last time this Session the importance of this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government fully appreciate the importance of the subject brought before the House by the hon. gentleman. It is a question which has occupied the attention, not only of my Department but also of the Government, and nothing will be left undone within the law to encourage our manufacturers in this country. I am very much pleased to see the changed and altered tone that characterizes the speech of my hon. friend to-day, compared with the tone which has characterized the speeches of those who have preceded him during this Session. It is gratifying to know—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not my speeches surely.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say yours, I said those of your friends. I stated that I congratulated the House on the changed and altered tone of the sentiments uttered by the hon. member to-day contrasted with those which have been uttered during this Session by those who are sitting on the same side of the House with himself. We have heard, whenever the question of manufactures has been discussed, a deprecation from those gentlemen not only as to quality but as to the worth and capacity of our manufacturers to supply the wants of the Dominion. Neither do I think it advisable to go into the general question. I repeat that the question of drawbacks is one surrounded by a great many difficulties, in endeavoring to protect the revenue from the dishonest trader; but with the power given in the law at present, I have no doubt that we will be able to adopt some system which will meet the views of those who are desirous of assisting the export trade of our manufacturers to foreign countries. Having said this much, I take this opportunity, also, not of setting myself right, but of setting the hon. gentleman right in the statement he made, while delivering his annual speech on this question of drawbacks: That the parties to whom I alluded had applied to the Government for a change in their demands for drawbacks upon articles which I contended, and contend to say, had no right to a drawback. At that time the hon. gentleman contradicted me by saying that they had made application from that time—or at least he was so informed, as he qualified it afterwards—and no information had been given them as to the change in the Order in Council, which enabled a wider range to be taken with regard to the matter of drawbacks with that particular locality. I was under the impression, from enquiries which I made, that I was quite correct in that statement, for this reason: I knew that my hon. friend had a watchful eye on the Department, and particularly with respect to drawbacks; and when I inform the House that on the 19th of May, 1881, the Order in Council was changed opening the door still wider by which we could meet the demands to a certain extent of this particular manufactory, in which articles upon which drawbacks could be granted, that were wholly manufactured out of the country but which were used in the completion of any article in this country, and that on the 27th of the next month the following letter was written to the gentlemen who are interested in this particular industry, this matter will be placed in a new light:

"CUSTOM'S DEPARTMENT,  
"OTTAWA, 27th June, 1881.

"The House will bear in mind that on the 19th of May, 1881, the Order in Council was changed."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can I trouble the hon. gentlemen to read the Order in Council first.

Mr. BOWELL. I will read a portion of it.

Mr. PATERSON. Read the whole of it, if you please.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to read the whole of it, but I will send it over to the hon. gentleman. That is not the point. It is not what the Order in Council contains, but what I contended as to the demand made by certain manufacturers for a drawback on articles, among others pig iron manufactured at Londonderry; and that never, after we pointed it out, had they made any application to change the form of the request to enable us to pay the drawback to which they were then entitled; that is the only point to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. I do not propose to discuss the whole question of drawbacks, but merely the matter on which my hon. friend said he was informed I was not correct.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—I think what I said was, and the whole contention was on this point, that the Order in Council in all cases required

claims for drawbacks to be made on the day when the goods were entered, and the number of Customs entry had to be sworn to by the claimants; and that this was the trouble—that they could not do this, that in two cases this had been varied, while in other cases it was not varied; and what I ask the hon. gentleman now is, whether the Order in Council waives this statement of the day that the goods are passed and the number of the entry—that is the difficulty.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to be led away from the point to which I desire to call the attention of the House.

Mr. PATERSON. What I mentioned is the point.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the point, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I said that his friends never made an application for a drawback after their attention had been drawn to the fact that they were claiming that to which they were not entitled. The answer he made to me was that he was so informed,—that they had made application, and changed their claim in order that they could receive certain portions of it. I then stated that we had never any such communication with that firm; and what I wanted to point out was, that after the change was made by Order in Council, they were specially notified of it by letter from the Department which I addressed to that establishment. This letter runs as follows:—

"CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,  
"OTTAWA, 27th June, 1883.

"The Manager  
"Waterous Engine Works Company,  
"Brantford.

"SIR,—Adverting to yours of the 20th instant, *re* drawback claimed on boiler plates and tubes used in the manufacture of boilers exported. "Until the amendment to the Act and passing of the Order in Council of the 19th ultimo, a copy of which I enclose, drawback could not be paid on manufactured articles like boilers tubes, which are complete in themselves and only attached to the boilers exported.

"Under the regulations in force, as you will see, an additional affidavit will be required (the form of which is given) before your claim, which I herewith return, can be allowed.

"I am, Sir,  
"Yours, &c, &c,  
(Signed) "W. G. PARMALEE,  
"Accountant."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That addition makes it worse, if I understand the matter rightly.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the change of the affidavit to which my hon. friend referred; and he knows that in the cases to which he called my attention, the Department had changed them by omitting certain portions of it. Had this firm made its applications in the manner in which they were notified by the accountant to do so, and intimation having been made to them that the affidavit would be changed, it would have been so liberally interpreted and altered as to meet their case. The hon. gentleman should not try to make the matter appear still worse for them.

Mr. PATERSON. That was my impression after what you read.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not in your interest to misrepresent this question. I then asked the accountant whether he had received any reply to his letter of June 27th, 1881; and he writes me this note:

"OTTAWA, 11th May, 1883.

"SIR,—With reference to claims of the Waterous Engine Company for drawback, I beg to state that though they were furnished with a copy of the Order in Council, under authority of which drawback on manufactured articles attached to goods exported is payable, yet they never complied with the requirements thereof, nor in any way intimated their intentions with regard thereto. In fact, I have seen nothing from them on the subject since.

"As the tubes undergo no process of manufacture at their hands, but are simply adjusted and attached, the affidavit in form given in the

Order in Council would be required; and had any claim been made on such tubes, accompanied by the necessary affidavits and evidence of exportation, it would have been paid without question.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Yours, &c.,

"W. G. PARMALEE,  
Accountant.

"Hon. M. BOWELL, Minister of Customs, &c.

"With reference to claims of the Waterous Engine Company for drawback, I beg to state that though they were furnished with a copy of the Order in Council, under authority of which drawback on manufactured articles attached to goods exported is payable, yet they never complied with the requirements thereof, nor in any way intimated their intentions with regard thereto. In fact, I have seen nothing from them on the subject since."

The House will see that everything was done that could be done under the law to meet that particular case. With regard to notifying these gentlemen, when it was not particularly our duty to do so, particular pains were taken to keep these gentlemen informed on the changes that had been made, and to meet their views and requests to the fullest possible extent. I was anxious that this should go to the country, and upon the official records—that there was no negligence on the part of the Customs Department in respect to this case; but I did think that these gentlemen had become so wealthy under the National Policy that the question of a drawback of a few hundred dollars was of much less importance to them than keeping the question in abeyance in order that my hon. friend might make his annual speech on the drawback question, and that they would much rather have the grievance than obtain the money.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I can only say that the hon. Minister of Customs has failed altogether to make out his case. I did not want to speak to-day, and only spoke with the view of having this matter settled. I did not want to refer to the matter I brought up the other night at all, as we went into that very fully; but the House will observe that the hon. Minister does not touch the point of the difficulty at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not propose to enter into that. I proposed to put myself right as to giving them notice.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not contradict that. My statement was that while certain manufacturers were required to specify the very day on which an entry was made, and the number of the Customs' entry, that regulation was waived as to other manufacturers, and all the affidavit they made was that the goods had paid duty within two years; and in order to prove conclusively that that was the case, I showed that, attached to the very returns that came down, and at a date subsequent to the alterations in question, were the affidavits of other firms in which they were complying with the strict regulations as to the entry and its date.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the question.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. Minister did not say that the Order in Council relieved them.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say to the contrary. What I say was that within a month after the Order passed a change was made, and they never complied with that.

Mr. PATERSON. What I complain of, and what they complained of, was that they cannot make an affidavit as to the particular date and the number of the entry; and the hon. Minister will not say that he ever wrote to them saying that this regulation would be waived in their case as it was in the case of others. Only last night I received a letter from that firm, in which they say: "Your contention in the House in reference to that matter is true. There never has been any proposition to us to waive the regulation as to giving the date and the customs entry;" and there is where the whole difficulty lies—and it is insurmountable. I don't find fault because the regulation was waived in the case of the two sewing machine manufacturers, but because it was

Mr. BOWELL,

not waived also in the case of others: I think the hon. Minister, when I brought this matter up in the spirit I did, and with the object I did, need not have referred to the question of the National Policy, and the views expressed upon it by certain gentlemen. So far as my attitude towards the manufacturers is concerned, I challenge him, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, to find an utterance of mine in which I have not stood by the manufacturers of this country and rejoiced in their success as much as any other man could. And I think it was scarcely necessary for the hon. gentleman to close his remarks by saying that men who are making so much money should not think of such a small matter as a few hundred dollars of drawback, and that the grievance complained of would be more valuable to me than a few hundred dollars to them. Nothing of the kind. There are plenty of opportunities for a man in Parliament to air his eloquence without taking up a matter of this kind. My complaint does not affect one individual firm merely. There are other firms in my county, who are doing a trade with Russia, that are in precisely the same position. The hon. Minister's remarks made it necessary for me to state what I have done.

Mr. BOWELL. I want to draw the attention of the House to this fact—the hon. gentleman has not mentioned the point I raised in reading these letters. It was simply a question of statement as between the hon. gentleman and myself, as to whether the firm to which he alluded had received notice of certain changes in the Order in Council, and whether they had complied with it. The hon. gentleman said that they had complied with it, and that they had offered to change the mode in which they made their claim. I said that I had no knowledge of it, and that is the whole question I wished to refer to. Yet, on the strength of that, the hon. gentleman has gone into the whole question of drawbacks in order to draw the attention of the House away from the real point at issue. There is great difficulty in arriving at the correct amount to be paid back in cases in which the duty is *ad valorem*; but I do not desire to go into that question, I desire to confine myself expressly to what I said; and it was because the hon. gentleman did not touch that point that I made use of the expression that I thought he rather preferred a grievance in order to be able to make an annual speech.

Mr. PATERSON. You scarcely believed it at the time, did you?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think this subject should be complicated by the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. member for South Brant, which the hon. Minister wishes to limit to the one issue, whether notice was given to the firm in question, while my hon. friend contends, and with justice, that there was a practical impossibility of complying with the requirements of the Department, and complains that the Department relaxed these requirements in favor of one manufacturer, while the requirements for the general mass of manufacturers were kept at the old level. The proposition of my hon. friend was stated in that way, and I did not hear the hon. Minister, at any time reply to it. On the contrary, he said he would not take that occasion to reply to it; but he has not taken any subsequent occasion. The hon. Minister made an observation which, I think, had better not have been made. He said he supposed these manufacturers were making so much money under the operation of the fiscal policy, that they would not care much about a few dollars drawback. I consider it is of the last consequence to the interest of the country, in so far as they are connected with manufacturing, that we should not hamper the export trade of the manufacturers. We have got a sparse population, a naturally limited home consumption, and manufacturing enterprises stimulated by the present tariff; and if you do not give all the freedom

you can, under this tariff, to the extension of our trade beyond our limits, you will inflict serious injury on our manufacturing interests. We have contended, on this side, for the advisability of keeping at the lowest possible rate the duties on the raw material manufactured. That applies both to the domestic and the foreign trade of these manufacturers; but while the duties are kept at their present rate it is still of greater consequence that the system of drawbacks shall be such as is consistent with the avoidance of fraud in order to give what facilities can be given to foreign trade. I agree with the hon. Minister of Customs that the subject is one of great complication and difficulty, and requiring the exercise of great caution particularly in order that the revenue may not be injured. But those difficulties must be grappled with as far as they can, and the export trade which has been going on for some time so fortunately in several branches of manufactures must not be crippled further than avoidable under the influence of the fiscal policy. That export trade is important from another point of view. It gives an opportunity of expansion and stability to the trade, and also the fullest benefit that can be given under our system to the influence of competition and to the re-development of the energies and the workmanship of our manufacturers. It is of great importance that we should be able to show, as I believe we can in several important branches, that we can hold our own with our neighbors. I have not underestimated the difficulties of the present system, but believe they can be grappled with, and that it is not a question of small consequence which people will not care about.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said manufacturers were making so much money—

Mr. BOWELL. I was simply referring to one firm. I know the contrary.

Mr. BLAKE. You see the difficulty caused by complicating a large general question with a small personal controversy. I am glad to hear that the observation of the hon. gentleman was not a particular, but a general one; and I hope efforts will be made, on the part of the Government, to diminish the disadvantages under which manufacturers labor as regards the extension of their foreign trade.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The importance of the export trade of the Dominion is fully appreciated by the Government. It is quite true that, under the existing policy, our manufacturers are not driven in many cases to seek for a market abroad as they were previous to 1879. There are other industries for which we have had a foreign market, and continue to enjoy it to the present, and which we were not in a position to keep successfully in competition against the manufacturers of similar articles in the United States and Great Britain. But the question is surrounded with difficulty in many cases. If we have erred at all, in many cases we have erred in favor of the manufacturers. Take the question of cut nails and other articles on which we gave a drawback to the manufacturers. We have made a liberal calculation as to the amount of duty on the raw material which enters into those articles, so that these manufacturers have had a full return of the duty. With reference to sewing machines, we have carefully analyzed the iron and other material used in the different classes, so that we pay a certain sum to the party exporting according to the class of machine; but in the case referred to by the hon member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) the question was not quite so clear as in others. The desire of the Government has always been to deal liberally with the manufacturers. If my memory serves me, the parties made application, in the first instance, for a drawback on the manufactured brass that was used in an engine. The difficulty arose here that arises in the case of

other articles that may be imported into the country and pay duty, while the same articles are manufactured in the Dominion. If a drawback was given on those it would interfere with the Canadian manufactures. That was the one principle which actuated us in refusing some of the applications. I think that the firm referred to had not made any application after they received the letter from the hon. Minister of Customs. They, or any other firm engaged in the manufacture of articles for export, may rest assured that the Government will do all it can to facilitate their operations.

Bill read the second and third times, and passed.

#### PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the Governor General's Secretary:

OTTAWA, 23rd May, 1883.

SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General, if the state of the public business will permit, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament, on Friday, the 25th instant, at 3.30 o'clock p.m.

I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,

F. DE WINTON, Lt. Col. R. A.

Governor General's Secretary.

The Honorable  
The Speaker  
of the House of Commons.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the business on the Order Paper has been disposed of, I would suggest that the House should meet here at nine o'clock to-night, to receive communications from the Senate. I understand the hon. leader of the Opposition leaves town to-night, and most likely he would like to know what will be done during the remainder of the Session. Of course, we shall have to remain in Session until we hear what the result of the deliberations of the other House is. I may say at once that the Government will not allow any other business except what results from communications from the Senate. We will not introduce any measures, or discuss any, before prorogation, except as occasion may require in communications from the Senate. I mention this for the benefit of hon. members on the other side who desire to go away, and who would not like to forfeit their standing as careful watchmen over the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. These observations are well understood to apply always to the "other side." All public virtue is concentrated in the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am well aware that it would be impossible for those hon. gentlemen, even under these circumstances, to tear themselves away from the Capital until after the last gun is fired.

Mr. LANDRY. I have a question on the notice paper can I put that question now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Leave it till to-morrow.

Mr. LANDRY. I have also a Bill on the Order Paper; will the Government name a day to consider it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman has got a bill, he had better pay it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the Statute of Limitations bar this Bill.

House took Recess till 9 o'clock p. m.

#### After Recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns, it do stand adjourned until Friday next, at 10 a.m. Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to; and (at 10.25 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 25th May, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE DOMINION AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had hoped, on behalf of the Government, to have laid before the House during the present Session the state of the negotiations for a settlement of all matters between British Columbia and Canada. These negotiations have been going on up to this time, but I am sorry to say that we have not been able, so far, to bring down a measure this Session. I may shortly, however, state the position in which this matter now stands, for the general information of the country. In order finally to settle all matters in dispute between that Province and the Dominion which existed, in fact, almost since the time of the Union—at all events, since the expiration of two years afterwards—negotiations were entered into this winter, and Mr. Trutch, who has acted for the Dominion as Government agent, came specially here, after having previously communicated with the Government of British Columbia, in order to frame some arrangement by which all these matters should be finally settled. The chief cause of complaint in the Province of British Columbia was the failure to carry out exactly, literally, the Terms of Union, *quoad* the commencement of the Canadian Pacific Railway. One of the Terms of Union was that within two years the Canadian Pacific Railway should be commenced, and should be finished within ten years. I will not trouble the House with a restatement of all the various circumstances which caused the delay. It has been a source of irritation and annoyance, very natural in some respects, in British Columbia, that all the advantages of the expenditure on the construction and the use of the road after completion should be lost by that Province. In order to settle that question it will be remembered that when the late Canadian Government was in power they made a very vigorous effort to settle that question, and there was a proposition made to British Columbia to give them \$750,000 as a compensation for the non-performance of the contract. The House will remember how that arrangement failed. Besides this question there was another question—a money matter—connected with the construction of a graving dock at Esquimalt. By the Terms of Union, Canada became liable, to a certain extent, to assist that enterprise; and the Legislature here, in order to meet the wishes of the Government of British Columbia, went considerably further, and instead of guaranteeing the interest as under the original treaty, they agreed to advance the sum of \$250,000, and the British Admiralty agreed to give £50,000 sterling on the completion of the graving dock. These are two questions to be settled. Now, we consider it of the greatest importance that for once and all time, these burning questions shall be allayed and the fire extinguished. It was therefore agreed, that on getting a receipt in full from British Columbia, by Act of the Legislature, that on getting a receipt for all claims for non-performance of the conditions of building the railway within a certain time, and for real or supposed obligation on the part of Canada, against the Government as a Government, to

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

construct the Island Railway, that we should contribute to the construction of the Island Railway the sum of money offered by the late Government, to the extent of \$750,000. With regard to the Esquimalt Graving Dock, it was found that from a variety of circumstances, that work was not successfully progressing. The financial state of affairs in British Columbia was not encouraging, and the work was going on very slowly, and, consequently, with a great waste of money; and it was important that this work should be finished, and it is more important now than ever, in view of the early construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the fact that the graving dock most likely will be brought into active use. All this is, of course, subject to the approval of Parliament. It has been arranged that we should take the Esquimalt Graving Dock off the hands of the British Columbia Government. They have expended \$250,000 on the work, which we propose to repay them, and complete the dock. The money subsidy therefore for those two objects will be \$1,000,000, \$750,000 in aid of building the railway, and \$250,000 as purchase money for the graving dock. The subsidy for the construction of the railway was to be given to an incorporated company, the company to be composed of men of good credit, standing and means, who should give security to the Dominion Government, and we propose that they should submit that security and obtain an acknowledgment from the British Columbia Government, that the security is ample—in other words, that the security should be satisfactory to both Governments. In order further to enable the construction of that road the British Columbia Government agree to transfer the lands which had been reserved originally for the construction of the road, to the Dominion Government, those lands being held for the purpose of aiding, additionally, the construction of the Island Railway, and the Dominion Government would act in regard to the Island Railway as they had with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is, as the work proceeded land and money would be given in the proportion as was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the construction of that work. Then, as regards the land question, the House will remember that the British Columbia members agreed in the Terms of Union, to reserve twenty miles of land on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia on the mainland, in order to aid in the construction of the railway. Now, it is provided in the Terms of Union that all existing rights, such as squatters' rights, should be protected. The British Columbia Government could only give the Dominion Government twenty miles on each side of the railway which was in their power to give, and the Act of Union further provided that any deficiency in the lands lying on each side of the railway, should be made up by lands contiguous to this railway belt. The railway passed along the gorge of the Fraser River; there is not a wide valley there, and twenty miles on each side of the railway would include a large portion of mountain land of no value for agricultural or other purposes, and of the valley itself, a large portion has been already appropriated for other purposes, by other parties, under various titles, or otherwise, as not to render it available for a land grant for building a railway. In order to make up the deficiency, and render it an inducement for the Dominion Government to enter into the fullest, these arrangements for taking the graving dock off the hands of the British Columbia Government, it was agreed to supplement the land grant along the railway, by conveying to the Dominion Government 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River country, and contiguous to our own North-West, that land to be located by the Dominion Government in a rectangular block. There is reason to believe that the land is of good quality, and fit in every way for agricultural purposes, but as the land lies on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, far away from the main resources of British Columbia, it is of more value to us than to them. This is a valuable grant to the Canadian Government,

and is really no sacrifice on the part of British Columbia, on account of the remoteness of the land from the centres of trade and population. This seemed to the Government to be a satisfactory arrangement in every respect; the Government thought so then, and it thinks so now. The negotiations would have gone on without check, and the Government would have taken the responsibility of asking Parliament, this Session, to pass an Act confirming the arrangement. In order to carry out this arrangement, the British Columbia Government, in good faith, submitted, late in their Session, a proposal; it was late of necessity, because they were awaiting for the return of Mr. Trutch, after having concluded this arrangement, and it could not be proceeded with until he had returned after completing the whole matter. I say that the British Columbia Government introduced an Act in good faith, for the purpose of carrying out this arrangement. They had passed an Act which we received by telegram a very short time ago. On looking over that Act, however, we found that by error—a very natural one—I suppose the British Columbia Government, or the draughtsman of the Bill, did not reflect that in its terms it materially altered the arrangement, because it provided, in fact, that the Dominion Government should build the road, and in order to enable the Dominion Government to do so, it passed an Act of incorporation, to be brought into effect in a manner satisfactory to the Canadian Government; and the Act itself says, that in order to enable the Canadian Government to build the road, it incorporates this company. Now, it was no portion of the agreement that the Canadian Government should build it. We agreed, in fact, to see that the incorporated company that should build it, should be a satisfactory company, and give ample security. We pledged ourselves not to give a charter to any body of capitalists or persons who could not give ample security, while we agreed to see that there was such ample security given, and while we had money in our hands and the land in our hands only to be given to the company as the work progressed, and therefore there was no reasonable probability of the road not being finished. Yet we have in no way pledged the faith of the Canadian Government to the building of that road. Now, although in substance there appeared to be no great difference in this matter, the Canadian Government could not but reflect that the obligation to build the Island Railway had been solemnly repudiated by the Canadian Parliament, and we had to inform the British Columbia authorities that we had no hopes—even if willing—of successfully carrying such an obligation through the Canadian Parliament—that we should not, under all the circumstances, pledge ourselves to build it as a Government work. This is the way in which that matter now stands. There was another clause of the Bill which was also contrary to the agreement which has been entered into, and which I fancy was inserted in the British Columbia Bill under the idea that we would not object to it, and that was that all the lands which had been appropriated in aid of the building of the Island Railway, except coal and mineral lands, should for the next four years be sold at the price of \$1 an acre. Now, as that grant of lands was to be in aid of the construction of the road and was to be given to the contractors as they built the road, we felt that we had no right to diminish the value of the aid by making limited prices. That was not part of the agreement. I believe that \$1 an acre is considered the normal price of land now in British Columbia, and, therefore, it was supposed that we would not object to it, and that the contractors to build the railway would not object to it; but it remained to be seen whether the contractors would object to it or not; and we had to inform the British Columbia Government that without the assent of the company who were to get this aid, we could not agree to fix a maximum price. There is, of course,

matter of regret that this difference between the Act which was passed in British Columbia and the agreement recently made between the two Governments has prevented us coming here now to ask the Canadian Parliament to supplement this agreement and confirm it, but I do not believe that there will be any deadlock in the matter. Still, it is the cause of some little delay. The British Columbia Legislature consists of twenty-five members. They have recently prorogued, and it will be some personal inconvenience to the representatives in the Legislature to re-assemble; but I have no doubt that they will re-assemble within a reasonable time for the purpose of amending their Act, so as to make it in conformity with the agreement which was recently entered into between the Governments. That once done, we will take the responsibility of making all kinds of provisional arrangements for the organization and incorporation of the company and for taking security, so that when our Legislature meets next winter, the Government will be able to submit a measure confirming the agreement so made. There will practically be little, if any, delay, because even if we had passed an Act this Session confirming the legislation in British Columbia we would have been obliged then to look for a company, a body of men willing to accept the charter and undertake the construction of the road. That company would have to have been organized; its capital subscribed; its first instalment, or the first call, paid up under our general railway system, and then that company would have been obliged, after being fully organized, to organize their staff before they could commence the construction of the railway, before they could turn a sod, so that it would absorb nearly all this summer before that could be done. Little time will be lost, because we will, in the meantime, proceed as if to a certain extent a measure had been passed here. I have no doubt that we will be able to get a company of capitalists who will undertake the work, subject, of course, to the approval of the Parliament here. They will be satisfied with the assurance that the Canadian Government will do what they can to carry that measure next Session in this Parliament, so that I think, practically, there will be little or no delay. And then another question which is considered of great importance in British Columbia, is the opening up of all the lands for settlement on the mainland on each side of the railway now rapidly in course of construction. Immigration, I am happy to say, is now flowing from the south into British Columbia; immigration has gone in there this year, I believe, to a larger extent than has been the case for a good many years; and these lands are sought for eagerly by intending settlers and by the navvies and persons employed in the construction of the road, from Yale up to Kamloops, on the Onderdonk contract. There need be no deadlock or delay in the matter. The intention of the Canadian Government is to instruct Mr. Trutch to confer with the British Columbia Government, to organize at once a land office for the purpose of putting the lands on each side of the railway into the market immediately, and to open them for settlement on liberal terms. It is part of the agreement which is to be carried out that the terms should be liberal. I presume—I speak approximately—that the lands will be put into the market at the nominal price there—say, \$1 an acre, or thereabouts; there can be no settlement as to the exact figure, as a great portion of these lands have been squatted upon. The Canadian Government has also agreed that the squatter settlers on these lands shall have a prior right to them at the ordinary price of unimproved land. There will be no objection to the settlement on each side of the railway, in consequence of the postponement of the carrying out of the works on the Island. These are the circumstances, and I thought it right to mention to the House, for the information of the public, the facts exactly as they are. I could not do it earlier, because telegraphic messages have been going on—until yesterday I may say—between the two Govern-

ments, and between our agent, Mr. Trutch, and myself. These are the facts, and I desire them to go to the public, so that the public will be fully advised as to the responsibilities the Canadian Government have undertaken under this arrangement, and that the country may have an opportunity of considering them between now and next Session.

Mr. TROW. Assuming the great responsibility of leading the great Reform party, I may say that my followers are not as numerous as we expected in proportion to our friends on the opposite side of the House, and I question very much whether it would be necessary or proper on my part, to ask for a vote on any question that may come before us to-day. I think it is proper that some arrangement should be made for better terms to British Columbia, for various reasons. In the first place, as the hon. First Minister has just stated, the lands were not generally known, nor was the route of the railway fixed a year, or even six months ago. As regards the lands on the Peace River, I think the exchange would be a very good one; for, judging from the reports of Professor Macoun and other gentlemen who have traversed that country, there is no doubt that there are large quantities of land in that region which are valuable for the settlement of an agricultural population. The proposed exchange will also render any provinces which may be carved out in that country much more compact than they otherwise would be, and will be decidedly advantageous for the Province of British Columbia. It is the only Province in the Dominion in which I have not yet travelled, more or less, although I have made several attempts to visit it; but from all I can learn with regard to it, it is not an agricultural country, and the available lands in the valleys along the line of route are very limited, because the valleys are exceedingly narrow, and cannot be expected to maintain a very large population. No doubt these lands are very fertile, but the mountains, which differ from all other mountains almost on the face of the globe, run, not parallel, but at right angles to the valleys, and thus render communication between them very difficult. There are great engineering difficulties in the way of the construction of the railway, and the expense before the line is completed, will, in all probability, form an enormous tax on the Dominion. I think it is high time that the First Minister and his Administration should seriously consider these matters, and not enter into any scheme that would be likely to enhance our indebtedness. I heard, quite recently, from the floor of the House, that we have in the valley of the Gatineau, adjoining the Capital, a very fertile section of country that remains undeveloped, and in which not a mite of construction has yet been undertaken, but in which it is proposed to undertake a line of railway under the general scheme of subsidies which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has brought down. I think there are many parts of the old Provinces—the Eastern Townships, the Chicoutimi Valley, the Lake St. John district, and many other districts—that require development as well as British Columbia. The country has already undertaken the construction of over 200 miles of railway in British Columbia, and the Island Railway will be an additional expense. It is true we are to receive some compensation, but it is questionable whether the lands can be sold to any advantage, above the cost of survey. They are not as valuable as the lands of the North-West. There is some object in constructing a railway in the North-West, because there are lands on each side of the railway which are valuable for settlement, and from which funds can be realized to aid the construction. It is hoped that the adjustment with British Columbia will not be altogether in the interests of British Columbia, but in the interests of the Dominion at large. I do not know that for one particular Province—one so remote, at all events—we should incur enormous expenditure, while we are in our infancy. We have not the unbounded

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

resources that the people of the United States have, and yet a railway mania in that country a few years ago brought on a financial crisis. We are not prepared to say that we shall be blessed by Providence with as good crops as we have had during the past three or four years. Failures of the crops may overtake us; and I think it is the duty of the Administration to study economy. It is true that the hon. Finance Minister has taxed the people so excessively as to accumulate a very large amount of money; but the people will not always be willing to be so heavily taxed, even if they are able to pay. These are times of prosperity; we may have adversity in two or three years; and now is the time to husband our resources.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It appears to me that the hon. gentleman who last spoke is laboring under a delusion. Neither the British Columbia people nor the British Columbia Government want any better terms. All British Columbia wants is that the terms upon which she entered Confederation should be faithfully carried out, and that some compensation should be made to them for the delays which have been occasioned. I understood recently that these matters would not come up this Session, and consequently I am not prepared fully to discuss them at the moment. But, as a representative of British Columbia, I must urge upon the Government the duty of carrying out as quickly as possible the terms of Confederation, more particularly in regard to the construction of the Island Railway as a part of the trans-continental railway between Ottawa and the capital of the Pacific Province, the completion of the dry dock at Esquimalt, and the throwing open to settlement of all the railway lands that have been reserved for the purpose of its construction—more than this British Columbia does not ask. It has been urged upon the Government of the day from time to time to have these terms carried out; unfortunately, during four or five years, there was a Government in power who was, to say the least, inimical to British Columbia. I am happy to say that those gentlemen are not now in power, but that those are in power with whom the terms were made with British Columbia, and I hope they will long continue there, and that within a short time all the Terms of the Union will be faithfully carried out.

Mr. TROW. One word in reference to the Terms of Union. It strikes me forcibly that they were not for the construction of a railway, but to provide for some means of communication between the older Provinces and British Columbia.

Mr. BAKER. I beg your pardon.

Mr. TROW. It was utterly impossible to do anything more. The hon. gentleman from Victoria seems to blame the previous Administration for not sooner proceeding with the work—the same work having been condemned by the Senate which the hon. First Minister proposes to-day, and it strikes me that the Senate did right in not passing that measure. We are not in a financial position to spend \$10,000,000 for the sake of a few thousand inhabitants. We must proceed gradually and progressively, according to our financial circumstances.

Mr. BAKER. The hon. gentleman makes a great mistake when he says there was no railway contemplated. It was essentially a railway that led British Columbia to come into Confederation at all. What advantage would British Columbia have had in coming into the Union if she had not been connected with the East by a railway? I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by some method of travel—perhaps he means a pack-mule train, or something of that sort? But I repeat, the main inducement that led British Columbia to come into the Dominion was the construction of a railway from the sea-board of British Columbia to connect with the system of railways in Canada,



to be commenced within two years, and completed in ten. That agreement was made on the 20th of July, 1871; we have passed the 20th of July, 1881, and two years beyond it, and still this part of the contract has not been completed. In fact, it is only barely commenced. I do not blame the hon. leader of the Government or his Administration, but I do blame the Administration of the party which the hon. gentleman who last spoke has the distinguished honor of representing in this House; and if they had carried out the agreement, we would now have a railway between Ottawa and Victoria by which we could make the journey in eight days, instead of sixteen, as at present.

Mr. HACKETT. As I am the representative of a Province, the terms upon which it entered Confederation not having been carried out, I may be pardoned for making a few remarks on this occasion. With regard to the proposition of the hon. First Minister, I think it is a reasonable one; I consider there is no parallel between it and the building of the railway as contemplated by the Mackenzie Administration. The proposition of the hon. First Minister is that \$1,000,000 be given to British Columbia for the purpose of building this railway in Vancouver Island, while the scheme of the Mackenzie Government contemplated the construction of that railway as a Government work at a cost of from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000. I think it very desirable that good faith should be kept with each Province. If we are to make of this Dominion a great country there must be no disaffection on the part of the people of any Province, and if \$1,000,000 will satisfy the people of British Columbia so as to make them look upon the Dominion Government as a paternal Government, I think it will be money wisely expended. More than that, I look upon British Columbia as being one of the finest Provinces of this Dominion. It has great and undeveloped resources, and every person knows that it is possessed of a beautiful climate; and I have no doubt, that before long, it will be considered one of the finest Provinces of this Dominion. The First Minister has spoken of the large number of immigrants going in there this year, and I think it is desirable that the lands of the Government should be open for settlement, so that those people who go there for the purpose of becoming agriculturists, may have their expectations realized. Coming now to another Province, I would just say, that the terms of Confederation have never been faithfully carried out with Prince Edward Island. It was agreed that a continuous communication should be kept up between that Province and the mainland in winter and summer; as every one knows that the want of that communication is a great drawback to the Island. Prince Edward Island has a population of 110,000; these people are large consumers of Dominion manufactures, and, I think, I am only stating what is correct, when I say that not less than \$1,000,000 per annum worth of manufactured products of the Dominion are consumed in Prince Edward Island. It is most desirable then, not only in the interests of Prince Edward Island, but of the whole Dominion, that the terms of Confederation should be carried out, and that this continuous steam communication, both in winter and summer, should be fully provided. Now, it may be said that the representatives of Prince Edward Island in this Parliament are too exacting, that they are asking the impossible, but that is not so. We know that for three or four years after Prince Edward Island came into the Union, scarcely any attempt was made to carry out the agreement. From 1876, until the present time, the *Northern Light* has been the only means of steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and it is well known that that vessel cannot be considered in any degree as answering the needs of the Island, or as fulfilling the Terms of the Union. This year a vote has been taken for building a branch railway connecting the Prince Edward Island Railway with

the outlying portion of the Island called Cape Traverse. While the Government are going on building this railway, I hope they will not neglect the means of providing satisfactory communication by water, and until this is done Prince Edward Island must have recourse to the old means of crossing by ice boats. A very great improvement may be made at Cape Traverse even under the old system of ice-boat crossing. We only want boat-houses to be erected at the Cape for the convenient accommodation of passengers and crews, and that additional ice-boats be placed there for the purpose of keeping up communication—that is to say, whenever a crossing is possible, boats may leave the mainland and the Island simultaneously and cross in opposite directions. At the present time, there can be only one crossing a day. The crew leave the Island and row across to the mainland during the day, and they are so fatigued on arriving there that they are unable to return on the same day, and if, in the meanwhile, a storm arises, they are not able to return on the following day, and on several occasions they have been obliged to remain a whole week on one side or the other. All we look for, while the railway is in process of construction, is the construction of these boat-houses and additional facilities for crossing by means of ice-boats, which I think is a very moderate request, and one to which the Government should accede. Referring for a moment to the report of the Committee, the hon. Finance Minister stated that we were asking for three lines of steamboats. What we did ask for in that report was that the present steam service be continued, that a company be subsidized for the purpose of keeping up the summer service, that a ferry be established at the Cape, and that the *Northern Light* be maintained at Georgetown. We are not asking, however, for three lines of steamboats. The summer service extends during only six months of the year; the Georgetown communication is maintained for only a month or two, and then we have to fall back on the crossing at the Cape. As it is the policy of the Government to foster the industries of all the Provinces, and as the Government has deemed it expedient and wise to subsidize lines of steamers for promoting trade between the Dominion and foreign countries, it is only right that the Government should subsidize a line of steamers for the purpose of keeping up communication with Prince Edward Island during the summer. I have already stated that the Island takes \$1,000,000 worth of the products of the other Provinces of Canada each year; and in view, as I have said, of the subsidies granted to lines of steamers sailing for foreign ports, I think it just that a line should be subsidized for the purpose of keeping up communication with the Island, and enabling the people to buy the products of Canada as cheaply as possible, and creating a market in our own Dominion for the products of the larger Provinces. This, then, I take it, will be done by the Government. The Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island have placed an additional boat on the route this year. It is an iron screw vessel and will prove a valuable boat. The company have kept up communication for some years by means of two small steamers, and as they have added a first-class iron steamer, I think they should obtain an additional subsidy of \$5,000 a year. I approve very heartily of dealing liberally and fairly with British Columbia, and while doing so towards a people who have been a little persistent, and have looked forward with great anxiety to the carrying out by the Dominion of the Terms of Union, the people of Prince Edward Island have remained very patient, and something should be done for them now.

#### ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move, on the part of the Commons, that the Address to His Excellency the Governor-General be presented to His Excellency by those

hon. members of this House who are members of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

At 11.20 a.m. the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### LICENSE BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Whilst we are waiting for a summons to another place, I desire to say that several members have expressed the desire that a large edition of the License Bill, as finally adopted, should be printed, in order that a pretty general circulation of it might be made. Its provisions interest so directly the general public, that it is most important, much more so than in the case of other measures, that it should be placed as early as possible in the hands of the people. I am sure that I speak the general sense of the House in suggesting that a sufficient number should be printed to permit of a hundred copies being furnished to each member.

#### CONGRATULATIONS, &c.

Mr. WRIGHT. Before the Usher of the Black Rod gives his three knocks, before that pleasant little raven from the Upper Chamber comes tapping at our door, I have been requested by a number of the members of the House to say a few words concerning the manner in which you have discharged the important duties devolving upon you during this Session. It must be confessed, Sir, that the proceedings of this Parliament have been of a somewhat monotonous character, indicative somewhat of the approach of our political millenium; and, Sir, as it is said that a nation is happy that has no history, when we consider that no important measures have been brought before us, except perhaps, the License Bill, and that the affairs of the country have been as well administered by the Government conducting them, I think we have been happy in having so monotonous, if indeed, not so very pleasant a Session. I have been requested, Sir, by many members of this House, to express their gratification at the manner in which you have performed the important duties devolving upon you. When we heard you read the solemn service with which we begin our proceedings, we thought a great mistake had been made when you devoted yourself to the law instead of the Gospel, to the evil instead of the good. But, Sir, we had to bow to the inevitable, and born as you were, under the shadow of the old fort of Frontenac; born, as you were, under the shadow of that great penal institution, where justice presents its malevolent rather than its benevolent aspects, we all felt assured that when you were selected by the Commons to perform the important duties of the office you hold, you would perform them with a singular grace and a wonderful charm—and I am free to confess that our expectations have not been disappointed. I am sure both sides of the House will agree with me that in all respects you have performed your duty in a manner to win commendation from all sorts and conditions of men; but while you have not been guilty of any sins of commission, I fear we must charge you with a sin of omission. We had reason to expect that the monotony of our Parliamentary life would have been relieved by a pleasant charm and an agreeable change. We thought that we would hear the rustling of divinity, the fluttering of angelic wings, and the odor of violets and orange flowers in our passages and corridors; but, Sir, a word to the wise is sufficient; and as an eminent writer says, it is never too late to mend, and we trust this matter will be mended before we meet again another Session. Sir, you have occupied a very distinguished position. You remind us of that picture by a great French artist which depicted the deluge. On a vast rock in

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the midst of a great expanse of waters, was seated a noble and distinguished figure, not unlike your own, who looked down on the struggling swimmers below. You have seen the struggles of the two parties; you have seen the ebb and flow of political life; the fierce assaults of my hon. friends of the Opposition on the serried ranks of their opponents, and you have heard the cry of many a strong swimmer in his agony, who went down in the terrible gulf—who, commencing his political life, found that in this arena, above all other, the principle of the survival of the fittest prevails; and I think, Sir, you have borne the criticisms of your friends as well as your enemies, which proves always the existence of the highest statecraft. In all respects, Sir, you deserve the highest commendation at the hands of your fellow-citizens, your colleagues and your countrymen; and we trust that when the period arrives, which comes to Speakers as well as to meaner organizations, when you will be exalted into the political arcana—we hope then when you will be transferred to another sphere, you will pass your time in studying, patiently, Parliamentary problems and curious constitutional questions so that you may enjoy the utmost happiness consistent with the state of things here below. And I am sure I express the opinion of every member in saying we trust that when that time arrives, you will have so comforted yourself that we will be able to join in saying: "Well done good and faithful Speaker, enter thou into the new governorship, collectorship or the judgeship prepared for you from the beginning of this Parliament."

Mr. TROW. I entirely coincide in the views expressed by the hon. member for Ottawa county, and regret exceedingly that my respected leader is not here, because I know his views towards you, Mr. Speaker, are of the kindest nature, and I know the universal feeling of respect which my hon. friends on this side of the House entertain with reference to you as a gentleman who occupies the honorable position of Speaker of this House. In reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Cardwell, I think it very desirable that a large issue should be in circulation. The Bill to which he referred is one of vital importance, interesting the whole community—

Mr. SPEAKER. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman. I have received an informal Message from His Excellency asking myself and the House to go to the Senate Chamber in order to present the Address to him.

The House accordingly repaired to the Senate Chamber.

On their return,

Mr. TROW resumed his remarks. "I do not know," he said, "any Bill that would require so much consideration on the part of the public; nor do I know that it has been passed in such a hurried manner." It was remarkable to notice so many amendments made precipitately without nine-tenths of the members knowing what they were. Quite a number of professional men—I do not wish to say anything disparaging to the profession—but quite a number seemed to take no interest in making amendments to the various clauses; and it struck me forcibly that there was no reason why our laws should not be made so simple that one member of the legal profession need not go to another to ask his interpretation of certain clauses."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the honor, on behalf of those members of the Privy Council who waited on His Excellency with an Address, to lay before this House the answer of His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:—

*Honorable Gentlemen:*

No higher personal honor can be received by a public man than that which by this Address you have been pleased to accord to me. In asking you to accept my gratitude, I thank you also for your words regarding

the Princess, whose affection for Canada fully equals mine. It will be my pride and duty to aid you in the future to the utmost of my power. Now that the pre-arranged term of our residence among you draws to its end, and the happiest five years I have ever known are nearly spent, it is my fortune to look back on a time during which all domestic discord has been avoided, our friendship with the great neighboring Republic has been sustained, and an uninterrupted prosperity has marked the advance of the Dominion.

In no other land have the last seventeen years—the space of time which has elapsed since your Federation—witnessed such progress. Other countries have had their territories enlarged, and their destinies determined by trouble and war, but no blood has stained the bonds which have knit together your free and order-loving populations. And yet in this period, so brief in the life of a nation, you have attained to a Union whose characteristics, from sea to sea, are the same.

A Judicature above suspicion; self-governing communities entrusting to a strong Central Government all national interests; the toleration of all faiths; with favor to none; a franchise recognizing the rights of labor by the exclusion only of the idler; the maintenance of a Government, not privileged to exist for any fixed term, but ever susceptible to the change of public opinion, and ever open through a responsible Ministry to the scrutiny of the people;—these are the features of your rising Power.

Finally you present the spectacle of a nation, already possessing the means to make its position respected by its resources in men available at sea or on land. May these never be required except to gather the harvests the bounty of God has so lavishly bestowed upon you. The spirit, however, which made your Fathers resist encroachments on your soil and liberties, is with you now; and it is as certain to-day as it was formerly, that you are ready to take on yourselves the necessary burden to ensure the permanence of your Laws and Institutions.

You have the power to make Treaties on your own responsibility with foreign Nations, and your High Commissioner is associated for purposes of negotiation with the Foreign Office.

You are not the subjects, but the free allies of the great country which gave you birth, and is ready with all its energy to be the champion of your interests. Standing side by side Canada and Great Britain work together for the commercial advancement of each other. It is the recognition of this which makes such an occasion as the present significant. Personalities, however dear to individuals, are of no public moment. These may be happy or unhappy accidents. But the satisfaction experienced from the condition of the connection now subsisting between the old and the new lands, can be affected by no personal accident.

I therefore rejoice that again it has been your determination to show that Canada remains as firmly rooted as ever in love to that free union which ensures to you and to Great Britain equal advantages. Without it, the maintenance of your Institutions and national autonomy would not be allowed to endure for a twelvemonth; while the loss of the alliance of the communities which were once the dependencies of England, would be a heavy blow to her commerce and renown.

I thank you once more for your words which shall be dear treasures to me for ever; and may the end of the term of each public servant who fills with you the office which constitutes him at once your Chief Magistrate and the Representative of a United Empire, be a day for pronouncing in favor of a free national Government, defended by such Imperial alliance.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA,  
25th May, 1883.

Mr. TROW. I suppose I may resume my remarks, even if I have to give them in instalments. I was just going to refer, when interrupted, to the length of the Session. Had the Government been fully prepared with its measures, one-third of the Session might have been saved. The Ontario Election and Easter holiday may have had something to do with the length of the Session; but, at all events, it has been unusually long—over fifteen weeks—and two out of the three important measures proposed by the Government have been abandoned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Deferred.

Mr. TROW. Perhaps deferred is the better word. For the first five weeks of the Session there was very little done. I must give, however, several members of the Administration credit for the manner in which they prepared certain measures, and it is gratifying to know that great courtesy was shown by the hon. Minister in explaining the various items in the Estimates. I regret extremely my respected leader is not here, and I think the Government and every hon. member of this House is under a debt of gratitude to him for the manner in which he has scrutinized, analyzed and perfected the various Bills that have come before the House.

Mr. BRECKEN. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the very eloquent speech of the king of the Gatineau.

He is generally very accurate as well as poetical, but I think I have found him out in an inaccuracy. He said your occupation was rather an incongruous one, because you had belonged to the Bar, and still had distinguished yourself as Chaplain to the House. The hon. gentleman forgets that the law and the Gospel are handmaidens.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Speaker: In the absence of my hon. friend the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), who makes it a habit to address this House in the name of the French population, even when it behooves him the least to do it, I deem it my duty to add my compliments to those that have just been paid you by my English speaking colleagues. I am convinced you have performed your duties to the best of your ability, as it is also the duty of each and every hon. member in this House. We all have admired the progress you have made in the French language, and it is a great consolation for our souls to hear you say your prayers in French. I believe, Mr. Speaker, if the current rumors are well founded, if an event, not ignored by us married men, and not by yourself neither, is about to be renewed, that this House will be delighted to hear that you are leaving the Speakers Chair to take possession of another chair in the domestic sanctuary. In such an important move, the knowledge of the two languages may be of some help to you. Allow me to repeat the fact that the French speaking members of the House of Commons feel proud with the manner in which you have accomplished your duties of Speaker. It is true that, for my part, I might have some slight exception to take, for on a certain occasion when I thought I could deliver a speech, I was, through your intervention, prevented from bringing before this House a motion which I had not prepared, but which I had the intention to prepare. At all events, let us leave this aside, and allow me to join in the concert of praise which is being addressed to you by this House, and hope fervently that next year you will say your prayers in French, not only on Mondays, but also on every second day of the week.

#### PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod;

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

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

#### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to authorize the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act to incorporate "The Central Bank of Canada."

An Act respecting the Citizens' Insurance Company of Canada.

An Act farther to reduce the capital stock of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bank of London, in Canada

An Act to amend the Acts respecting procedure in criminal cases, and other matters relating to Criminal Law.

An Act to incorporate "Les Révérends Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée des Territoires du Nord-Ouest."

An Act to amend "An Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the University of Saskatchewan and to authorize the establishment of colleges within the limits of the Diocese of Saskatchewan.

An Act to provide for the amalgamation of the Bank of Nova Scotia with the Union Bank of Prince Edward Island.

An Act to empower the National Insurance Company to wind up its affairs and relinquish its charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.

An Act to incorporate "The Manitoba and North Western Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien."

An Act to amalgamate the Presbyterian Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund in connection with the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, and the Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and to create a corporation to administer such funds.

An Act to incorporate the Royal Society of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Brant County Bank of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Western Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the "Montreal and Western Railway Company."

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating "The Great Eastern Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, and the Act amending the same.

An Act to amend the "Act to incorporate the London and Ontario Investment Company, Limited."

An Act to amend the Act passed in the forty-fifth year of the reign of Her present Majesty, intituled: "An Act to repeal the duty on promissory notes, drafts and bills of exchange."

An Act to amend "An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations."

An Act to amend the several Acts incorporating the "Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company," and to change the name thereof to the "Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada."

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Davis and Lawrence Company.

An Act to grant certain powers to the Acadia Powder Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Phosphates and Mining Company.

An Act further to amend an Act intituled: "An Act relating to Banks and Banking," and the several Acts amending the same.

An Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the North-Western Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Royal Canadian Passengers Steamship Company (Limited).

An Act to continue "An Act to incorporate sundry persons by the name of the President, Directors and Company of the Farmers' Bank of Rustico."

An Act to incorporate the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate a Company under the name of "The Rathbun Company."

An Act to incorporate the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec and James' Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate "The Grange Trust (Limited)."

An Act to amend and continue in force the Act incorporating the Grafton Harbour Company, and for other purposes.

An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874."

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Northern, North-Western, and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, and to change the name of the said Company to the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Acts relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of Pictou.

An Act to amend the "Act to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited)."

An Act to incorporate "The Pacific and Peace River Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan and North-Western Railway Company.

An Act to unite the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company, and the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company into one corporation, under the name of "The Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company."

An Act for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Customs.

An Act to amend "The Post Office Act, 1875."

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific Coast of Canada and Asia.

An Act respecting booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts or otherwise.

An Act to incorporate the Railway Trust and Construction Company of Canada (Limited).

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Quinze Pier Boom, and Improvement Company.

An Act to amend "The Dominion Elections Act, 1874."

An Act to amend "An Act respecting the Offices of Receiver General and Minister of Public Works," as to the powers of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. LANDRY.

An Act respecting the Harbor Master of the Harbor of Three Rivers.  
An Act to amend "An Act to incorporate the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada."

An Act to authorize the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to extend their traffic arrangement with the North Shore Railway Company to fifty years from the date thereof.

An Act respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to amend "The Canada Civil Service Act, 1892."

An Act to amend "An Act respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company."

An Act to incorporate "The Canadian Rapid Telegraph Company (Limited)."

An Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of Inland and Coasting ships.

An Act consolidating and amending the several Acts relating to the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Company (Limited), and to change the name thereof to "The American, British and Continental Cable Company (Limited)."

An Act to amend the "Patent Act of 1872."

An Act to amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

An Act further to amend and to consolidate, as so amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.

An Act to make further provision respecting the Regulation and Collection of tolls on Government timber slides and other works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber, lumber and saw-logs.

An Act to amend an Act of the present Session, intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Railway Trust and construction Company of Canada (Limited)."

An Act relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

An Act to amend the law respecting Lotteries.

An Act to make provision for the taking of evidence in relation to criminal matters pending in Courts of Justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions or before foreign tribunals.

An Act further to amend "The Interpretation Act."

An Act for granting certain powers to the Canadian Electric Light Company.

An Act to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter sixty-two, and the Act forty-third Victoria, chapter seventeen, respecting the Quebec Harbor.

An Act to amend the Act thirty-eighth Victoria, chapter fifty-six, intituled: "An Act respecting the Graving Dock in the Harbor of Quebec, and authorizing the raising of a loan in respect thereof."

An Act to make further provision for deepening the Ship Channel of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec

An Act authorizing subsidies for the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling expenses of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.

An Act to provide for advances to be made by the Government of Canada to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

An Act to amend an Act of the present Session respecting Booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts or otherwise.

An Act to extend to British Columbia the Act relating to fishing by Foreign Vessels.

An Act respecting the High Court of Justice of Ontario.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the superannuation of persons employed in the Civil Service of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, chapter four, intituled: "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Department of the Interior," and to amend "The Indian Act, 1880."

An Act further to amend the Tariff of Duties of Customs.

An Act to legalize proceedings taken for the naturalization of certain Aliens in the Province of Manitoba.

An Act to continue for a limited time the Acts therein mentioned.

An Act to encourage the manufacture of Pig Iron in Canada from Canadian Ore.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Laws relating to Penitentiaries.

An Act respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors and the issue of licenses therefor.

An Act to further amend the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intituled: "An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending respectively the 30th June, 1883, and the 30th June, 1884, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service,"—to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

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

“In Her Majesty’s name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.”

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the First Session of the Fifth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I desire to thank you for the diligence and earnestness with which you have performed your duties during this protracted Session.

The large sums which the buoyant state of the Revenue has enabled you to appropriate in aid of the construction of railways and the great works of internal improvement will be carefully applied and economically expended, and must contribute in a large measure to the prosperity and progress of the Country.

The Dominion Lands Bill which embodies the results of the experience acquired during the last two years will, it is believed, greatly assist and encourage settlers now flowing in such unprecedented numbers into Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

The amendments to the laws respecting the Militia will tend to improve the discipline, training and military education of that invaluable force.

The consolidation and amendment of the Statutes relating to the management of the Customs, while protecting the honest trader against fraudulent and dishonest competitors, will free the commerce of the Country from some of the restraints imposed on it by the previously existing laws.

The readjustment of the Tariff and the reduction of duties on the raw materials used in our manufactures, together with the bounty granted on the production of pig iron, must aid in the further development of Canadian industries.

It is gratifying also to know that the financial position of the Public Treasury has enabled you to lower the pressure of taxation by more than a million of dollars.

The Bill for the regulation of shop, saloon and tavern licenses must have the effect of preventing the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors in every Province of the Dominion, and affords an efficient system for its successful operation freed from the suspicion of political bias or control; while at the same time it will not unduly interfere with the rights of those who had engaged in the trade under the authority of Legislative enactments.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I return you my thanks for the Supplies you have granted for the various public services.

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I desire to thank you for the great honor conferred on me by the presentation of a Joint Address. The Princess and I have both been profoundly touched by your words; and the Message of which you make us the bearers comes, as we personally know, from a people determined to maintain the Empire.

The severance of my official connection with Canada does not loosen the ties of affection which will ever make me desire to serve this country.

I pray that the prosperity I have seen you enjoy may continue, and that the blessing of God may at all times be yours to strengthen you in Unity and Peace.

The Speaker of the Senate then said :

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

It is His Excellency the Governor General’s will and pleasure that this Parliament be prorogued until Wednesday the Fourth day of July next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Wednesday, the Fourth day of July next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 4th day of July next.

# INDEX.

## FIRST SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1883.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company, Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb. Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H. House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negated; N.B., New Brunswick; N. W. T., North-West Territory; N. S., Nova Scotia; O. C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P. E. I., Prince Edward Island; P. O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Supl., Supplemental, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays. Names in italic and parenthesis are those of the movers.

### ABBOTT, Hon. J. C. C., *Argenteuil*

Canadian Pacific Ry. C.'s Petition for B (M. to read) 741 (vol. ii.) B. 114, 1°\*, 783; 3° m., 888; (Amt. to recom.) 889.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 38; on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) as to constitutionality, 417.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 216; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) 220.

Grand Trunk and North Shore Rys. Amalg. B. 111 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com. (Amt.) 888.

Mingan, Seignior of, Documents respecting (M. for copies\*) 659.

Montreal, Ottawa and Western Ry. Co. (B. 73, 1°\*) 150.

Petition for Private Bill, W. V. Lawrence & Co. (M. to read and receive) 139.

Private Bills Reps, from Com. (M. to extend time) 288.

### ALLEN, Mr. B., *West Grey*

Chinese Immigration into B. C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 904.

Lord's Day, Railway Traffic on, on M. for Ret., 900.

Timber on Indian Lands (Ont.) on M. for Ret., 294.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (wools and woollens) 674.

### ALLISON, Mr. W. H., *Hants*

Newspaper correspondence, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Charlton and others*) in re Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1059.

### AMYOT, Mr. G., *Bellechasse*

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 422; in Com., 557.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 124.

Census Returns, Distribution of (Ques.) 89.

Confederation Debates, Index to (Ques.) 266.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Houde*) 218.

Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 117; on Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) that Com. rise (Ques. of Order) 200.

Debates, Official Reps. of, on French Reporting Staff, (remarks) 415; on M. to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1136.

Frontenac Terrace, Quebec (M. for Ret.) 54.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 581.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, Petitions from Quebec, on M. for copies, 214; B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. 1322, 1323, 1325; on Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) 1369.

King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 179.

Lebel and Renouf, Drs., Accts. of (M. for copies\*) 40.

SUPPLY—*Militia* (Ammunition) 854; (Drill pay, &c.) 856.

*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 852.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 405.

Veterans of 1812 of Quebec (Ques.) 56.

**ARMSTRONG, Mr. J., South Middlesex**

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 570.

Loyal Orange Association Incomp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 257.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 410.

**AUGER, Mr. M., Shefford**

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 161; on M. for 3° (Amts. 6 m. h.) 215, 308, 311, 370.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 882.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1320, 1322, 1325, 1328—1330, 1331, 1334.

Letter Postage, Reduction on (Ques.) 106.

Loyal Orange Association Incomp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 257.

Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 728.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 682.

**BAIN, Mr. T., North Wentworth**

Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 726.

SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Patent Record) 836.  
*Immigration*, 851.

*Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 765.

**BAKER, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B.C.**

Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks) 785.

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 325, 906.

Immigration into B.C., including Chinese, on M. for copies of Cor., 73.

Immigration into B.C. (M. for Cor.) 776.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1327, 1346; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 40, N. 95) 1372.

Little Bear Creek, Navigation of (Ques.) 56.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com. on Res., 429, 431; on M. for 2°, 706; in Com. 708.

Negotiations with B.C., *in re* Dry Dock and Island Ry. (Ques.) 657; on Explanations (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1394.

Pilotage Acts Amt. (Ques.) 165.

Pilotage Authorities in B.C. (M. for copies of Cor.) 205.

SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c.. Overseers and Wardens) 1015, 1016; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1190.

*Ocean and River Service* (*Sir James Douglas*) 953; (Examination of Masters and Mates) 953.

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 928; suppl., 118

**BAKER, Mr. E. C.—Con.**

*Steamboat Inspection*, 1190.

Two Creeks Harbor (Ques.) 56.

**BAKER, Mr. G. B., Missisquoi**

Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res. 1311.

**BARNARD, Mr. F. J., Yale**

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 905.

Lakes Shushwac and Okanagan Canal (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 232.

**BEATY, Mr. J., jun., West Toronto**

Central Bank of Can. Incomp. (B. 16, 1°\*) 40.

Insolvents, Discharge of Past (B. 8, 1°\*) 35; M. for 2°, 118, 121.

Insolvents' Estates, Equitable Distribution of (B. 9, 1°) 35.

Loyal Orange Association Incomp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 260; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 652.

North-Western Bank Act Amt. (B. 82, 1°\*) 185.

North-Western Bank Incomp. (B. 112, 1°\*) 693.

Private Bills (Ms. to extend time) 36, 66, 88, 161.

Standing Orders Com. (prop. M. to form Joint Com.) 233; M. to send Mess to Sen.) 291.

Union Ass. Co. of Can. Act, Amt. (B. 47, 1°\*) 106.

Wood Mountain, Qu'Appelle and Prince Albert Ry. Co. Incomp. (B. 48, 1°\*) 106; Sen. Amts. (M. to disagree) 767.

**BÉCHARD, Mr. F., Iberville**

Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 309, 310.

Debates, Official Reps. of, on M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1136.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 578.

Mount Johnson, Postmaster at (Ques.) 547.

Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1338.

**BENSON, Mr. W. F., South Grenville**

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1361.

Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 208.

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on *Ways and Means*, 618.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 679.

**BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois**

Canadian Electric Light Co. (B. 105, 1°) 547; 2° m., 701.

**BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

- Hemlock Bark, U.S. duties on (Ques.) 78.  
 Ontario and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 65, 1°\*) 140.  
 Public Works Salaries of Employés charged to (M. for Stmtnt.\*) 116.  
 St. Jean, Banque de, Annual Returns (M. for copies) 66.  
 SUPPLY—*Miscellaneous* (M. Fabre's Salary and Contingencies) 1380.

**BERGIN, Mr. D., Stormont and Cornwall**

- Dominion Lands Act Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 948.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1339, 1341, 1345.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 538; in Com., 584.  
 Personal Explanations (par. in *Toronto Globe*) 709.

**BERNIER, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe**

- SUPPLY—*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) Ques., 1005.

**BLAKE, Hon. E., West Durham**

- Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 3°, 372; (Amt. to recom.) 499; in Com., 557.  
 Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks) 785.  
 Address, on the, 13.  
 Address to His Excellency on Departure, on Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1385.  
 Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 753, 1132, 1133, 1178, 1236.  
 Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to recom., 286, 306, 314.  
 Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 691.  
 Allowance on Goods required by the C.P.R. Co. (M. for Ret., 41.  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 781.  
 Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 836, 837, 840, 842, 845.  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 99; on M. for 2°, 190.  
 Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 522.  
 Booms, &c., on Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 786; in Com., 788, 935.  
 Building Societies, Permanent, B. 17 (*Mr. Williams*) on M. for 1°, 40; on M. for 2°, 124.  
 Burpee, S. G., Charges against, on M. for copies, 505.  
 Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 505.  
 Canada Central Ry. and Town of Pembroke Bonus (M. for copies of Petitions, &c.) 220.  
 Canadian Consolidated Five per Cent. Loan B. 21 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 53; on M. for 2° of B., 81; on M. for 3°, 102.  
 Canadian Electric Light Co.'s B. 105 (*Mr. Bergeron*) on M. for 2°, 701.

**BLAKE, Hon. E.—Con.**

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Reps., as to route, progress, &c., (remarks) 66, 67, 80, 81, 86.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Location and Lands (M. for Maps) 75.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Commission (M. for Stmtnt.) 41.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., North of Lake Superior and East of Current River (Ques.) 501.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Monopoly, &c. (M. for Ret.) 107.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., in Com. of Sup., 998, 999, 1137—1139, 1141, 1149; conc., 1214, 1219.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. and the North American Contracting Co., Contract between (M. for copy) 778.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 114 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for 2°, 783; on M. to recom., 889.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. (Reply to Annual Statement) 977.  
 Carriages, Duty on, in Com. on W. & M., 662.  
 Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 38; in Com., 314.  
 Cape Breton under Confederation, on M. for Stmtnt., 415.  
 Census Records, 1881, on M. for Stmtnt., 104.  
 Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 743.  
 Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1199, 1223.  
 Charitable, Philanthropic, and Provident Associations Act Amt. B. 100 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 1°, 498.  
 Chief Justiceship of Queen's Bench, Man. (M. for Ret.) 60.  
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 51 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 164.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 743, 752, 753, 1132, 1175, 1177, 1235, 1237, 1249.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 932; in Com. on Res., 933—935; in Com. on B., 1036; on M. for 3°, 1060.  
 Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 792; on M. for 2° of B., 1231; in Com., 1234.  
 Coal Lands in the N.W., Sales and Leases (M. for Ret.) 41.  
 Collection of Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1073—1079, 1250; conc., 1317.  
 Commercial Treaties (M. for Ret.) 76.  
 Committee, Select Standing, on M. to conc. in List, 36.  
 Comparative Statement of Local Freight Rates, 991.  
 Concurrence—Library (Salaries) 1114; Health Statistics, 1115; Public Buildings (Ottawa) 1116; Excise, 1120; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1120; Post Office (Mail Service, &c.) 1123; Dominion Police, 1127; Kingston Penitentiary (Grist Mill) 1125; House of Commons (Witnesses and Shorthand Reporters) 1214; Immigration 1114; Winnipeg Hospital) 1214; Claim of James Dick, 1214; Compensation to Mrs. McInnis, 1222; Fishery Bounty (Services in connection with) 1224; Canals (Capital) 1317; Militia (Purchase of Property) 1317; Collection of Revenue (Excise) 1317; Dominion Statutes Consolidation, 1387.



BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 32 (*Mr. Riopel*) on M. for 2°, 125.
- Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2° (objection) 1212; on M. for 2°, 1293; in Com., 1297, 1300, 1302—1309.
- Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead, in Com. of Sup., 1141.
- Cordage, Duty on, in Com. on W. & M., 669.
- Cottons, Printed and Dyed, in Com. on W. & M., 676.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 147, 150.
- County Judges Criminal Court B. 11 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 103.
- Credit Valley Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 50 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on Sen. Amts. (M. to disagree) 1098.
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 217; on Amt. to Amt. (Ques. of Order) 219; in Com., 261; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 309; on M. for 3°, 369.
- Criminal Cases, Procedure in, B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 87.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 88; in Com., 117; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 195; in Com. on Ques. of Order, 200; on M. that Com. rise, 201.
- Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 101; in Com. on B., 589—593.
- Customs Frauds (M. for Ret.) 42.
- Customs Seizures (M. for Stmnt.) 41.
- Culbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1159.
- Debates, Official Reps. of: on National Policy, on M. for copies, 502; on omission from, 694; on M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1134; on expunging Report on Ottawa Orange Demonstration, 1199.
- Dick, James, Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1139; conc., 1214.
- Dillon, Year's salary to, in Com. of Sup., 1237.
- Dionne, O., Services of, in Com. of Sup., 1184.
- Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. B. 85 (*Mr. Bolduc*) on M. for 2°, 903.
- Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 840.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 98; in Com., 879, 882, 887, 936; on Sen. Amts., 1310.
- Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1112, 1113, 1380.
- Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incorp. B. 49 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 373.
- Dominion Ry. Trust and Construction Co. Incorp. B. 41 (*Mr. Small*) on M. for 2°, 164.
- Dominion Statutes, Consolidation of (M. for Stmnt.) 67; in Com. of Sup., 1040; conc., 1387.
- Dominion, The, Persons entering, leaving and settling M. for Stmnt. 295.
- Drawbacks on Articles manufactured for Export, on 2° Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1390.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Dufferin Bridge, Remission of duty on Iron for, on M. for copies of Cor., 898.
- Dunn and Page, Messrs., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- Dustan, Mr., Claim of, for Remission of Duty (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 659.
- Easter Adjournment, on M. (remarks) 289.
- Electoral Franchise B. 107 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 595; on withdr. of B., 1387.
- Elections, General, Votes polled at (M. for Stmnt.) 56.
- Estimates, The (Ques.) 281.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1022; conc., 1120.
- Expiring Laws Continuation B. 133 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1335.
- Extradition Act, Canadian (M. for Ret.) 42.
- Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1374.
- Factories, Offences against Persons employed in, B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 1°, 828; on withdr. of B., 1386.
- Factory Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1197.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1010.
- Fisher, Judge, Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1236.
- Galt, Sir Alexander, Resignation of (Ques.) 266.
- General Elections, Returning Officers (M. for List) 57.
- General Elections, Votes polled at (M. for Stmnt.) 57.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1091.
- German Immigration and Naturalization, on M. for Cor., 97.
- Governor-General's Expenses to B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1191.
- Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 953.
- Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1158; conc., 1221.
- Grinding in Bond and Transport of Wheat through U.S. (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 56.
- Grist Mill, Kingston Penitentiary, on conc., 1127.
- Guns, Manufacture of, Contract for (M. for copy) 57.
- Heney, Stewart & Co, Award, in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- High Commissioner, Successor to (Ques.) 376; Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1177.
- Houde, Mr., Sessional Indemnity, in Com. of Sup., 1380.
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 846, 849, 1238; conc., 1114, 1214.
- Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret. 76.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1191, 1377.
- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 790; on Sen. Amts., 1279.
- Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for 2°, 118.
- Insolvent Traders' Assets, Distribution of, B. 99 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 1°, 368.
- Intercolonial Ry. Commission, Claims settled by, on M. for Ret., 134.
- Intercolonial Ry. Commission (M. for Ret.) 42; in Com. of Sup., 1150.

# INDEX.

## BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

Intercolonial Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1060—1064, 1076, 1150—1157, 1158, 1245; conc., 1219.

International Fishery Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1044, 1191.

Inter-provincial Trade, on M. for Sel. Com., 115; on M. for Com. to send for persons, papers, &c. 139.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on M. for copies of Petition from Quebec, 215; on M. for Sel. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 236; objection to suspension of Rule 78, and to serve on Com., 253; (M. for Ret. in respect to) 380; on B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1226; in Com., 1227; on M. for 2° of B., 1318—1331, 1339, 1341—1347, 1349, 1355, 1358, 1361, 1362; on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1365; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) 1366; neg. (Y. 46, N. 105) 1371.

Iron and Manufactures of, in Com. on W. & M., 672.

Ketchum, Mr., Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1154; conc., 1219.

King's County (P.E.I.) Election (remarks on Printing Returns) 53; on prop. M., 93; (remarks) 102; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 154; (personal stmt.) 157; on Amt. to Amt., on Ques. of Order, 175; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 824; on alteration of Return by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (Ques.) 826.

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incomp. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 371.

La Cloche and Duck Islands, Sale of (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 660.

Lakes Huron and Superior, Water Lots in Harbors, on M. for Cor., 503.

Lands, Public, of the Dominion, Acts Consolidation, B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 98; in Com., 879, 882—884, 936; on Sen. Amts. (M. to disagree) 1310.

Lands (N.W.) System of Transfer (M. for Ret.) 79.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 759, 763, 765, 835, 1133, 1380.

Letters, Undelivered (Ques.) 889.

Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. 631, 1026; in Com. of Sup., 765, 1133.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of of Sup., 1019, 1191.

Liquor Legislation and Licensed Victuallers (M. for Cor.) 80.

Loan, Canadian Consolidated Five per Cent. B. 21 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 53; on M. for 2° of B., 81; on M. for 3°, 102.

Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) remarks, 501.

Lumber, Importation of, into Man., on M. for Ret. 95.

Mackenzie, Judge, Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1132.

McLellan, Roderick, Claim to land in N.W.T. (M. for Cor.) 778.

## BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 952, 953.

Mann, C. H., Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1157.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com. on Res., 430; in Com., 708.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 544—546, 583, 729—732.

Militia Blankets, Tenders, &c., for purchase of (M. for copies) 230.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 859, 1239—1241; conc., 1316.

Ministerial Explanations, on the, 33.

Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1038—1042, 1044, 1191—1193, 1195—1197, 1378—1381; conc., 1128, 1387.

Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses, B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 316; on M. to place on Orders, 332.

Naturalization of Aliens in Man. B. 140 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1387, on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) neg., 1387.

Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 375; on M. for 3°, 1095, 1097.

Oblats Fathers Incomp. B. 19 (*Mr. Royal*) in Com., 244; (Amt. to recom.) 368.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 953.

O'Connor, Hon. John, Sums paid (M. for Stmt.) 56.

Order of Business (remarks) 1391.

Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 1197.

Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 753—756, 1237.

Penitentiaries, Laws Consolidation B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1038; in Com., 1309; on M. to recom., 1387.

Permanent Building Societies B. 17 (*Mr. Williams*) on M. for 1°, 40; on M. for 2°, 124.

Personal allusions in Newspapers (remarks) 1363.

Petition for Private Bill (C. P. Mattock) on M. to read and receive, 138.

Phair vs. Venning, in Com. of Sup., 1193.

Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 710—716.

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1197; conc., 1123.

Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 164.

Prince Albert and N.W.T. Lands, Claims of Inhabitants (M. for Cor.) 130.

Prince Edward Island Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1064.

Private Bills, on Ms. to extend time, 36, 88.

Promissory Notes, &c., Repeal of Duty Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com. 427.

Public Business, State of (remarks) 55, 106, 1235.

Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 304.

Public Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 98; in Com., 879, 882—884, 936; on Sen. Amts. (M. to disagree) 1310.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 913, 923, 931, 1180—1184, 1247.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Public Works, Salaries charged against (M. for Ret.) 86.
- Public Works, Telegraphic Expenditure charged to (M. for Stmnt.) 84.
- Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1238.
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com on Res., 1214.
- Queddy River Driving and Boom Co., on M. to receive Petition, 186.
- Queen's Bench (Man.) Chief Justiceship (M. for Ret.) 60.
- Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co. Incorp. B. 66 (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. for Com., 942.
- Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 998, 999, 1060—1063, 1070—1073, 1137—1141, 1149, 1150, 1154, 1157—1160, 1245; conc., 1214, 1219, 1221.
- Railway Subsidies, Applications for, on M. for Stmnt. (Amt.) 301.
- Railway Trust and Construction Co. B. 141 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1336.
- Rathbun, H. B., and Sons Incorp. B. 26 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on M. for 2°, 77.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- Returning Officers in General Elections (M. for List) 57.
- Richards, S., Allowance to, in Com. of Sup., 1878.
- Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1073.
- Rolling Stock transferred by Purcell & Co., in Com. of Sup., 1149; conc., 1219.
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 859.
- Russell vs. The Queen (M. for copies of Judgment) 66.
- St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. B. 138 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 1199; in Com., 1334; on M. for 3° of B. (Amt.) 1363.
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1071.
- Sales and Leases of Land in the N.W. (M. for Ret.) 41.
- Salaries charged against Pub. Works (M. for Ret.) 86.
- Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., on Res., 1311, 1315.
- Saskatchewan University Incorp. B. 18 (*Mr. Williams*) in Com., 244; (Amt. to recom.) 261.
- Select Standing Committees, on M. to conc. in Lists, 36.
- Senate, Reform in the, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 759.
- Schreiber, Mr., Allowance to, in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 957, 1190.
- Shanly, Frank, Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- Shipbuilding Trade of Que., in Com. on W. & M., 668.
- Speaker, Election of, on M., 1.
- Standing Orders Com., on prop. M. to form Joint Com., 233; on prop. M. to send Mess. to Sen., 291.
- Standing Orders, on Res., 742.
- Statistics, Health and Agricultural, in Com. of Sup., 842—845.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 137 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1257, 1269; in Com., 1284—1290; B. in Com., 1332; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1333.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

Superannuation Fund (M. for Ret.) 301.

## SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice*, 753; suppl. (Widow of Judge Mackenzie) 1132, (Woodward vs. Russell) 1133, (S. Richards, allowance to) 1178, (Widow of Judge Fisher) 1236.
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Archives, care of, &c.) 836; (Census) 837; (Dominion Exhibition) 840; (Health Statistics) 842; (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 845.
- Canals—Capital*: Williamsburg (Entrance and Lock at Rapide du Plat Canal) 1070, (Compensation for Land taken for Rapide du Plat Canal) 1159; St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1071; Murray, 1071; Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c., between Lakefield and Balsam Lake) 1071; Tay (Construction of Works) 1072; Grenville (Honey, Stewart & Co., Award) 1158, conc., 1221; Culbute (to complete) 1159; Welland (Compensation to Messrs. Dunn and Page) 1150. *Income*: Trent Valley (Survey of Nav.) 1072; Rideau (Toll Collector's Office) 1073.
- Charges of Management*, 743.
- Charges on Revenue*: Customs, 1198; Excise (H. H. Grant, difference of Salary) 1198; (J. Griffith, difference required to increase his salary) 1198; Public Works (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1199. P.E.I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1223.)
- Civil Government* (Customs) 1131; (Governor General Secretary's Office) 743, suppl., 1235; (Privy Council) 743, suppl., 1249; (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) 744; (Interior) 745, suppl., 1175, 1237; (Inland Revenue) 747, suppl., 1132; (Agriculture) 748, suppl., 1132; (Public Works) 749; (Railways and Canals) 1235; (Post Office and Finance Depts., Contingencies) 752; (Civil Service Examiners) 753; (High Commissioner, Contingencies) 1177.
- Collection of Revenues*: Repairs and Working Expenses (Intercolonial Ry.) 1073—1076; (Salaries, &c., Canal Officers) 1078; Maintenance and Repairs Harbors and Slides) 1078; (Telegraph Lines, Man. and N. W. T.) 1079; Excise, 1250, conc., 1317.
- Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys) 1112. *Income* (Outside Service) 1113; (Land Guides) 1380.
- Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1022; conc., 1120.
- Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1010.
- Geological Survey*, 1091.
- Immigration*, 846, 849; conc., 1114, 1214; suppl., 1238.
- Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 1191; (N.W.T.: Industrial Schools) 1387.
- Legislation* (Salaries, &c., Senate) 759; House of Commons (Salaries &c.) 763, (Publishing Debates) 763, (Grant to Library) 765, suppl., 1133, (Reports for Supreme Court) 835, (Sessional Indemnity, Mr. Houde) 1380.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1019; (Surveys, Lake Huron and Superior) 1191.

*Mail Subsidies* (West Indies and Brazil) 952; (France and Quebec) 952; (Cape Canso and Port Hood) 952; (Canada and Germany) 953.

*Militia* (Royal Military College) 859; (Purchase of Property, Artillery, Battery and Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1239—1241; conc., 1316.

*Miscellaneous* (*Canada Gazette*) 1038; (N.W.T., Expenses of Government) 1039; (Dominion Statutes Consolidation) 1040, conc., 1387; (Legal Expenses, John Burgess) 1192; (Factory Commission) 1197; (N.W. Mounted Police, Compensation to Members) 1041; (Phair vs. Venning, Costs and Damages) 1193; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1042, 1044; (Extra Clerks, Service of) 1196; (Governor General's Expenses to B.C.) 1191; (International Fishery Exhibition) 1044, suppl., 1191; (Parliamentary Companion) 1197; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 1044; (Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings) 1195; (Library, Department of Justice) 1044; (Retiring allowances to Dominion Policemen) 1192; (Cases decided on B.N.A. Act) 1045, conc., 1128; (Widow of Frank Shanly) 1378; (Mr. Fabre's Salary and Contingencies) 1378; (Costs of litigated matters) 1381; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1381.

*Ocean and River Service* (Government Steamers) 953.

*Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 753, conc., 1127, suppl. (Year's salary to J. Dillon) 1237; (St. Vincent de Paul) 754; (Dorchester) 755; (Man.) 756; (B.C.) 756.

*Post Office* (Mail Service, &c.) 1079; suppl., 1197; conc., 1123.

*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 908; suppl., 1180. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 909; (N.B.) 910; (Que.) 911, suppl., 1182; (Ont.) 912; (Man.) 912; (N.W.T.) 913; (Repairs, &c.) 913; suppl. 1183. *Harbors and Rivers* (N.S.) 923; (N.B.) 1381; (Ont.) 1183; (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1247; (Miscellaneous) 931; (O. Dionne, Services of) 1184.

*Quarantine* (Sydney, N.S.) 1238.

*Railways—Capital*: C. P. R. (Canada Central Subsidy) 998; Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 999; (British Columbia) 999; (Canadian Pacific Subsidy) 999; (Georgian Bay Branch) 1137; (West of Red River) 1138; (Dawson Route: Claim of James Dick) 1139, conc., 1214; (Contract 15: Joseph Whitehead) 1141; (Rolling Stock transferred by Purcell & Co.) 1149, conc., 1219. Intercolonial Ry. (Increased Accommodation at St. John) 1060; (Halifax Extension) 1061; Rolling Stock, 1061, 1062; (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1063, suppl., 1245; (Construction Account, old,

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

Commission, &c.) 1150; (Refund to Mr. Ketchum) 1154, conc., 1219; (Legal Expenses in re Western Counties Ry.) 1257; (Claim of C. H. Mann) 1157; (Mr. Walsh, damage to property) 1158; (Cape Traverse Ry., P.E.I.) 1064. General (Surveys and Inspections) 1065; (Subsidy, Bridge over Red River) 1158; (Allowance to Mr. Schreiber) 1158; (Railway Statistics) 1065; (Town of Pembroke Bonus) 1065—1067.

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observations); 957; suppl., 1190.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1046; conc., 1120.

Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1390.

Supreme Court Jurisdiction B. 100 (*Mr. Landry*) on M. for 1°, 383.

System of Transfer of Lands in N.W. (M. for Cor.) 79.

Tariff Alterations (M. for Ret.) 547; (remarks) 548.

Tariff Resolutions, specific and *ad val.* Duties (M. for Stmt. of values\*) 556.

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1072.

Telegraphic Expenditure charged against Pub. Works (M. for Stmt.) 84.

Three Rivers Harbor and Harbor Master B. 121 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1038.

Timber and Lumber Tolls and Dues B. 126 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1037; in Com. on B., 1207—1209.

Timber Licenses (M. for Ret.) 61.

Titles to Land, Transfer of, B. 97 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 573.

Tobacco and Snuff, in Com. on W. & M., 673.

Toronto Harbor and Esplanade B. 106 (*Mr. Small*) on M. for 2°, 709.

Town of Pembroke Bonus, in Com. of Sup., 1065—1067.

Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1072.

Troops, withdrawal of, from Halifax (M. for Despatches, &c.) 502.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (acetic acid) 661; (sulphuric acid, &c.) 662; (playing cards) 662; (printed music) 662; (braces or suspenders) 662; (carriages) 662; (railway cars, &c.) 662; (children's carriages) 663; (cotton duck) 663—665; (cordage) 668; (glazed and unglazed pipes) 671; (furniture) 681; (iron, and manufactures of) 672; (carbolic oil, &c.) 673; (lubricating oil) 673; (union paper collar cloth) 673; (tobacco and snuff) 673; (wools and woolsens) 675; (printed and dyed cottons) 676; (agricultural implements) 691; (coal dust) 692; (india rubber clothing) 692; (pumps, iron, &c.) 692; on conc. (books) 732.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1047; conc., 1120.

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1160.

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1070, 1159.

- BLAKE, Hon. E.—Con.**  
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 48  
 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. to disagree with Sen. Amts., 767.  
 Woodward vs. Russell, in Com. of Sup., 1133.  
 Woods and Woollens, in Com. on W. & M., 676.
- BLANCHET, Hon. J. G., Lévis**  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*)  
 on M. for 3°, 369.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election: Rep. of Com. on  
 Priv. and Elec. (M. to conc. in) 793; (Res.) summon-  
 ing Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend and amend  
 Return, 826.  
 Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B.  
 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 163.
- BLONDEAU, Mr. C. B., Kamouraska**  
 Murray Bay and River Ouelle Winter Service (M. for  
 Cor.) 106.
- BOLDUC, Mr. J., Beauce**  
 Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. (B. 85, 1°) 233;  
 2° m., 903; in Com., 1034.  
 Hemlock Bark, Export Duty on (Ques.) 1025.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*)  
 208; (Ques.) 1025.
- BOSSÉ, Mr. J. G., Centre Quebec**  
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7  
 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. to  
 receive Rep. of Com., 196.  
 Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Wit-  
 nesses, B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com.,  
 317.  
 Quebec and James Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 54, 1°\*)  
 129.  
 Quebec Fire Ins. Co. Capital Stock Reduction (B. 23,  
 1°\*) 56.
- BOURASSA, Mr. F., St. Johns, Q.**  
 Isle Aux Noix and St. Johns Barracks (Ques.) 1025;  
 (M. for Reps. of Engineers\*) 1034.  
 Pensions to Militiamen of 1812 (M. for Stmnts.\*) 55.  
 Scottsville Postmastership (M. for Ret \*) 52.
- BOURBEAU, Mr. D. O., Drummond and Arthabaska**  
 Agricultural Fertilizers, on M. for Sel. Com., 207.  
 Canadian Tobacco Regulations (Ques.) 41.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*)  
 on prop. Res. 576; in Com. on B., 917, 919.  
 Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M.  
 for 2°, 122.  
 Lord's Day, Railway Traffic on, on M. for Ret., 902.  
 Reciprocity with the United States, on M. for Cor., 272.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*)  
 212.  
 SUPPLY—*Militia* (Royal Military College) 859.
- BOWELL, Hon. Mr., North Hastings**  
 Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 688.
- BOWELL, Hon. Mr.—Con.**  
 Alterations in Tariff, on M. for Res. 547, 548.  
 Amos Rowe and the Govt., Relations between, on M.  
 for Cor., 1029.  
 Brandon as a Port of Entry (Ans.) 166.  
 Burgess, John, Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1192.  
 Canada at International Fishery Exhibition (Telegram  
 read) 1207.  
 Cape Race Light Dues, in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
 Carriages, in Com. on W. & M., 662.  
 Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1198; conc.,  
 1226.  
 Children's Carriages, Importation of, on M. for Ret.  
 777.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 747, 1131.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on  
 M. for 2°, 932; in Com. on Res., 935.  
 Concurrence—Fishery Overseers and Wardens, 1116;  
 Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1116; Excise, 1120;  
 Dominion Police, 1126; Kingston Penitentiary (Grist  
 Mill) 1127; Cases decided on B.N.A. Act, 1128;  
 Fishery Bounty, Services in connection with, 1224—  
 1226; Customs (Man.) 1226.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 Cottons, Printed and Dyed, in Com. on W. & M., 678.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*)  
 on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) 219.  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1000—1009.  
 Customs Acts Consolidation (B. 34, Res.) 100; in Com.  
 101; 1°\* of B., 102; in Com., 587—593, 694—702;  
 Sen. Amts. 1037.  
 Customs Frauds, on M. for Ret., 42.  
 Customs Laws, Modification of, on M. for Cor., &c.,  
 508.  
 Customs Seizures, on M. for Ret., 41.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of (M. for Sel. Com.) 28; on  
 omission, 693; in Com. of Sup., 746.  
 Departmental Reps., Compilation of, on Prop. Res.  
 (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 299.  
 Dionne, O., Services of, in Com. of Sup., 1186.  
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A.*  
*Macdonald*) in Com., 885.  
 Drawbacks on Articles Manufactured for Export, on M.  
 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. of Sup., 1130; on 2°  
 Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1388—1390.  
 Dufferin Bridge, Remission of Duties on Iron for, on  
 M. for copies of Cor., 898.  
 Examination of Masters and Mates, in Com. of Sup.,  
 952.  
 Fishery Bounty Augmentation (Ans.) 1025.  
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1014—1019, 1187—  
 1190; conc., 1117, 1224.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) M. for Com.,  
 1200; in Com., 1204; Sen. Amts., 1384.  
 Fishing by Foreign Vessels Extension to B.C. Act (B.  
 143, 1°) 1363.  
 Government Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 953.

**BOWELL, Hon. Mr.—Con.**

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1249.  
 Inspection of Steamers (Ans.) 1025.  
 Insuring Goods in Bonded Warehouses (Ans.) 204.  
 International Fisheries Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1191;  
 Canada at (Telegram read) 1207.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1361.  
 Iron, and Manufactures of, in Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 Jacques, James H., Appointment of (Ans.) 289; on M. for Cor., 507.  
 Kearney, Charles, Appointment of, on M. for Cor., 507.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 764.  
 Life-boats, Purchase of, in Com. of Sup., 954, 1249.  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 956, 957, 1019, 1116, 1191.  
 Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, in Com. of Sup., 1019.  
 Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 259.  
 Lubricating Oils, in Com. of W. & M., 673.  
 Lumber, Importation of, into Man., on M. for Ret., 95.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1039, 1044, 1045, 1191—1193, 1197; conc., 1128.  
 Miscellaneous Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1039.  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 953—956, 1249.  
 Phair vs. Venning, in Com. of Sup., 1193.  
 Portage La Prairie as a Customs Outport (Ans.) 166.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1186, 1241.  
 Quebec Harbor Police (Ans.) 890.  
 Richibucto River, Obstructions in (Ans.) 1025.  
 Robertson vs. The Queen, in Com. of Sup., 1197.  
 Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 957, 1190.  
 Selkirk as a Port of Entry (Ans.) 315.  
 Spirituous Liquors, Importation of (Ans.) 502.  
 Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1190.  
 SUPPLY—Charges on Revenue (Customs, Man.) 1198; conc., 1226.  
*Civil Government* (Customs) 747, 1131.  
*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1000—1009.  
*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1010, 1014—1019, conc., 1117; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1187—1190, conc., 1224.  
*Indians* (N.B.) 1249.  
*Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 764.  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c.) 956; (Signal Stations) 957; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1019, conc., 1116; (Cape Race Light Dues, &c.) 1191.  
*Miscellaneous* (Phair vs. Venning, Costs and Damages) 1193; (Miscellaneous Printing) 1039; (International Fisheries Exhibition) 1191; (Legal Expenses, John Burgess) 1192; (Surveys of Lakes Huron and Superior) 1044; (Cases decided on B.N.A. Act) 1045, conc., 1128; (Robertson vs. The Queen) 1197.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Government Steamers)

**BOWELL, Hon. Mr.—Con.**

SUPPLY—Con.  
 953 (Examination of Masters and Mates) 953; (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.) 954, suppl., 1249; (Triennial List of Shipping) 956.  
*Public Works—Income*: Miscellaneous (O. Dionne, Services of) 1186; Buildings (P.E.I.) 1241.  
*Scientific Institutions* (Observatories and Meteorological Observations) 957; suppl., 1190.  
*Steamboat Inspection*, 1190.  
*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1049, 1056.  
 Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 2°, 1388—1390.  
 Sydenham River, Navigation of (Ans.) 1025.  
 Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 547, 548.  
 Tea, Differential Duty on (Ans.) 412.  
 Three Rivers Harbor and Harbor Master (B. 121, 1°) 999; 2° m., 1038.  
 Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 36.  
 Triennial List of Shipping, in Com. of Sup., 266.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (carriages) 662; (railway cars, &c.) 663; (children's carriages) 663; (cotton duck) 664, 666; (iron and manufactures of) 672; (carbolic oil, &c.) 673; (lubricating oils) 673; (printed and dyed cottons) 678; (agricultural implements) 688.  
 Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1050.  
 Westhaver's Point, Lighthouse at, on M. for Cor., 781.

**BRECKEN, Mr. F. DE ST. C., Queen's, P.E.I.**

Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks) 785.  
 Cape Breton under Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 414.  
 Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1076.  
 Compensation for Injuries, P.E.I. Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1166.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on M. for 3°, 369.  
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1013, 1188.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1324, 1325; on Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) 1367.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 153; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 825.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1382.  
 P. E. I. and Mainland Mail Service (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1376.  
 Prorogation, Congratulations, &c. (remarks) 1397.  
 Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1382.  
 Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1312.  
 Signal Stations at North Cape and East Point (M. for Ret.) 1026.

**BROKEN, Mr. F. DE St. C.—Con.**

Steam Communication P.E.I. and Mainland (M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com.) 1027.

SUPPLY—*Charges on Revenue*: P.E.I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1166.

*Collection of Revenues*: Repairs and Working Expenses (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1076.

*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1013; Services in connection with Bounty) 1188.

*Miscellaneous* (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1382.

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 615.

**BRYSON, Mr. J., Pontiac**

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1275.

SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1247.

Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co. Incorp. B. 66 (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. for Com., 941.

**BURNS, Mr. K. F., Gloucester**

Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 789.

Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 256; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 646.

Reciprocal Trade with Brazil, &c., on M. for Cor., 772.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1265.

SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1017; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1187.

*Immigration*, 847.

*Railways—Capital*: C.P.R. (Contract 15 and Joseph Whitehead) 1145.

*Tariff Alterations*, on M. for Ret., 551.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 476; in Com on Res. 2 (cordage) 668.

**BURPEE, Mr. C. Sunbury**

Immigrant Agents, Temporary (M. for Ret.) 86.

Immigration into Canada, 1882 (M. for Stmt.) 80.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1323, 1326.

**BURPEE, Hon. I., St. John, N.B., (City and County)**

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 947.

Coal entered Ex-Warehouse (M. for Ret.\*) 80.

Coal, Export of, from N.S. (M. for Ret.) 76.

Consolidated Fund Receipts and Expenditure (M. for Ret.) 76.

Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res. 101; in Com. on B., 588, 699—702.

Dominion Lands, Receipts from Sales (M. for Ret.) 76.

Grain, Flour and Coal Duty, Abolition of (M. for Ret.\*) 80.

Imports and Exports (M. for Ret.) 76.

**BURPEE, Hon. I.—Con.**

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1249.

Intercolonial Ry. Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmt.) 76.

Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock Purchases (M. for Ret.) 76.

Queddy River Driving and Boom Co., on M. to receive Petition, 185.

Shipbuilding Materials, Drawbacks on (M. for Ret.) 76.

Shipping Materials, Drawbacks on (M. for Ret.) 76.

St. John River Ry. Bridge (M. for Ret.\*) 80.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1206.

Sugar, Drawbacks on (M. for Ret.\*) 80.

Superannuation of Civil Servants, in Com. on Res., 793.

SUPPLY—*Civil Government* (Finance and Treasury Board) 747; (Customs) 747.

*Indians* (N.B.) 1249.

*Tariff Alterations*, on M. for Ret., 549.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (cordage) 668.

**CAMERON, Mr. HECTOR, North Victoria**

Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 223, 224; (M. to recom.) 286, 306.

Atlantic, Pacific and Peace River Telegraph Co. Incorp. (B. 62, 1°) 140.

Bayfield Harbor, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M, for copies, 774.

Building Societies, Permanent, Act Amt. B. 17 (*Mr. Williams*) on M. for 2°, 125.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 38.

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 51, 1°\*) 106; 2° m., 164; on 2°, 244.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1298, 1303, 1305, 1307.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. Act Amt. (B. 50, 1°\*) 106; 2° m., 164; Sen. Amts., 1098.

Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incorp. (B. 49, 1°\*) 106; in Com., 373; Sen. Amts., 804.

Grand Trunk and North Shore Rys. Amalg. B. 113 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com., 803.

Great North-Western Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 74, 1°\*) 150.

Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beatty*) on M. for 2°, 120.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1320, 1326, 1328—1330, 1339, 1342, 1343, 1348, 1357, 1359, 1360, 1362; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) carried, 1372.

King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 166; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 821.

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 372.

CAMERON, MR. HECTOR.—*Con.*

- Library of Parliament, on M. (*Mr. Colby*) to conc. in Joint Coms. Rep., 631.  
 Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 255.  
 Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 803; 3° m., 1095, 1096.  
 Pacific and Peace River Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 64, 1°\*) 140.  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 716.  
 Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 164.  
 Promissory Notes, &c., Repeal of Duty Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 427.  
 Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co. Incorp. (B. 72, 1°\*) 150.  
 Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1313.  
 Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamboat Co. and Nelson Valley Ry. and Transportation Co. Amalg. (B. 88, 1°\*) 261.

CAMERON, MR. HUGH, *Inverness*

- Cape Breton under Confederation (M. for Stmt. of Expenditure on Railways, Canals, &c., in all the Provinces, area and population, &c.) 412.  
 Geological Reps. of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond Counties (M. for copies) 779.  
 Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1272.  
 SUPPLY—*P. blic Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 923.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed Cotton) 681.

CAMERON, MR. M. C., *West Huron*

- Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 224; on M. to recom., 283, 306.  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 781.  
 Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 513.  
 Campbellton and Gaspé Steam Service, on M. for Cor., 505.  
*Charybdis*, Disposal of, (M. for Cor.) 135.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 746, 748.  
 Colonization Lands (M. for Ret.) 55.  
 County Judges' Criminal Court B. 11 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 103.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 145.  
 Criminal Law Amt., Offences against the Person (B. 7, 1°\*) 32; M. for 2°, 87; in Com. 116; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 195; in Com., on M. (*Mr. Rykert*) that Com. rise, 200; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 201.

CAMERON, MR. M. C.—*Con.*

- Expenses of Members of the Govt. in England, on M. for Ret., 381.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election (M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend Hs. with Ret.) 40; Clerk in attendance, 52; (Res.) 89; (Ques.) 116, 140; on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 800; (Amt. to Amt.) 806.  
 Maritime Court of Ont. (M. for Ret.) 105.  
 Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses (B. 6, 1°\*) 32; 2° and Ref. to Sel. Com., 87; rep. from Sel. Com. with Amts., 140; M. for Com., 315; M. to place on Orders, 331.  
 Port Albert Harbor Improvements (M. for Ret.) 376.  
 Privileges and Elections Com., on Rep. of (remarks) 693.  
 Regina as the Capital of the N.W., on M. for O.C., 278.  
 SUPPLY—*Civil Government* (Interior) 745; (Indian Affairs) 746; (Marine and Fisheries) 748.  
 Timber Licenses, on M. for Ref., 229.

CAMPBELL, MR. C. J., *Victoria, N.S.*

- Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 612.

CARLING, HON. J., *London*

- Burpee, S. G., Postmaster at Florenceville, Charges against, on M. for copies, 505.  
 Farnham and Guillaume Mail Service (Ans.) 125.  
 Flesherton and Vandeleur Mail Service (Ans.) 547.  
 Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Bi-daily Mail Service (Ans.) 781.  
 Letter Postage, Reduction on (Ans.) 106.  
 Letters, Undelivered (Ans.) 889.  
 Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 952.  
 Money Orders and the Postal Union (Ans.) 106.  
 Mount Forest and Glen Eden Mail Service (Ans.) 547.  
 Mount Johnson, Iberville Co., Postmaster at (Ans.) 547.  
 Newspapers, Free Delivery of (Ans.) 890.  
 Picton and Trenton Mail Service (Ans.) 502.  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1081—1083, 1197.  
 Post Office Act (1875) Amt. (B. 92, 1°\*) 283; 2° m., 1037.  
 Report of Postmaster General (presented) 106.  
 SUPPLY—*Mail Subsidies* (Lakes Huron and Superior) 952.  
*Post Office* (Mail Service, &c.) 1079, 1081—1083; suppl., 1197.

CABON, HON. J. P. R. A., *Quebec County*

- "A" and "B" Batteries, Vacant Commissions in (Ans.) 204.  
 Annual Camps, on 3° of B. 31 (Ans.) 834.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 748.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1036.



CARON, Hon. J. P. R. A.—*Con.*

- Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incorp. B. 49  
(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 374.  
Drill Shed at Iona, Contract for, on M. for copy, 133.  
Great Guns, Manufacture of, on M. for copy of Contract, 57.  
Militia Acts Amt. (B. 31, 1°) 67; 2° m., 526, 540; in Com., 544, 546, 583—587, 729—732: adjd. deb., on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) to M. for 3°, 830; on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 831.  
Militia Blankets, Tenders, &c., for purchase of, on M. for copies, 231.  
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 853—856, 858, 860, 1239—1241.  
Militia, Pay of Officers and Men (prop. Res.) 693; in Com. on Res., 721—728; embodied as sec. 43 in B. 31.

Militia Report (presented) 36.

Peters, Major, Charges against, on M. for Cor., 781.

Richmond Field Battery, Guns for, on M. for Ret. 205.

SUPPLY—*Civil Government* (Post Office) 748.

*Militia* (Military Branch and District Staff Salaries) 853. (Ammunition, &c.) 853, suppl., 1240; (Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, &c.) 856; (Drill Sheds) 858; (Care of Military properties) 858; Royal Military College) 858, suppl., 1240; ("A" and "B" Batteries) 860; (Artillerymen at Shoeburyness) 860; (Purchase of Property, Artillery Battery, and Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1239—1241.

*Pensions* (Veterans of 1812) 852; (Compensation in lieu of Land) 853.

Veterans of 1812 of Quebec (Ans.) 56.

Veterans of 1812-15, or Widows of, Pensions to (Ans.) 657.

CASEY, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin*

Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 224.

Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 191.

Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 519.

Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1168.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 932.

Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1223; in Com., 1234.

Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 51.

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) on M. for Com., 565.

Debates, Official Reps. of, on M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1136.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 874, 880, 888.

Dominion, The, Persons entering, leaving and settling, on M. for Stmt., 296.

CASEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

Drill Shed at Iona, Contract for (M. for copy) 133.

Dufferin Bridge, Remission of Duty on Iron for (M. for copies of Cor.) 897.

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1089.

Grenville and Carrillon Canal Contract, Arbitrator's Award on Claim (M. for copy\*) 903.

Hudson's Straits, Exploration of (Ques.) 1137.

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1108.

Insolvents, Discharge of Past, on M. for 2°, 121.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on M. for copies of Petitions from Quebec, 214; B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1326, 1328.

Jewish Refugees from Russia, Immigration of (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 659.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 763, 766, 1131.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 855—859.

Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1043, 1196, 1197.

Morpeth Harbor Improvements (M. for copies of Cor.) 556.

North-West Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1110.

Pembina Branch, Gravel Claim (M. for copies of Cor.) 902, 1034\*.

Prisoners, Removal of, to Penitentiaries (M. for Cor.) 133.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 913, 914, 927, 930, 1243, 1247.

Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co., on M. for Ret., 85.

Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1141, 1144, 1149.

Regina as the Capital of the N.W. (M. for O.C., &c.) 273, 280.

Returning Officers in General Elections, on M. for List, 58.

Returns, bringing down, on M. for Ret. of Timber Licenses, 62.

Salaries of Sessional Messengers (remarks) 1386.

Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1285.

SUPPLY—*Charges on Revenue*: P.E.I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1168.

*Geological Survey*, 1089.

*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 1108.

*Legislation* (Salaries, &c., House of Commons) 763; (Grant to Library) 766, suppl., 1133.

*Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 854; Drill Instruction and Drill Pay) 955; (Contingencies, &c.) 857; (Royal Military College) 859.

*Miscellaneous* (Publications of Proceedings of Royal Society) 1196; (Parliamentary Companion) 1197; Mounted Police Barracks) 1043.

*North-West Mounted Police*, 1110.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 913, suppl., 1243; (Repairs, &c.) 914. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 927, suppl., 1247. Telegraphs, 930.

*Railways - Capital*: C.P.R. (Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead) 1144, 1149; (Dawson Route, Claim of James Dick) 1141.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1046.

CASEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

- Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 555.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 3 (agricultural implements) 685.  
 Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1046.

CASGRAIN, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet*

- Address to His Ex. on Departure, on Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1385.  
 Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 685.  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts. Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 840.  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 190; in Com., 282.  
 Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 789.  
 Building Societies, Permanent Act, Amt. B. 17 (*Mr. Williams*) on M. for 3°, 125.  
 Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com. 202; on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) as to constitutionality, 426.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 744.  
 Civil Service Employés in Montreal, on M. for Ret., 78.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1074.  
 Concurrence—Intercolonial Railway (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1121; Adulteration of Food, 1125; Dominion Police, 1126.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 145.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amts. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 216, 312.  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1004.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of (attention of Hs. called to an omission) 693; on M. to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1135.  
 Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1112.  
 Elgin Station Depot (Ques.) 40.  
 Fabae, Hon. H., Appointment of (M. for Cor.) 84; Salary of (Ques.) 1136.  
*Genii*, British Ship (M. for Cor. between Master and Depts.) 380.  
 Hébert, Hubert, Case of (Ques.) 78, 1169.  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1105.  
 Interest in Canada, to fix the Rate of, B. 77 (*Mr. Catudal*) to place on Order Paper for 2°, 957.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sel. Com. (Ques. of Order) 234; (objection to serve on Sel. Com.) 254; B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. 1323.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on alteration of Ret. by Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 826.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 766.  
 Lieutenant Governors, Salaries of, in Com. of Sup., 1242.  
 Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 643.  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 855.

CASGRAIN, Mr. P. B.—*Con.*

- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1184, 1379.  
 Morin, Lucien, Official Arbitrators Award to (Ques.) 220.  
 North-West Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1111.  
 Orange Demonstration at Ottawa, or expunging Rep. from Debates, 1199.  
 Parliament, Opening of, Formal Ceremonies at (remarks) 4.  
 Pelletier and others, Claims of (Ques.) 1025.  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1083.  
 Procedure of the House, Recording Votes (remarks) 827.  
 Private Bills, on M. to extend time, 88.  
 Public Contracts, Funds in relation to (B. 5, 1°) 32; M. for 2°, 93; ref. to Sel. Com., 102; 3° m., 302.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 925, 1183, 1242.  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1145, 1156, 1157.  
 Returning Officers in General Elections, on M. for List 58.  
 Royal Military Col. Graduates as D.L.S. (B. 33, 1°\*) 77; on withdr. of B., 1034.  
 Sailors, Release of Imprisoned, at Quebec (M. for copies of Cor.) 380.  
 Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1312.  
 Secretary of State (Ques.) 951.  
 St. Jean Port Joli Wharf (Ques.) 41, 315; (M. for Rets.) 64, 377.  
 Standing Orders, on Res., 741 (vol. ii.)  
 SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census) 840.  
*Civil Government* (Justice) 744.  
*Collection of Revenues*:—Repairs and Working Expenses (Intercolonial Ry.) Ques., 1074.  
*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1000, 1004.  
*Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys) 1112.  
*Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 1105.  
*Legislation* (Grant to Library) 766.  
*Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 854.  
*Miscellaneous* (O. Dionne, for Services) 1184; (Mr. Fabre's Salary and Contingencies) 1379.  
 North-West Mounted Police, 1111.  
 Post Office (Mail Service, &c.) 1083.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Man.) 1242; Harbors and Rivers (Ques.) 925, suppl., 1183.  
*Railways—Capital*: C.P.R. (Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead) 1145; Intercol. Ry. (Land and other claims) 1156; (Rivière du Loup Branch) 1157.

CATUDAL, Mr. M., *Napierville*

- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 308.  
 Interest in Canada, to fix the Rate of (B. 77, 1°\*) 150.

CHAPLEAU, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne*

- Introduced, 1317.

CHARLTON, Mr. J., *North Norfolk*

- Adultery, Seduction, &c. (B. 13, 1°) 38; 2° m., 123;  
M. for Com., 220; in Com., 223; M. to recom., 283;  
in Com., 286; on M. to recom., 306; in Com., 313.
- Agreements between Companies and Govt. respecting  
Colonization Grants (M. for Ret.\*) 55.
- Arts, Agriculture, &c. in Com. of Sup., 837.
- Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 282.
- Cereals, Duties and Imports, on M. for Stmt., 775.
- Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 745, 747, 748, 752.
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1077.
- Colonization Lands (M. for Ret.\*) 55; (remarks on  
delay) 557.
- Concurrence—Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1117.
- Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead, in Com. of Sup.,  
1146.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. Mc-  
Carthy*) on M. for 2°, 148.
- Debates, Official Reps. of, in Com. of Sup., 764.
- Departmental Reps., Compilation of, on prop. Res. (*Mr.  
Ross, Middlesex*) 300.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A.  
Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 864; in Com., 873—  
888, 936; on M. for 3°, 936; (Amt.) 940, 950.
- Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1111, 1113.
- English Artists vs. Canadian, in Com. of Sup., 762.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1022, 1023.
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1013.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1092.
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 846.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1101, 1102, 1105—1110.
- James' Bay Expedition (Ques.) 1136.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 761, 764, 766.
- Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, conc., 1117.
- Lumber, Importation of, into Man., on M. for Ret., 95.
- Manitoba Indian Agency (M. for Rep., &c.) 902.
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1041.
- North-West Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1110.
- Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard  
Tilley*) 717, 721.
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1082.
- Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. (B.  
39, 1°\*) 89; 2° m., 162; M. to withdw., 288.
- Public Lands Surveyed in the N.W. (M. for Ret.\*) 55.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 912, 913.
- Question of Privilege, on Correspondence, Toronto  
*Mail, in re Increased Indemnity* 1057.
- Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1146.
- Regulations concerning Public Lands (M. for Ret.\*) 55.
- Sales of Public Lands (M. for Ret.\*) 55.
- Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*)  
209.
- Stationery supplied to Senators, in Com. of Sup., 762.
- SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census) 837.
- Civil Government* (Interior) 745; (Finance and Treas-  
ury Board) 747; (Post Office) 748; (Contingent  
Expenses, High Commissioner) 752.

CHARLTON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

- SUPPLY—*Con.*
- Collection of Revenues: Repairs and Working Expenses  
(Canals)* 1077.
- Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys) 1111; *Income  
(Outside Service)* 1113.
- Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1022, 1023.
- Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1013.
- Geological Survey*, 1089, 1092.
- Immigration*, 846.
- Indians* (N.S.) 1101; (B.C.) 1101; (Man. and N.W.T.)  
1102, 1105—1110.
- Legislation* (Salaries, &c., of Senate) 761; House of  
Commons (Publishing Debates) 764; (Grant to  
Library) 766.
- Miscellaneous* (Mounted Police Barracks) 1041.
- North-West Mounted Police*, 1110.
- Post Office* (Mail Service, &c.) 1082.
- Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Man.) 912;  
(Repairs, &c.) 913.
- Railways—Capital: C.P.R.* (Contract 15, and Joseph  
Whitehead) 1146.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 431; (personal ex-  
planation) 456.
- Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 552.
- United States, Reciprocity with the, on M. for Cor., 271.
- COCHRANE, Mr. E., *East Northumberland*
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (agricultural  
implements) 690.
- COCKBURN, Mr. A. P., *North Ontario*
- German Immigration and Naturalization, on M. for  
Cor., 98.
- Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*)  
on M. for 2°, 703.
- Returning Officers in General Election, on M. for List,  
60.
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 665.
- COLBY, Mr. C. C., *Stanstead*
- Atlantic and North-West Railway Co.'s Incorp. Acts  
Amt. (B. 59, 1°\*) 129.
- Charitable, Philanthropic and Provident Associations  
Act Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 497.
- Cottons, Printed and Dyed, in Com. on W. & M., 676.
- Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 71, 1°\*) 150.
- Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com.,  
700.
- European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Co.'s  
Act Amt. (B. 118, 1°\*) 828.
- Grand Trunk and North Shore Rys. Amalg. (M.  
to read and receive petitions) 630; Ms. to suspend  
Rules 51 and 43, and B. 113, 1°, 692; recom., 888.
- Library of Parliament, Joint Committee's Rep. (Ms. to  
conc. in) 630, 1025.
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed  
cottons) 676.

COOK, Mr. H. H., *East Simcoe*

- Midland Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 165.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 211.  
 SUPPLY—Indians (Annual Grant to supplement Fund) 1095.

COSTIGAN, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

- Adulteration of Food Rep. (presented) 36; in Com. of Sup., 1113.  
 Bill Stamps, Redemption of (Ans.) 502.  
 Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1199.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 747.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1113, 1249, 1251.  
 Concurrence—Excise, 1117—1119; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1120.  
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 885, 887.  
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1020—1024, 1383; conc., 1117.  
 General Inspection Act (1874) Amt. (Res. in Com., and B. 104, 1°\*) 526; 2° m., 828; in Com., 829.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation (B. 115, prop. Res.) 574; Res. in Com., 790; 1°\* of B., 791; in Com., 915—922; 3° m., 999; Sen. Amts., 1279.  
 Inland Revenue, Returns and Statistics (presented) 36.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1197.  
 SUPPLY—Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 747.

*Charges on Revenue*: Excise (Tobacco Stamps) 1198, (Wainwright, F. G., extra services) 1198, (H. H. Grant, difference of Salary) 1198, (C. J. Griffith, difference to increase Salary) 1198; Inspection of Petroleum (Martin Battle, for extra services) 1199.

*Collection of Revenues*: Maintenance and Repairs (Slide and Boom Dues) 1079; Adulteration of Food) 1113; (Excise) 1249; (Weights and Measures and Gas, 1251.

*Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1020—1024; conc., 1117; (Salary of Inspector of Tobacco) 1383.

*Miscellaneous* (Merchants Bank vs. Regina) 1197.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1045, 1052, conc., 1120.

Timber and Lumber, Tolls and Dues (B. 126, prop. Res.) 709; M. for Com., 1037; 1°\* of B., 1038; 2° m., 1207; in Com., 1208.

Weights and Measures Act, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Irvine*) to amend, 290.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1045, 1052; conc., 1120.

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 36.

Wells, Mr., Brewer of Goderich (Ans.) 889.

COUGHLIN, Mr. T., *North Middlesex*

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 314.

COURSOL, Mr. C. J., *East Montreal*

- Boisvert, Julie, Case of (Ques.) 107.  
 Civil Service Employés in Montreal (M. for Ret.) 78.

COURSOL, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*

- Insuring Goods in Bonded Warehouses (Ques.) 204.  
 Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on M. to fix day for 2° (Amt. 6 m. h.) 254, 255; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 638.  
 Money Orders and the Postal Union (Ques.) 106.  
 National Ins. Co. Winding-up (B. 20, 1°\*) 52.  
 Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1336, 1359.

CURRAN, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal*

- Boisvert, Julie, Trial of (Ques.) 41.  
 Citizens Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 67, 1°\*) 140.  
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 199.  
 Davis and Lawrence Manufacturing Co. Incorp. (B. 79, 1°\*) 161.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of, on National Policy (M. for copies) 502.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1320, 1322, 1327, 1358, 1362.  
 Insolvent Traders Assets, Distribution of (B. 99, 1°) 267.  
 Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 256; on M. for 2°, 632; (Amt. 6 m. h.) 637.  
 Meharg and Cooney, Provision for Widows of (Ques.) 126.  
 Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses, B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) carried on a div., 322.  
 Montreal Custom House Supernumerary Clerks (M. for Ret.) 72.  
 Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1313.  
 Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1337.  
 St. Lawrence Bridge and Manufacturing Co. Incorp. (B. 68, 1°\*) 140.

DALY, Mr. M. P., *Halifax*

- Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) on M. for 2°, 228.  
 Bermuda, Telegraphic Communication with (Ques.) 39.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1198.  
 Concurrence—Fishery Bounty (Services in connection with) 1225.  
 Cordage, in Com. on W. & M., 669.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) 916.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1363.  
 Orange Demonstration at Ottawa, on expunging Rep. from Debates, 1199.

DALY, Mr. M. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Collection of Revenues: Excise* (J. Griffith, difference of Salary) 1198.

*Railways and Canals—Capital: Intercolonial* (Rolling Stock) 1062.

Vice Admiralty Courts, Officers of, Emoluments, &c. (M. for Ret.) 902.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (cordage) 669.

DAVIES, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Canadian Rapid Telegraph Co., limited (B. 120, 1°\*) 922.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 203. Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1161; conc., 1222.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1076.

Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Ret.) 43; on M. for Sel. Com., 68.

Concurrence—P.E.I. Ry. (Compensation for Injuries) 1222.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1301, 1302.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) 219; on M. for 3°, 369.

Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 117.

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1008, 1009.

Dominion Piers in P.E.I. (Ques.) 1249.

Farmers' Bank of Ont. (B. 28, 1°\*) 67.

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1013, 1016.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 917.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1325, 1346; on Amts. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1366, (*Mr. Blake*) 1367, (*Mr. Foster*) 1375.

King's County (P.E.I.) Election (remarks on printing Returns) 53; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 151; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 183; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 816.

Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 953.

Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1044, 1192, 1381.

Prince Edward Island and Mainland Mail Service (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1376.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 910, 924, 1181, 1241.

Question of Privilege, on Toronto *Mail's* Correspondence *in re* Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1059.

Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1064.

Red Point (P.E.I.) Breakwater (Ques.) 266.

St. Peter's Road Ry. Crossing (Ques.) 107, 125.

Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res. 1313.

DAVIES, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*

Steam Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 1027.

Superannuation of P.E.I. Judges (Ques.) 204.

SUPPLY—*Charges on Revenue* (Compensation for injuries on P.E.I.) 1161; conc., 1222.

*Collection of Revenues: Repairs and Working Expenses* (Intercol. Ry.) 1074, 1076; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1076.

*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1008, 1009.

*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1013, 1016.

*Mail Subsidies* (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 953; (Halifax and Murray Harbor) 953.

*Miscellaneous* (Surveys of Lakes Huron and Superior) 1044; (International Fisheries Exhibition) 1192; (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1381.

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (P.E.I.) 910, suppl., 1241; (N.S.) 1181. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 924; (P.E.I.) 1246. Dredging, 929.

*Railways—Capital* (Cape Traverse Ry.) 1064.

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 602.

DAWSON, Mr. S. J., *Algoma*

Bank of London, in Canada, Incorp. (B. 29, 1°\*) 67.

Buoys and Beacons in Lake Huron (M. for Ret.) 79.

Concurrence—Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1117; Claim of James Dick, 1217.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 883, 884.

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co., Incorp. (B. 56, 1°\*) 129.

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1203.

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1013.

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1093.

Hudson's Bay, Season of Navigation in (M. for Ret.) 62.

Hydrographic Survey, on M. for Cor. 83.

Immigration and Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 849.

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1098, 1378.

Inspection of Steamers (Ques.) 1025.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1325.

Lakes Huron and Superior, Water Lots in Harbors (M. for Cor.) 503.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 765.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 956, 1019; conc., 1117.

Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*), on Amt. (*Mr. Courso*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 259.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 429; on M. for 2° of B., 705.

Militia Act Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 539.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 955.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1248.

**DAWSON, Mr. S. J.—Con.**

Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co., Incorp. B. 66 (*Mr. Tasse*) on M. for Com. 942.

Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1065.

Rainy, River Imp. Co. Incorp. (B. 38, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 89.

Shipping Disasters on Inland Water (M. for Ret.) 29.

Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1191.

Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1290.

SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1013.

*Geological Survey*, 1093.

*Immigration and Quarantine*, 849.

*Indians* (Annual Grant to supplement Fund) 1098 ; (N.W.T., Industrial Schools) 1378.

*Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 765.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c.) 956 ; (Colchester Reef) 956 ; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1019, conc., 1117.

*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.) 955.

*Public Works—Income* : Harbors and Rivers (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1243.

*Railways—Capital* : General (Surveys and Inspections) 1065.

*Steamboat Inspection*, 1191.

Timber on Indian Lands (Ont.) on M. for Ret., 294.

**DEBRAUJEU, Mr. G. R. L. G. H. S., Soulanges**

Point des Cascades and Lake St. Francis Canal (Ques.) 266.

SUPPLY—*Canals—Capital* : Lachine, 1068, 1070.

**DE ST. GEORGES, Mr. J. E. A., Portneuf**

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on Prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 582.

Lake St. John Ry. Co., Subsidy to (M. for copies of Cor\*) 525.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 704.

Montreal Harbor Commission and Pilots By-law (M. for O. C., &c.) 776.

**DEJARDINS, Mr. A., Hochelaga**

Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks) 785.

Channel between Montreal and Quebec, Deepening of (Ques.) 1251.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien (B. 22, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 56 ; M. for Com., 261 ; M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 215 ; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 216 ; in Com., 261 ; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 307 ; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 310 ; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 369.

*Concurrence—Health Statistics*, 1115.

Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 117 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 196 ; in Com., 200.

**DEJARDINS, Mr. A.—Con.**

Debates, Official Reps. of, on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 204.

Health, Statistics, conc., 1115.

Interest in Canada, to fix the Rate of, B. 77 (*Mr. Catudal*) on M. to place on Order Paper for 2<sup>o</sup>, 957.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1351 ; on Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1364.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1380.

Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron*) on M. to place on Orders, 332.

Personal Explanation (Newspaper Reports) 785.

Private Bills, on M. to extend time, 88.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 925, 1246.

Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1337.

SUPPLY—*Legislation* (Sessional Indemnity, *Mr. Houde*) 1380.

*Public Works—Income* : Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 925 ; suppl., 1246.

**DODD, Mr. M., Cape Breton**

Supply—*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries &c.) 956.

*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.) 953.

*Quarantine* (Sydney, N.S.) 1239.

**DUGAS, Mr. F., Montcalm**

Controverted Elections Act of 1874 (Ques.) 56.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 579 ; in Com. on B., 921.

**DUNDAS, Mr. J. R., South Victoria**

General Inspection Act (1874) Amt. B. 104 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 829.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 921.

Northern Ry. Co's B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1097.

Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1292.

**DUPONT, Mr. F., Bagot**

Farnham and Guillaume Mail Service (Ques.) 125.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 580.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 654.

Yamaska River Improvements (Ques.) 41.

**FAIRBANK, Mr. J. H., East Lambton**

Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 187 ; in Com., 282.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup. (Ques.) 1074.

**FAIRBANK, Mr. J. H.—Con.**

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1309.

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 571.

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 850.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1345.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1179.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1272; in Com., 1286.

SUPPLY—*Collection of Revenues*: Repairs and Working Expenses (Intercolonial Ry.) Ques., 1074.

*Immigration*, 851.

*Public Works—Capital*: Public Buildings (Ottawa) 1179.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1050.

**FARROW, Mr. T., East Huron**

Electoral Divisions in Man., &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 659.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1362.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 655.

Port Albert Harbor Improvements, on M. for Ret. 377.

Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 552.

*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 626.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 681.

Wells, Mr., Brewer of Goderich (Ques.) 889.

**FERGUSON, Mr. C. F., North Leeds and Grenville**

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (agricultural implements) 684, 685.

**FERGUSON, Mr. J., Welland**

Niagara Ry. and Bridge Co., Incorp. (B. 61, 1°\*) 140.

**FISHER, Mr. S. A., Brome**

Census Records, 1881 (M. for Stmt.) 104.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 310, 312.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1324, 1329—1339, 1340, 1359.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (agricultural implements) 689—691; conc. (books) 736.

**FLEMING, Mr. J., Peel**

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1376.

SUPPLY—*Indians* (B.C.) 1102; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1103.

**FORBES, Mr. J. F. F., Queen's, N.S.**

Coffin's Island, Completion of Works at (Ques.) 501.

Government Steamer *Newfield* and wrecked *Moravian* (M. for Ret., 301).

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1319.

Liverpool Bay Breakwater (Ques.) 84; (Motion for copies of Cor.\*) 383.

Liverpool Harbor Buoy or Fog-Whistle (Ques.) 130.

McCallum, W. D., Removal and Dismissal of (M. for Ret.\*) 55.

*Newfield* and *Moravian* Steamships (Ques.) 1025.

Padding Pan Works (Ques.) 130.

SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1010.

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1247.

**FORTIN, M. P., Gaspé**

Campbellton and Gaspé Steam Service (M. for Cor.) 504.

Cordage, in Com. on W. & M., 669.

Fisheries Act. Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1202—1205.

Fishery Bounty Augmentation (Ques.) 1025.

Hydrographic Survey (M. for Cor.) 82.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 708.

Pictou Harbor Act Amt. B. 108 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 1°, 741, (vol. ii.)

Reciprocal Trade with Brazil, &c. (M. for Cor.) 767.

Riparian Rights, in Com. on B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) 1202.

St. Lawrence, Deepening Channel, on Personal Explanation, 786.

*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (cordage) 669.

West Indies and Brazil, Trade with (M. for copy of Petition\*) 781.

**FOSTER, Mr. G. E., Kings, N.B.**

Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to recom., 285.

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 321.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 934.

Concurrence—Health Statistics, 1115.

Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7, (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 198; in Com. (Ques.) 200.

Health Statistics, conc., 1115.

Immigration into B.C., on M. for Cor., 74.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1325, 1323, 1329, 1331, 1340, 1346, 1351, 1356, 1358, 1359; on Amts. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373, 1374; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) carried, 1375.

FOSTER, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

Liquors, Distilled and Fermented, imported for Consumption, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 78.

Newspaper Items, on Ques. of Priv. on Toronto *Mail's* and *Globe's* Correspondence in re Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1058.

Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1292.

Tariff—On M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M. (explanation) 608, 614.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 446.

GAGNÉ, Mr. J. A., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay*

Ste. Anne, Wharf or Pier at (M. for Ret\*) 138.

GIGAULT, Mr. G. A., *Rouville*

Cereals, Duties and Imports (M. for Stmt.) 775.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 579.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, Petitions from Quebec (M. for copies) 213; (M. for ref. to Sel. Com.) 383; B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1322, 1329, 1343, 1346, 1348; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom) neg., 1375.

Tobacco, Canadian, Licensed Manufacturers of (M. for Ret.\*) 86.

Vote on Intoxicating Liquors B. (Ques. of Priv.) 1386.

GILLMOB, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte*

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 326.

Customs in Com. of Sup., 1004.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1342.

Leather, in Com. on W. & M., 672.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1020.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 705.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 910.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1270; in Com., 1289.

SUPPLY—Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1004.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1020.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 910.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 487; in Com. on Res. 2 (leather) 672.

GIROUARD, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier*

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) as to Constitutionality, 420.

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 563.

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 311.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1359, 1360; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) carried, 1374.

GIROUARD, Mr. D.—*Con.*

King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 813.

GIROUARD, Mr. G. A., *Kent, N.B.*

Richibucto River, Obstructions in (Ques.) 1025.

GORDON, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island*

Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 683.

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 328, 907.

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. (M. for Cor.) 301.

Immigration into B.C., including Chinese, on M. for Cor., 73.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1345, 1346.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 954.

Pilotage Authorities in B.C., on M. for Cor., 207.

SUPPLY—Ocean and River Service (Purchase of Life Boats, &c.) 954.

Vancouver Island Geological Survey (Ques.) 376.

Vancouver Island Ry. Reserve, Squatters' Rights (M. for copies of Petitions, &c.\*) 382.

Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 3 (agricultural implements) 683.

GRANDBOIS, Mr. P. E., *Témiscouata*

Edmunston to Rivière du Loup Ry. (Ques.) 41.

Rivière du Loup and River Ouelle Ice Reqs. (M. for copies\*) 215.

Semaphore at Rivière du Loup (M. for Cor.) 134.

GUILLETT, Mr. G., *West Northumberland*

Grafton Harbor Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°\*) 89.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1316.

SUPPLY—Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1107.

Railways—Capital: Intercolonial (Construction Account, old, Commission, &c.) 1153.

GUNN, Mr. A., *Kingston*

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorpor. Act Amt. (B. 36, 1°\*) 89; in Com., 341.

Tea, Differential Duty on (Ques.) 412.

HACKETT, Mr. E., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Brae, Survey and Harbor Improvements (M. for Ret.\*) 781.

Cape Traverse Ry. (Ques.) 66.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1077.

Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 49; on M. for Sel. Com., 70; (M. to employ Shorthand writers) 129; on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 1028; (remarks) 1395.

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1009.

Loyal Orange Association Incorpor. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m.h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 647.



**HACKETT, Mr. E.—Con.**

Negotiations with B.C., *in re* Dry Dock and Island Ry. on Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1395.  
 Shorthand Writers (M. to employ for Sel. Com.) 129.  
 Summerside Harbor Survey (M. for copy of Engineers' Rep.) 367.  
 SUPPLY—*Collection of Revenues*: Repairs and Working Expenses (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1077.  
*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1009.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 620.

**HAGGART, Mr. J. G., South Lanark**

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 147.  
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 371.  
 Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 163.  
 SUPPLY—*Canals—Capital*: Tay (Construction of Works) 1072.

**HALL, Mr. R. N., Sherbrooke**

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) M. to adj. deb., 498.  
 Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incorp. B. 49 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 373.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1320—1322, 1362.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 793.  
 Petition for Private Bill, C. P. Mattock, &c. (M. to read and receive) 138.  
*Ways and Means*—conc. (books) 738.

**HAWKINS, Mr. J. J., Bothwell**

Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge (M. for Sp. Com.) 508; (Ques. of Order) 519; reply, 524.  
 Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 257; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 644.  
 Sydenham River, Navigation of (Ques.) 1025.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 484.

**HAY, Mr. R., Centre Toronto**

London and Ontario Investment Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 53, 1°\*) 116.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 681.

**HESSON, Mr. S. R., North Perth**

Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 838.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 665.  
 Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 591, 593.  
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1002.

**HESSON, Mr. S. R.—Con.**

Dominion Lands Act Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 879, 880; on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3° (Ques.) 939.  
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1022, 1024.  
 German Immigration and Naturalization; on M. for Cor., 97.  
 His Excellency's Successor (M. for Cor.) 65.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 847.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 922.  
 Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beatty*) on M. for 2°, 122.  
 Land Improvement Fund (M. for Ret.) 39.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 536.  
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1082.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1244.  
 SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census) 838.  
*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1002.  
*Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1022, 1024.  
*Immigration*, 847.  
*Post Office* (Mail Service, &c.) 1082.  
*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1244.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 619.  
 Timber Permits, Rainy Lake and River District, on M. for Ret., 778.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 497, in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 665; (wools and woollens) 674.  
 Wools and Woollens, in Com. on W. & M., 674.

**HICKEY, Mr. C. E., Dundas**

SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Miscellaneous (Monument to Joseph Brant) 1249.

**HOMER, Mr. J. A. R., New Westminster**

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 904, 907.  
 Hawaiian Islands, Reciprocity with (Ques.) 67; (Res.) 231; withdn., 232.  
 Immigration into B.C., including Chinese, on M. for Cor., 73.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1346.  
 Pilotage Authorities in B. C., on M. for Cor., 207.  
 SUPPLY—*Penitentiaries* (British Columbia) 757.

**HOUDÉ, Mr. F., Maskinongé**

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Amt to recom.) 218; (remarks) 219.

**IRVINE, Mr. D., Carleton, N.B.**

Burpee, S. G., Charges against (M. for copies) 505.  
 Jacques, James H., Appointment of (Ques.) 289; (M. for copies of Cor.) 506.

**IRVINE, Mr. D.—Con.**

- Kearney, Charles, appointment of (M. for copies of Cor.) 506.  
 Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1287.  
 Weights and Measures Act (prop. Res. to amend) 289.

**IRVING, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe***

- Acadia Powder Co. Incomp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to M. for 3°, 425; in Com., 557.  
 Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 223; on M. to recom., 287.  
 Bill Stamps (Ques.) 40.  
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com. (Ques. of Order) 117; on M. to receive Rep. of Com. (Amt. to recom.) 195; on M. that Com. rise, 201.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks) 694.  
 Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incomp. B. 49 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 373.  
 Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for 2°, 119.  
 Loyal Orange Association B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Courso*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 260.  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 534; (Ques.) 540; in Com., 586.  
 Petition for Private Bill (C. P. Mattock, &c.) on M. to read and receive, 139.  
 Richmond Field Battery, Guns for (M. for Ret.) 204.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on (prop. Res.) 207, 210; withdn., 213.

**JACKSON, Mr. J., *South Norfolk***

- Ontario, Disputed Territory of, Permission to cut Timber and Mine Lands in (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 232.

**JAMIESON, Mr. J., *North Lanark***

- Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incomp. B. 49 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 374.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1322, 1326, 1330, 1341, 1347, 1348, 1360.  
 Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 163.  
 Promissory Notes and Bill of Exchange Repeal Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 427.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 439.

**JENKINS, Mr. J. T., *Queen's, P.E.I.***

- Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 47; (M. for Sel. Com.) 68, 71.

**KEEFLER, Mr. T. T., *Lanenburg***

- Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Blandford Breakwater (Ques.) 68.  
 Dauphénéa, James, Claim of (M. for copies of Petitions, &c.) 781.

**KEEFLER, Mr. T. T.—Con.**

- Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) in Com. of Sup., 923.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1361.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com., 708.  
 Petite Rivière Breakwater (Ques.) 265.  
 SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 923; (Generally) 929.  
 Westhaver's Point, Lighthouse at (M. for copies of Cor., 780.

**KILVERT, Mr. F. E., *Hamilton***

- Civil Service Examination in Ont. (Ques.) 107.  
 Federal Life Ass. Co. Incomp. (B. 35, 1°\*) 88.

**KING, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.***

- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 456.

**KINNEY, Mr. J. B., *Yarmouth***

- Immigration into B.C., on M. for Cor., 75.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 666.

**KING, Mr. J. A., *Guysborough***

- Antigonish and Guysborough Mail Route (M. for Ret\*) 77.  
 Customs Laws, Modifications of (M. for Cor., &c.) 507.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com., 1207.  
 Goose Island Lighthouse, N.S. (Ques.) 166.  
 Indian Harbor Breakwater (M. for Ret.\*) 118.  
 Lobster Fishing, Close Season (M. for O.C., &c.\*) 659.  
 New Harbor Breakwater (Ques.) 78; (M. for Ret.\*) 116.  
 Semaphores on Coast of Guysborough Co. (Ques.) 547.  
 Spirituous Liquors, Importation of (Ques.) 502.  
 SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1012, 1018; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1190.  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c.) 956; (Signal Stations) 957.  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 923; Dredging, 929.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. (cotton duck) 665; (cordage) 666; (leather) 672.

**KIRKPATRICK, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac***

- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incomp. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 371.  
 SUPPLY—*Legislation* (Grant to Library) 765, 766.  
*Collection of Revenues* (Excise) 1250.  
 [See SPEAKER, Mr.]

**KRANZ, Mr. H., *North Waterloo***

- Germany, Direct Steam Communication with (M. for Cor.) 96.  
 Immigration and Naturalization of Germans (M. for Cor.) 96, 104.

**LABROSSE, Mr. S., Prescott**

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 580.

**LANDERKIN, Mr. G., South Grey**

Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 781.

Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 844.

Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 194.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B 45. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 888.

Durham and Walkerton Mail Route (M. for Ret.) 86.

Fever contracted in Camp, in Com. on Militia B., 585; in Com. of Sup., 855.

Fosherton and Vandeleur Mail Service (Ques.) 547.

Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Bi-daily Mail Service (Ques.) 781.

Inter-provincial Trade, on M. for Sel. Com., 115.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1322.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 858.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 585.

Mount Forest and Glen Eden Mail Service (Ques.) 547.

SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Health Statistics) 844.  
*Militia* (Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, &c.) 855.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1053.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, in Com. of Sup., 1053.

**LANDRY, Mr. A. C. P. R., Montmagny**

Bernatchez, N., Seizure of Tobacco on Premises of (M. for Ret.\*) 383.

Confederation Debates, Index to (remarks) 785.

Debates, Official Reps. of, French Reporting Staff (remarks) 415.

Dominion Laws, Codification of (Ques.) 890.

Ferry Boats (Ques.) 376.

Grosse Isle and Mainland Communication (Ques.) 890.

Grosse Isle Semaphore Communication (Ques.) 78.

Hébert, Hubert, Charges preferred against (M. for copies) 381.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 577.

Intercolonial Ry. Office in Quebec (Ques.) 376.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1322.

Lake St. Peter, Deepening of (Ques. of Priv.) 1363.

Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, Occupation of, in Com. of Sup., 1243.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 653.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 706; on M. for 3°, 743.

North Shore Ry., Ferry Boats at Terminus (Ques.) 35.

Orange Demonstration at Ottawa, Report of Proceedings as published (read) 1169.

**LANDRY, Mr. A. C. P. R.—Con.**

Passenger Accommodation at "The Crossing" (Ques.) 376.

Prorogation, Congratulations, &c. (remarks) 1397.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1186.

Quebec Harbor Police (Ques.) 890.

Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1244.

Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1313.

Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1338.

Standing Orders, Rules and Regulations (remarks) 741.

St. Jean Port Joli Wharf, on M. for Ret., 378.

SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Miscellaneous (O. Dionne, for services) 1186; Buildings (Man.) 1243.

*Railways and Canals—Capital*: Intercolonial, 1244.

Supreme Court Jurisdiction (B. 100, 1°) 383.

Supreme Court (Ques.) 29.

Votes and Proceedings, Translation of (remarks) 828.

**LANGEVIN, Hon. Sir HECTOR L., Three Rivers**

Address to His Excellency on Departure, on Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1385.

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 1133.

Accommodation in Buildings (remarks) 785.

Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.

Bayfield (N.S.) Breakwater Extension (Ans.) 657.

Bayfield (Ont.) Harbor Engineer's Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 744.

Bermuda, Telegraphic Communication with (Ans.) 39; further explanation, 81.

Blandford (N.S.) Breakwater (Ans.) 68.

Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters (B. 96, 1°\*) 315; 2° m., 786; in Com., 789, 935.

Brandon Post Office (Ans.) 166.

Buckhorne, Lake Erie, Pier at (Ans.) 890.

Cable Extension from Barrington to Cape Sable Island (Ans.) 107.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. and The North American Contracting Co., on M. for copy of Contract, 779.

Cape George (N.S.) Breakwater, Rebuilding (Ans.) 502.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) as to constitutionality (M. to adj. deb.) 426.

Cartier, Sir Geo. E., Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1378.

Channel between Montreal and Quebec (Ans.) 1251.

Chatham to Escuminac Telegraph (Ans.) 81.

Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1199.

Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 77.

Civil Service Examinations in Ont. (Ans.) 107.

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°\*) 292; 2° m., 931; Res. in Com., 933; B. in Com., 1035—1037; 3° m., 1060.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 744, 747, 749, 750, 752, 1131, 1175, 1249.

Coffin's Island, Completion of Works at (Ans.) 501.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1078, 1079.

Concurrence—Library (Salaries, &c.) 1114; Public Buildings (Ottawa) 1116; Excise, 1120; Weights and

**LANGÉVIN, Sir HECTOR L.—Con.**

- Measures and Gas, 1121; Post Office (Mail Service &c.) 1123; Library, Dept. of Justice, 1128; H. of C. (Shorthand Writers, &c.) 1214; Immigration (Winnipeg Hospital) 1214; L. J. Demers, balance of acct., 1279; A. Audet, for translating, 1280.
- Confederation Debates, Index to (remarks) 785.
- Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on objection to 2°, 1213.
- Controverted Elections Act of 1874 (Ans.) 56.
- Cotton Wood Canon (B.C.) Improvements (Ans.) 315.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. (M. to print Stmnts. made before Ry. Com.) 331.
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) 219; on M. for 3°, 369.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron. Huron*) in Com. on Ques. of Order, 200.
- Debates, Official Reps. of, French Reporting Staff (remarks) 415.
- Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. B. 85 (*Mr. Bolduc*) on M. for 2°, 903.
- Dominion Piers in P.E.I. (Ans.) 1249.
- Drill Shed at St. Thomas, Removal of, on M. for Ret. 133.
- Fabre, Hon. H., Appointment of, on M. for Cor., 84; on Salary of, 1136; in Com. of Sup., 1379.
- Frontenac Terrace, Quebec, on M. for Ret., 54.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Rets. (Ans.) 166.
- Grosse Isle Semaphore Communication (Ans.) 78; 890.
- Hawaiian Islands, Reciprocity with (Ans.) 68.
- Houde Mr., Sessional Indemnity, in Com. of Sup., 1380.
- Indian Harbor, N.S. (Ans.) 78.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1376, 1378.
- Isle aux Noix and St. Johns Barracks (Ans.) 1025.
- Jeannette's Creek (Ont.) Obstruction of, by G. T. R. (Ans.), 890.
- King's County (P.E.I.) Election (Ans.) 116.
- L'Avénir, Postmaster, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 902.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 766, 1133, 1238, 1380.
- Library of Parliament, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 1025: in Com. of Sup., 766, 1133.
- Liquor Certificates granted by Physicians, on M. for Ret., 777.
- Little Bear Creek (B.C.) Navigation of (Ans.) 56.
- Liverpool Bay Breakwater (Ans.) 84.
- Lord's Day, Railway Traffic on, on M. for Ret., 900.
- Malpeque (P.E.I.) Breakwater Repairs (Ans.) 889.
- Manitoba Indian Agency, on M. for Rep., &c., 902.
- Marine Telegraph, Canada and Asia, Act Amt. (B. 116, 1°\*) 791.
- Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 704.
- McLennan, Roderick, Claim to Land in N.W.T., on M. for Cor., 778.
- Meharg and Cooney, Provision for Widows of (Ans.) 126.
- Midland Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 165.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1134.

**LANGÉVIN, Sir HECTOR L.—Con.**

- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1044, 1378, 1379.
- Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. to place on Orders (Ques. of Proceed.) 332.
- Montreal Custom House Supernumerary Clerks, on M. for Ret., 72.
- Montreal Harbor Commission and Pilot By-law, on M. for O.C., 776.
- Morpeth Harbor (Ont.) Improvements, on M. for Cor., 558.
- Newfield* and *Moravian* Steamships (Ans.) 1025.
- New Harbor (N.S.) Breakwater, (Ans.) 78.
- Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 803.
- Oliver, Davidson & Co., in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- Petite Rivière (N.S.) Breakwater (Ans.) 266.
- Piteau, L.J., Indemnification to, in Com. of Supply, 1238.
- Police, Dominion, Rep. (presented) 40.
- Port Albert Harbor Improvements, on M. for Ret., 377.
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 10°3; conc., 1123.
- Private Bills Reps. of (Ms. to extend time) 660, 783, 915.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 907, 909—913, 922, 924, —926, 928—930, 1160, 1180—1184, 1186, 1241—1249, 1381; conc., 1116.
- Public Works Reps. (presented) 36; from 1867 to 1882 (presented) 1169.
- Public Works, Telegraphic Expenditure charged to, on M. for Stmnt., 85.
- Pudding Pan (N.S.) Works (Ans.) 130.
- Quebec Geographical Society, in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1214.
- Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co. Incorp. B. 66 (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. for Com., 942; in Com., 943.
- Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. B. 69 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 287.
- Reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands (Ans.) 56.
- Red Point (P.E.I.) Breakwater (Ans.) 266, 315.
- Regina, Immigrant Shed and Improvements (Ans.) 265.
- Repatriation of Canadians, on M. for Stmnt., 894.
- Russell vs. Woodward, in Com. of Sup., 1133.
- Sable Island Telegraph Communication (Ans.) 68.
- Secretary of State's Rep. (presented) 36.
- Semaphore at Rivière du Loup, on M. for Cor., 135.
- Semaphores on Coast of Guysborough Co. (Ans.) 547.
- Semaphore Communication with Grosse Isle (Ans.) 78.
- Signal Stations at North Cape and East Point (P.E.I.) on M. for Ret., 1026.
- Speaker, Election of (M. sec.) 1.
- Standing Orders (Res.) 741 (vol. ii.)
- St. Francis Wharf, Island of Orleans (Ans.) 890.
- St. Jean Port Joli Wharf (Ans.) 41, 315; on M. for Ret., 379.
- St. Thomas Drill Shed, Removal of, on M. for Ret., 133.
- Summerside Post office and Custom house (Ans.) 140.
- Superannuation of P.E.I. Judges (Ans.) 204.

**LANGÉVIN, Sir HECTOR, L.—Con.**

**SUPPLY—Administration of Justice** (Contingencies, Supreme Court) 1133; (Russell vs. Woodward, Expenses) 1133.

**Charges on Revenue:** Public Works (Telegraphs, B.C.) 1199.

**Civil Government** (Customs) 1131; (Interior) 1175; (Privy Council) 744, suppl., 1249; (Inland Revenue) 747, suppl., 1131; (Public Works) 749, 750; (Civil Service Examiners) 752.

**Collection of Revenues:** Maintenance and Repairs (Harbors and Slides) 1078; (Telegraphs, Man. and N.W.T.) 1078; (B.C.) 1079; (Agent and Contingencies, B.C.) 1079.

**Indians** (N.W.T., Industrial Schools) 1376; (Indian Agents, B.C.) 1378.

**Legislation** (Grant to Library) 766, suppl., 113; (Indemnification to L. J. Piteau) 1238; (Sessional Indemnity, Mr. Houde) 1380.

**Militia** (Guard at Government House) 1134.

**Miscellaneous** (Library, Dept. of Justice) 1044; (Dominion Statutes Consolidation) 1378; (Quebec Geological Society) 1378; (Widow of Sir George E. Cartier) 1378; (Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies) 1379.

**Post Office** (Mail Service, &c.) 1083, conc., 1123.

**Public Works—Capital:** Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 907, conc., 1116, suppl., 1180; (Compensation to C. Vaux) 1181. Telegraphs (B.C., Oliver, Davidson & Co.) 1160. **Income:** Buildings (N.S.) 909, suppl., 1181, 1241; (P.E.I.) 910, suppl., 1241; (N.B.) 910, suppl., 1182, 1242; (Que.) 910, suppl., 1182, 1242; (Ont.) 911, suppl., 1182, 1242; (Man.) 912, suppl., 1182, 1243; (N.W.T.) 913, suppl., 1243; (B.C.) 913; (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1182; (Generally) 913; (Repairs, &c.) 913, suppl., 1182. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 922, suppl., 1245; (P.E.I.) 924, suppl., 1246; (N.B.) 924, suppl., 1246; (Que.) 925, suppl., 1183, 1246; (Maritime Provinces, generally) 925; (Ont.) 926, suppl., 1183, 1247, 1381; (Man.) 928; (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1247; (B.C.) 928, suppl., 1182; (Generally) 929. Dredging, 929. Roads and Bridges, 930. Telegraphs, 930; (B.C.) 1249. Miscellaneous, 930, suppl., 1184; (Surveys and Inspections) 1186; (Fort Dufferin) 1245; (Cost of litigated matters) 1381.

**Telegraphic Expenditure** charged to Public Works, on M. for Stmt., 85.

**Timber Permits, Rainy Lake and River District, on M. for Ret.,** 778.

**Toronto Harbor and Esplanade B. 106** (Mr. Small) 2° m., 709.

**Two Creeks** (B.C.) Harbor (Ans.) 56.

**Vaux G., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup.,** 1181.

**Westport** (N.S.) Pier (Ans.) 376.

**LANGÉVIN, Sir HECTOR L.—Con.**

Westhaver's Point, Lighthouse at, on M. for Cor., 780.

Winnipeg Post Office Site (Ans.) 889.

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. 48 (Mr. Beatty) on M. to disagree with Sen. Amts., 767. Yamaska River Improvements (Ans.) 41.

**LAURIER, Hon. W., East Quebec**

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 1171.

**Concurrence—Weights and Measures and Gas, 1120;** Post Office (Mail Service, &c.) 1124.

Confederation, Picture to commemorate, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1171.

Damour, David, Dismissal of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.\*) 903.

Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Bolduc) in Com., 903.

General Inspection Act (1874) and B. 118 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2°, 828.

Hébert Hubert, Charges preferred against, on M. for copies, 382.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Costigan) 576; B. 115, in Com., 915—920.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on M. for copies of Petition from Quebec, 214.

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 1238.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, in Com. on Res. (Mr. McLellan) 429.

Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6 (Mr. Cameron, Hyron) on M. for Com., 318.

Post Office Depart., Contracts with, for Carrying Mails (M. for copies\*) 86.

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1082; conc. 1124.

Premiums of Insurance (M. for Stmt.) 1030.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 910, 914, 925.

Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Leonard Tilley) in Com. on Res., 1214.

Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1062, 1064, 1157.

Royal Academy of Arts, Picture to commemorate Confederation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1171.

St. Francis Wharf, Island of Orleans (Ques.) 890.

Subsidy, Increased, for Quebec (M. for Ret.) 779.

**SUPPLY—Civil Government** (Inland Revenue) 747.

**Legislation** (Indemnification to L. J. Piteau) 1238.

**Post Office** (Mail Services, &c.) 1082, conc., 1124.

**Public Works—Income:** Buildings (Que.) 910; (Repairs, &c.) 914; Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 925.

**Railways—Capital:** Intercolonial (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1063, 1064; (Rivière du Loup Branch) 1157.

Timber and Lumber Tolls and Dues B. 126 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 1208.

**LESAGE, Mr. C. A., Dorchester**

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Costigan) 578.

**LEPAGE, Mr. A. C.—Con.**

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1365.  
Vital Statistics (Ques.) 56.

**LISTER, Mr. J. F., West Lambton**

Concurrence—Excise, 1118—1120.  
Consolidated Ry. Acts Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1301.  
Excise, in Com of Sup., 1023; conc., 1118—1120.  
Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1368.  
Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 705.  
Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 536.  
Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 723.  
SUPPLY—Excise (Salaries, &c.) 1023; conc., 1118—1120.  
Walpole Island, Sale of Oak Timber on (M. for Cor.) 1031.

**MACDONALD, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.**

SUPPLY—Miscellaneous (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1383.

**MACDONALD, Rt. Hon. Sir JOHN A., Carleton & Lennox**

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. to adj. deb., 498, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 500.  
Address, on the, 22; M. for Com. to draft, 28; draft reported, 28; His Excellency's reply, 77.  
Address to His Excellency on his Departure (m.) 1384.  
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 753, 1178.  
Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 123; in Com., 222, 224, 313.  
Agricultural Fertilizers, on prop. Res., 116.  
Amos Rowe and the Govt., Relations between, on M. for Cor., 1029.  
Bannon, Rev. Mr., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
Bill Stamps (Ans.) 40.  
Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, P.E.I. (B. 135, 1°\*) 1316; 2° m., 1339.  
Boisvert, Julie, Trial of (Ans.) 41, 107.  
Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters (B. 96, introd.) 298; in Com., 789.  
Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 507, 523.  
Burgess, John, Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1193.  
Burpee, S. G., Charges against, on M. for copies, 505.  
Canada Central Ry. and Town of Pembroke Bonus, on M. for copies of Petitions, &c., 230.  
Canadian Pacific Ry. Reps. (remarks) 87.  
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (*Mr. Abbott*) on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) to M. for 3°, 889.  
Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 124; in Com., 202.  
Census Records (1881) on M. for Stmt., 105.  
Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1199.  
Chief Justiceship of Queen's Bench (Man.) on M. for Ret., 61.

**MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—Con.**

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 51 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 165.  
Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 905.  
Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 744, 746, 752, 1174-1177, 1237.  
Colonization Lands, on Ms. for Rets., 55.; on delay in bringing down Rets. (remarks) 558.  
Concurrence—Dominion Statutes Consolidation, 1387.  
Confederation Debates, Index to (Ans.) 266.  
Confederation, Picture to Commemorate, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1173.  
Consolidated Ry. Act (1879) Amt. B. 15 (*Mr. Muloch*) on M. for 2°, 104.  
Contract 15, and Mr. Whitehead, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Mackintosh*) 1283.  
County Court Judges, Ont. (B. 123, 1°\*) 1024.  
County Judges' Criminal Court B. 11 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 103.  
Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 8 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 148.  
Criminal Cases, Procedure in, B. 2 (M. for 2° and ref. to Sel. Com.) 87.  
Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 87; in Com., 117; on M. that Com. rise, 201.  
Criminal Law Consolidation (Ans.) 78.  
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1010.  
Debates, Official Reps. of, on National Policy, on M. to supply copies to new Members, 502.  
Dillon J., year's salary to, in Com. of Sup., 1237.  
Dionne, O., Services of, in Com., of Sup., 1185.  
Dominion Land's Acts Consolidation (B. 45, 1°) 98; M. for Com., 860; in Com., 873—888, 935, 936; on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 943.  
Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1111, 1113, 1199.  
Dominion Laws, Codification of (Ans.) 890.  
Dominion Phosphate and Mining Co. Incorp. B. 49 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 374.  
Dominion Police, in Com. of Sup., 753.  
Dominion Policemen, Retiring Allowances, in Com. of Sup., 1192.  
Dominion Statutes, Consolidation of, on M. for Stmt., 57; in Com. of Sup., 1040.  
Dominion, The, Persons entering, leaving, and settling, on M. for Stmt., 296.  
Dry Dock and Island Ry. (B.C.) 657, 1392.  
Dufferin Bridge, Remission of Duty on Iron for, on M. for copies of Cor., 898.  
Easter Adjournment (Ms.) 81, 289.  
Elections, General, Records of, on M. for Stmt., 57.  
Electoral Franchise (B. 107, 1°) 593; withdr. 1387.  
Evidence in Criminal Matters pending before Foreign Tribunals (B. 125, 1°\*) 1024; 2° m., 1338.  
Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1023.

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN A.—*Con.*

- Expiring Laws Continuation (B. 133, 1°) 1310, 2° m., 1336.
- Galt, Sir Alexander, Resignation of (Ans.) 263.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1088, 1090, 1092.
- Government Business (M. to take in Wednesdays) 596; (M. to take in Mondays) 1281.
- Germany, Direct Steam Communication with, on M. for Cor., 96.
- Hawaiian Islands, Reciprocal Trade with, on Res. (*Mr. Homer*) 231.
- High Commissioner, Successor to (Ans.) 376; Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 752.
- High Court of Justice, Ont. (B. 124 1°\*) 1024; 2° m., 1386.
- His Excellency's Successor, on M. for Cor., 65.
- Hudson's Bay, Season of Navigation, on M. for Ret., 64.
- Hudson's Straits, Exploration of (remarks) 1137.
- Immigration into B. C., on M. for Cor., 75.
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 848.
- Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret., 76.
- Indian Affairs, Departmental Rep. (presented) 36.
- Indian Affairs and Dept. of Interior (B. 139, 1°) 1335.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1099, 1101, 1102, 1106—1110, 1191.
- Increased Indemnity, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 1060.
- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 917—919, 922.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy with, Mess. from His Excellency (presented) 28.
- Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beatty*) on M. for 2°, 119.
- Insolvent Banks, Ins. and Loan Co.'s, &c. (B. 103, 1°\*) 631; 2° m., 791.
- Intercolonial Ry. Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1151.
- Interest in Canada, to fix the Rate of, B. 77 (*Mr. Catudal*) on M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 957.
- Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Excellency (presented) 98.
- International Fisheries Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1044.
- Interior, Rep. of the Dept. (presented) 331.
- Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°\*) 298.
- Inter-provincial Trade, on M. for Sel. Com., 115; on M. for Com. to send for persons, papers, &c., 139.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of (Res.) 187; M. to read par. from Speech from the Throne, 234; M. for Sel. Com., 234; Explanation, 235; M. submitting names of Com., 254; on objection of certain Members to serve on Com. (remarks) 254; on M. for Ret. 380; M. substituting names, 526; M. for Com. on Res., 1226; in Com. and B. 132, 1°\*, 1227; 2° m., 1318; in Com., 1319, 1321, 1323—1331, 1341, 1345, 1353, 1356—1358, 1360, 1361; 3° m., 1364.
- James' Bay Expedition (Ans.) 1186.
- Juvenile Offenders, Aiding and Abetting (Ans.) 78.
- Keewatin, Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 1040.

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN A.—*Con.*

- King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend House with Returns, 40; remarks on printing Returns, 53; on prop. M. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 93; (Ans.) 140; deb. resmd., 150; (Amt., to refer to Com. on Priv. and Elec.) 151; (personal) 156; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) Ques. of Order, 175; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) as to legality of Amt., 806, 824, 826.
- Lakes Huron and Superior, Water Lots in Harbors, on M. for Cor., 504.
- Lands (North-West) System of Transfer, on M. for Ret., 79.
- Lands, Public, of the Dominion, Acts Consolidation (B. 45, 1°) 98; M. for Com., 860; in Com. 873—888, 935, 936; on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 943.
- Leprohon, Mr., Superannuation of, in Com. of Sup., 763.
- Library of Parliament, Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 36; on M. (*Mr. Colby*) to conc. in Joint Committee's Rep., 630, 1026.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 757, 758, 762, 766.
- Lotteries Amt. Law (B. 136, 1°\*) 1316; 2° m., 1339.
- Manitoba Land Claims Act Amt. Bill 109 (*Mr. Royal*) on withdr., 1034.
- Manitoba Roads and Road Allowances Act Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. Royal*) on M. for 2°, 1035.
- Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 544—546; on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) to M. for 3°, 832.
- Ministerial Explanations, 32.
- Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 87; on M. for Com., 316.
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1039—1045, 1193—1197; conc., 1387.
- Messages from His Excellency (presented) 28, 77, 98
- Naturalization Act of Canada (Ans.) 104; (explanation) 1387.
- Naturalization of Aliens in Man. (B. 140, 1°\*) 1335; 2° m., 1387.
- Negotiations with B.C., *in re* Dry Dock and Island Ry. (Ans.) 657; Explanations as to Progress, 1392; North-West Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1110, 1191.
- Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°\*) 3.
- Order of Business (remarks) 1391.
- Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 1197.
- Phair vs. Veaning, in Com. of Supply, 1193.
- Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 233.
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 753, 755, 756, 1178, 1237.
- Penitentiaries Laws Consolidation (B. 111, 1°\*) 693; Res. in Com., 1035; 2° of B. m., 1038; in Com., 1309; re-com., 1387.
- Petition for Private Bill (C. P. Mattock, &c.) on M. to read and receive, 139.
- Portraits of Speakers of Sen., in Com. of Sup., 761.
- Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 163.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.*

- Prince Albert and N. W. T. Lands, Claims of Inhabitants, on M. for Cor., 131.
- Prince Albert and Edmonton Mail Route (Ans.) 265.
- Printing, Joint Committee on (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 33.
- Private Bills, Petitions for, on M. to extend time, 36.
- Privileges and Elections Com., on Rep. of (remarks) 633.
- Procedure in Criminal Cases Acts Amt. B. 83 (*Mr. Weldon*) on M. for 2°, 323.
- Provincial Governments' Claims against Dominion for Administration of Justice, &c., on M. for Cor., 267.
- Public Business, on the state of, 56, 106.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2°, 94; on ref. to Sel. Com., 102; on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*), 303.
- Public Lands Acts Consolidation (B. 45, 1°) 98; M. for Com., 860; in Com., 873—888, 935, 936; on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 943.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 913, 1185.
- Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1150.
- Railway Trust and Construction Co., limited (B. 141, 1°\*) 1336.
- Rathbun, H. B., and Sons Incorp. B. 26 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on M. for 2°, 77.
- Regina as a Port of Entry (Ans.) 265.
- Regina as the Capital of the N.W., on M. for O.C., 275.
- Reply to Address of H. of C., Mess. from His Excellency (presented) 77.
- Returning Officers in General Elections, on M. for List, 58.
- Richards, S., Allowance to, in Com. of Sup., 1178.
- Royal Academy of Arts, Picture to commemorate Confederation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1173.
- Royal Military College Graduates as D.L.S. B. 33 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on withdr. of B., 1034.
- Royal Society, in Com. of Sup., 1194.
- Salaries of Judges (B. 134) Res. in Com., 1310, 1314.
- Salaries of Sessional Messengers (remarks) 1386.
- Secretary of State (Ans.) 951.
- Select Standing Committees (M. for) 4; M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists 28; Lists presented, 35; conc. in, 36.
- Senate's Extravagance, in Com. of Sup., 758.
- Speaker, Election of (m.) 1.
- Speaker of Senate's Picture, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 758.
- Speech from the Throne, Consideration of (m.) 4.
- Standing Orders Com., on prop. M. (*Mr. Beatty*) for Mess. to Sen., 292.
- Steam Communication (P.E.I. and Mainland) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 1027.
- Stewart, John, Volunteer of 1837-38, on M. for Cor., 266.
- SUPPLY—Administration of Justice, 753; (S. Richards, allowance to) 1178.
- Charges on Revenue (Dominion Lands, Capital) 1199.
- Civil Government (Privy Council) 744; (Justice) 744; (Penitentiaries Branch) 744; (Interior) 744, suppl., 1174, 1237; (Indian Affairs) 746, suppl., 1177; (High Commissioner, Contingencies) 752.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

- Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1010.
- Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveyors) 1111. Income (Outside Service) 1113.
- Dominion Police, 753.
- Excise (Salaries, &c.) 1023.
- Geological Survey, 1088, 1090, 1092.
- Immigration, 848.
- Indians (Annual Grants to suppl. Fund) 1094, 1099; (N.S.) 1101; (B.C.) 1101; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1102, 1106—1110, suppl., 1191; (N.B., Compensation to Rev. Mr. Bannon) 1191.
- Legislation (Salaries, &c., Senate) 757, 758. House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 762; (Grant to Library) 766.
- Miscellaneous (Government of N.W.T., Expenses) 1039; (Extra Clerks, Services of) 1196; (Parliamentary Companion) 1197; (Government of Keewatin, Expenses) 1040; (Publications of Proceedings of Royal Society) 1194; (Dominion Statutes Consolidation) 1040, conc., 1387; (Legal Expenses, John Burgess) 1193; (Mounted Police Barracks) 1041—1044; (International Fisheries Exhibition) 1044; (Retiring Allowances, Dominion Policemen) 1192; (Library, Dept. of Justice) 1045; (Cases decided on B.N.A. Act) 1045; (Phair vs. Venning, Costs and Damages) 1193.
- North-West Mounted Police, 1110; suppl., 1191.
- Railways—Capital: Intercolonial Ry. (Construction Account, old, Commission, &c.) 1151.
- Penitentiaries (Kingston) 753; (Year's Salary to Dillon) 1237; (St. Vincent de Paul) 755; (Dorchester) 755; (Man.) 756; (B.C.) 756; (P.E.I.) 1178.
- Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 913. Miscellaneous (O. Dionne, Services of) 1185.
- Weights and Measures and Gas, 1047, 1050—1052.
- Supreme Court (Ans.) 29.
- Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 550.
- Timber Licenses, on M. for Ret., 61, 229.
- Timber on Indian Lands, on M. for Ret., 294.
- Troops, Withdrawal of, from Halifax, on M. for Ret., 502.
- Vancouver Island Geological Survey (Ans.) 376.
- Walpole Island, Sale of Oak Timber on, on M. for Cor., 1032.
- Ways and Means—on the Budget (reference to a garbled extract) 456.
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1047, 1050—1052.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A., *East York*

- Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 836, 838, 840, 841, 845.
- Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 100; on M. for 2° of B., 192.
- Bayfield (Ont.) Harbor Engineers' Reps., on M. for copies, 775.



MACKENZIE, Hon. A.—*Con.*

- Campbellton and Gaspé Steam Service, on M. for Cor., 505.
- Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 262.
- Census, in Com. of Sup., 838.
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Act Amt B. 51 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 165.
- Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 905.
- Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 743, 746, 748—752.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 147.
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on M. for 3°, 370.
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1009.
- Debates, Official Reps. of, on National Policy, on M. for copies, 503.
- Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 840.
- Dufferin Bridge, Remission of Duties on Iron for, on M. for copies of Cor., 898.
- Easter Adjournment (remarks) 289.
- Electoral Franchise B. 107 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1°, 594.
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 841.
- High Commissioner, Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 752.
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1024.
- Intercolonial Ry. Commission, Claims settled by, on M. for Ret., 134.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on objection of certain Members to serve on Sel. Com., 254.
- King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 172; (Amt. to Amt.) 175.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 372.
- L'Avenir Postmaster, Complaints against, on M. for copies, 902.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 757, 760, 835.
- Lord's Day, Railway Traffic on, on M. for Ret., 900.
- Masters and Mates, Certificates of, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. McLelan*) 429.
- Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) to M. for 3°, 832.
- Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 708, 712, 716.
- Portraits of Speakers of Senate, in Com. of Sup., 761.
- Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund. Act Amt. B. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 163.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 907, 909, 911—913, 922, 924—928.
- Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. B. 69 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 287.
- Railway Cars, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 663.
- Rathbun, H. B., and Sons Incorp. B. 26 (*Mr. White Hastings*) on M. for 2°, 77.
- Reform in the Senate, in Com. of Sup., 760.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A.—*Con.*

- Returning Officers at General Elections, on M. for List, 60.
- Speaker, Election of, on M., 2.
- Speaker of Senate's Pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 760.
- Statistical Accounts of Railways (Que.) 80.
- SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Patent Record) 836; (Census) 838; (Dominion Exhibition) 840; (Health Statistics) 841; (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 845.
- Civil Government* (Privy Council Office) 743; (Interior) 746; (Indian Affairs) 746; (Marine and Fisheries) 748; (Public Works) 749, 750; (Departmental Contingencies) 751; (Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner) 752.
- Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1007, 1009.
- Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1024.
- Legislation* (Salaries, &c., Senate) 757, 760; (Salaries, &c., Library) 835; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 835.
- Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 907. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 909; (Que.) 911; (Ont.) 912; (Repairs, &c.) 913. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 922; (P.E.I.) 924; (N.B.) 924; (Maritime Provinces, generally) 925; (Que.) 925; (Ont.) 927; (Man.) 928.
- Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 551.
- Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 596.
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (railway cars, &c.) 663.

MACKINTOSH, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City*

- Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 648.
- Question of Privilege, on Mr. Charlton's personal reference in Debate in Supply on Contract 15, and Mr. Whitehead (remarks) 1281.

MACMASTER, Mr. D., *Glengarry*

- King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 806.

MACMILLAN, Mr. D., *East Middlesex*

- Intoxicating Liquors, sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1360.

MCCALLUM, Mr. L., *Monck*

- Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 521.
- Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 202, 315.
- Concurrence*—Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1122.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 564.

**McCALLUM, Mr. L.—Con.**

Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadian B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*)  
 Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) 219.  
 Inter-provincial Trade: Subsidy to Steamers between  
 Western Lakes and Quebec, on Rep. of Com., 1122.  
 SUPPLY—*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1004.  
*Railways—Capital*: C.P.R. (Contract 15, and Joseph  
 Whitehead) 1145.  
 Timber on Indian Lands (Ont.) on M. for Ret., 295.  
*Tariff*—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. &  
 M., 613.

**McCARTHY, Mr. D., North Simcoe**

Acadia Powder Co. Incomp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on  
 Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom., 500; in Com., 557.  
 Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com.  
 (Amt.) 286; in Com., 313.  
 Bills of Lading Law Amt. (B. 84, 1°\*) 233; 2° m., 428.  
 Carriers by Land (B. 14, 1°) 38; 2° m., 124; in Com.,  
 202, 314; on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) as to constitution-  
 ality, 418, 426.  
*Concurrence*—Cases decided on B.N.A. Act, 1128.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 1295; in Com., 1298, 1302, 1304—1306, 1308; on M.  
 for 3°, 1317.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. (B. 3, 1°\*) 29;  
 2° m., 140, 149; M. for Com., 558.  
 Criminal Cases, Procedure in (B. 2, 1°) 29.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Mac-*  
*donald*) in Com., 1319—1321, 1323, 1324, 1326, 1328  
 —1331, 1339, 1342, 1345—1347, 1350, 1351, 1355,  
 1358, 1360—1362; on Amts. to recom. (*Mr. Ouimet*)  
 1364; (*Mr. Blake*) 1366, 1369; (*Mr. Patterson,*  
*Esq.*) 1373, 1374; on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.)  
 carried, 1375.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. (*Sir John A.*  
*Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 157.  
 Northern and North-Western and Sault Ste Marie Ry.  
 Co.'s Act. Amt. (B. 76, 1°\*) 150.  
 Northern and North-Western Boundaries of Ont. (M. for  
 copies of Cor.) 556.  
 Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M.  
 for 3°, 1096.  
 Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in  
 Com. on Res., 1311.  
 Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 1292.  
 Titles to Land, Transfer of (B. 97, 1°) 572.  
 Wesleyan Methodist Church Missionary Soc. (B. 43,  
 1°\*) 89.

**McCRAVEY, Mr. W., Halton**

Children's Carriages, Importation of (M. for Ret.) 777.  
*Concurrence*—Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and  
 Ferry) 1122.  
 Expenses at last Dominion Elections (M. for Ret.\*) 383.  
 Inter-provincial Trade: Subsidy to Steamers between  
 Western Lakes and Quebec, on Rep. of Com., 1122.

**McCRAVEY, Mr. R.—Con.**

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Mac-*  
*donald*) in Com., 1324, 1329.  
 Liquor Certificates granted by Physicians (M. for Ret.)  
 777.  
 SUPPLY—*Mail Subsidies* (Hamilton and Point Levis)  
 Ques., 953.  
*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life-boats,  
 &c.) 955.  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont)  
 927.  
 Timber Permits, Rainy Lake and River District (M. for  
 Ret.) 777.

**McDONALD, Mr. W., Cape Breton**

Cape Breton under Confederation, on M. for Stmt., 414,  
 Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
 1271.  
 SUPPLY—*Quarantine* (Sydney, N.S.) 1239.  
 Truro and Pictou Branch Ry. (M. for Cor.\*) 129.

**McINTYRE, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.**

Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for  
 Ret., 48.  
 Harmony and Elmira prop. Ry. (M. for Ret.) 115.  
 Red Point Breakwater (Ques.) 315.  
 SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers  
 (N.S.) 924; Dredging, 929.

**McISAAC, Mr. A., Antigonish**

Bayfield Breakwater Extension (Ques.) 657.  
 Cape George Breakwater, Rebuilding of (Ques.) 502.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLellan*) in Com.  
 1203.  
 Fishing Leases and Licenses, in Com. on B. 101, 1203.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*)  
 in Com., 708.  
 SUPPLY—*Fisheries*: (Salaries, &c., Overseers and  
 Wardens) 1010, 1018; (Services in connection with  
 Bounty) 1186.

**McLELLAN, Hon. A. W., Colchester**

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 748.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. (Res. in Com., and B. 101, 1°\*)  
 526.  
 Fisheries in Inland Waters (Ans.) 82.  
 Fisheries, Protection of, on Georgian Bay, &c., on M.  
 for Cor., 659.  
 Fishing Leases and Licenses in N.B., on M. for Ret.,  
 288.  
 Fog Whistle at Shelburne Harbor (Ans.) 107.  
 Goose Island (N.S.) Lighthouse, (Ans.) 166.  
 Hydrographic Survey, on M. for Cor., 82.  
 Life-Saving Stations, on M. for Cor., 128; as to keepers  
 (Ans.) 502.  
 Liverpool Harbor Buoy (Ans.) 130.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of (B. 89) Res. in Com.,  
 428; 1°\* of B., 431; 2° m., 702; in Com., 708,  
 3° m., 734.

**McLELAN, Hon. A. W.—Con.**

- Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 66.  
 Pictou Harbor Act Amt. (Res. and B. 108, 1°\*), 741.  
 (vol. ii.)  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 713, 718.  
 Pilotage Acts Amt. (Ans.) 165  
 Pilotage Authorities in B.C., on M. for copies of Cor., 207.  
 Sailors, Release of Imprisoned, at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 381.  
 Shipping Disasters on Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 32.  
 St. Lawrence River, restrictions in the use of the Channels (Ans.) 657.  
 SUPPLY—*Civil Government* (Marine and Fisheries) 748.  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of (Ans.) 81.  
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 496; in Com. on Res. 2 (cordage) 668.

**McMILLAN, Mr. J., South Huron**

- Bayfield Harbor, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 774.  
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 463; in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 680; (agricultural implements) 687.

**McMULLEN, Mr. J., North Wellington**

- Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Bill Stamps, Redemption of (Ques.) 502.  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 934.  
 Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1228; on M. for 3° (list of names presented) 1364.  
 Concurrence—Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1121.  
 Customs Duties Refunded at Port of Toronto (M. for Ret.\*) 660.  
 Intercolonial Ry. Earnings per ton per mile (Ques.) 1121, 1122.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1320.  
 Lord's Day, Observance of (Ques.) 767; Railway Traffic on (M. for Ret.) 899.  
 Question of Privilege, on Toronto *Mail's* correspondence in re Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1059.  
 SUPPLY—*Canals—Capital*: Cornwall (Construction of Drain) 1072.  
*Railways—Capital*: Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1062; C.P.R. (Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead) 1148; (Refund to Mr. Ketchum) 1156.  
 Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 624.  
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (glass show cases) 671; (wools and woollens) 675; (printed and dyed cottons) 679.

**McNEILL, Mr. A., North Bruce**

- Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) on M. for 2°, 228.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 557.  
 England's Commercial Policy, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. of Sup., 1084.  
 Englishmen as Foreigners, in Com. of Sup., 761.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1330, 1360; on Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373.  
 Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 260; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 641.  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 719.  
 Reciprocity with the United States, on M. for Cor., 272.  
 SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1014.  
*Legislation* (Salaries, &c. Senate) 761.  
 Timber on Indian Lands, Ont. (M. for Ret.) 292.  
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 680.

**MASSUE, Mr., Richelieu**

- Agricultural Fertilizers (prop. Res.) 116; (M. for Sel. Com.) 207.  
 Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 80, 1°\*) 161.  
 Veterans of 1812 (M. for Ret.\*) 40

**MÉTHOT, Mr. F. X. O., Nicolet**

- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 162; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 311.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1357.

**MITCHELL, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.**

- Accidents and Casualties on Rys. (M. for Ret.) 659.  
 Address, on the, 27.  
 Bannon, Rev. Mr., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
 Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 788.  
 Burgess, Mr., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1192.  
 Chatham to Escuminac Telegraph (Ques.) 81.  
 Concurrence—Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1117; Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1123.  
 Cordage, in Com. on W. & M., 669.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 664.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 148.  
 Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 587—593, 696—697  
 Dionne O., Services of, in Com. of Sup., 1184.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1205.  
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1011, 1016.

MITCHELL, Hon. P.—*Con.*

- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Accidents and Casualties (M. for Ret.\*) 232.  
 Grand Trunk and North Shore Rys. B. 113 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 692; in Com., 804.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co. purchasing Bonds and Shares of other Companies (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 232.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Returns (Ques.) 166, 204.  
 Grand Trunk Ry. Co., Sale of the Rivière du Loup Branch, &c. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 232.  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1191.  
 Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 120.  
 Intercolonial Ry., Coast and Island Communication with (Ques.) 81.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1339; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1367.  
 Iron and Manufacturers of, in Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, conc., 1117.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 705.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (Ques.) 540, 543.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1193, 1194.  
 Phair vs. Venning, in Com. of Sup., 1194.  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 710.  
 Portage Island, Miramichi River (M. for copies of Cor.) 272.  
 Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Repeal Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 427.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1184.  
 Queddy River Driving and Boom Co. (M. to receive Petition) 185; withdn., 187.  
 Railway Accidents and Casualties (M. for Ret.) 659.  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1063, 1156 conc., 1123.  
 Railway Cars, in Com. on W. & M., 663.  
 Representation in N.B., remarks on the Address, 27.  
 Riparian Rights, in Com. on B. 101 (*Mr. McLellan*) 1205.  
 Royal Academy of Arts (request for members to speak louder) 1173.  
 Royal Canadian Passenger Steamship Co. Incorp. (B. 55, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 129  
 Signal Stations at North Cape and East Point (P.E.I.) on M. for Ret., 1026.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 210.  
 St. Charles Branch and Ferry, in Com. of Sup., 1063; conc., 1123.  
 SUPPLY—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1011, 1016.  
*Indians* (Annual Grant to supplement Fund) 1095; (N.B., compensation to Rev. Mr. Bannon) 1191.  
*Miscellaneous* (Legal Expenses, John Burgess) 1193; (Phair vs. Venning, Costs and Legal Expenses) 1194.

MITCHELL, Hon. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

- Public Works—Income*: Miscellaneous (O. Dionne: for services) 1184.  
*Railways—Capital*: Intercolonial (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1063; conc., 1123, (land and other claims) 1156.  
 Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 549, 551, 555.  
 Washington Treaty, Termination of (Ques.) 81.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (railway cars, &c.) 663; (cotton duck) 664; (cordage) 669; (iron, and manufacturers of) 672.

MOFFAT, Mr. R., *Restigouche*

- Jacques, J., and Kearney, C., appointment of, on M. for copies of Cor., 507.  
 Public Contracts, Fraud in Relation to, B. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 306.

MULOCK, Mr. W., *North York*

- Consolidated Ry. Act (1879) Amt. (B. 15, 1<sup>o</sup>) 39; M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 103; withdn., 281; (Ques.) 383.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1307.  
 Patent Rights, Prevention of Fraud in (B. 98, 1<sup>o</sup>\*) 315.  
 SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1243.

O'BRIEN, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka*

- Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 282.  
 Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 2<sup>o</sup>, 1231.  
 Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1300.  
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 881.  
 Fisheries, Protection of, on Georgian Bay, &c. (M. for copies of Cor.) 657.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 531; in Com., 586, 731.  
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 853, 858.  
 Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 724.  
 Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1097.  
 Returning Officers in General Elections, on M. for List, 58.  
 Richmond Field Battery and Field Batteries generally (remarks on the position of the officers) on M. for Ret., 205.  
 SUPPLY—*Militia* (Ammunition) 853; (Drill Instructions and Drill Pay, &c.) 858.

ORTON, Mr. G. T., *Centre Wellington*

- Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 842, 844.  
 Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 315.  
 Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 144; on M. for Com., 566.

ORTON, Mr. G. T.—*Con.*

- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com. (Amt.) 162; (Amt. to Amt.) 219; on M. for 3°, 370.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 868; in Com., 875, 880.
- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 920.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1328, 1340, 1347; on Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) 1369, (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373.
- Legislation in Com. of Sup., 765.
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1041.
- Ordnance Lands or Naval Reserves (M. for Ret.) 54.
- Prince Albert and Edmonton Mail Route (Ques.) 265.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1244.
- Regina as a Port of Entry (Ques.) 265.
- Regina as the Capital of the N.W., on M. for O.C., &c., 274.
- Regina, Immigrant Shed and Improvements at, (Ques.) 265.
- SUPPLY—*Arts Agriculture, &c.* (Health Statistics) 842; (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 844.
- Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 765.
- Miscellaneous* (N. W. Mounted Police, Compensation to Members) 1041.
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1244.
- Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1048.

OUMET, Mr. J. A., *Laval*

- Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 499.
- Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. to consd. B. (prop. Res. as to constitutionality) 415.
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 309.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) 1364; carried (Y. 148, N. 1) 1365; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1368.
- Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 725.
- Promissory Notes, &c., Repeal of Duty Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 428.
- Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1337.

PAINT, Mr. H. N., *Richmond, N.S.*

- Concurrence—House of Commons* (Shorthand Writers, &c.) 1214; Fishery Bounty (Services in connection with) 1223.
- Gulf of St. Lawrence Telegraph (Ques.) 68.
- Inter-provincial Trade (M. for Sel. Com.) 113; Com. appointed 135; M. for power to send for persons, papers, &c. 139.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1361.
- Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for 2°, 707; in Com., 708.

PAINT, Mr. H. N.—*Con.*

- Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 544.
- Sable Island Telegraph Communication (Ques.) 68.
- SUPPLY—*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Lifeboats, &c.) 956; (Triennial List of Shipping) 956.

PATTERSON, Mr. J. C., *North Essex*

- Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 315.
- Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 591.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) 1368; on M. for 5° (Amt. to recom.) 1373; neg. (Y. 58, N. 80) 1374; (Amt. to recom.) neg., 1374.

PATERSON, Mr. W., *South Brant*

- Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1113.
- Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 837.
- Brant County Bank Incorp. (B. 52, 1°\*) 106.
- Canada and Spain, Trade Relations between, Instructions to Sir A. T. Galt (M. for Ret.) 547.
- Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 746.
- Civil Service Superannuation Act Consolidation B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M for 2°, 1233.
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1113; conc., 1125.
- Concurrence—Adulteration of Food*, 1125; Customs (Man.) 1226.
- Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 664—666.
- Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 593, 696, 702.
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1003, 1006, 1008.
- Debates, Official Reps. of, on M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps. of Com., 1135; in Com. of Sup., 765.
- Drawbacks, Claims for (M. for Ret.) 66.
- Drawbacks on Articles manufactured for Export, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. of Sup., 1129; on 2° Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1388—1390.
- Hawaiian Islands, Reciprocal Trade with, on Res. (*Mr. Homer*) 232.
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1099, 1377.
- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 790; in Com., 916—922; on M. for 3°, 999.
- Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (*Mr. Beatty*) on M. for 2°, 122.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1368—1370.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 765.
- Printed and Dyed Cottons, in Com. on W. & M., 678, 680.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 908.
- Question of Privilege, on Toronto *Mail's* Correspondence in re Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1058.
- Railway Cars, &c., in Com. on W. & M., 663.
- Reciprocal Trade with Brazil, &c., on M. for Cor., 774.

PATERSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Royal Academy of Arts, Picture to commemorate Confederation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1173.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (remarks on Member speaking twice) 1268.

Supply B. 128 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1388—1390.

SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Census) 837.

*Civil Government* (Auditor-General's Office) 746.

*Collection of Revenues* (Adulteration of Food) 1113; conc., 1125.

*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1000, 1003, 1006, 1008.

*Excise* (Salaries, &c.) 1021—1024; conc., 1118—1120.

*Indians* (Annual Grant to supplement Fund) 1099; (N.W.T., Industrial Schools) 1377.

*Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 765.

*Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 908.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1047, 1053, 1056.

Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 549; (personal explanation) 552.

Tobacco and Snuff, in Com. on W. & M., 673.

*Ways and Means*—Budget Speech (reply to) 345; in Com. on Res. 2 (braces or suspenders) 662; (railway cars, &c.) 663; (cotton duck) 664—666; (tobacco and snuff) 673; (printed and dyed cottons) 678, 680; (coal dust) 692.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1047, 1053, 1056.

PICKARD, Mr. J., *York, N.B.*

Debates, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks) 694.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) Ques., 501.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1273; in Com., 1287.

SUPPLY—*Administration of Justice* (Widow of Judge Fisher) 1273.

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Patent Record) 836.

PLATT, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward*

*Concurrence—Health Statistics*, 1116.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1036.

Life-saving Stations, &c. (M. for Cor.) 126; (Ques) as to keepers, 502; in Com. of Sup., 954, 1249.

Mail Carriage, Change of, in Prince Edward County (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 226.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 706.

Murray Canal and Presqu' Isle and Weller's Bay Harbors (M. for Ret.) 204.

Pictou and Trenton Mail Service (Ques) 502.

SUPPLY—*Canals—Capital*: Murray, 1071.

*Militia* (Drill Pay &c.) 857.

*Ocean and River Service*: (Examination of Masters and Mates) 953; (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.) 954, suppl., 1249.

PLATT, Mr. J. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Post Office* (Mail Service, &c.) 1079.

*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 928.

POPE, Hon. J. H., *Compton*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 583; in Com. of Sup., 748, 1132.

Archives, Care of, in Com. of Sup., 836.

Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 836, 837, 840, 841, 844; conc., 1115, 1129.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. and The North American Contracting Co., on M. for Cor., 779.

Canadian Pacific Ry., on Comparative Statement of Freight Rates, 997.

Census, in Com. of Sup., 837.

Census Records (1881) on M. for Stmt., 104.

Census Returns, Distribution of (Ans.) 89.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 748, 1132.

*Concurrence—Patent Record*, 1129.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1301.

Dominion, The, Persons entering, leaving and settling, on M. for Stmt., 295.

Immigrant Children, Care of (Ans.) 501.

Immigration and Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 845, 1134, 1238; conc., 1115.

Immigration to Canada (1882) on M. for Ret., 80.

Irish Immigration (Ans.) 547.

Library of Parl., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Joint Com., 1026.

National Policy, Trans. of Rep. of Sel. Com. (Ans.) 89.

Patent Act Amt. (B. 122, 1°\*) 957; 2° m., 1227.

Patent Record, in Com. of Sup., 836; conc., 1129.

Statistics, in Com. of Sup. (Criminal) 837; (Health) 841; (Agricultural, &c., Man.) 844.

SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Care of Archives) 836;

(Patent Record) 836, conc., 1129; (Criminal Statistics) 837; (Census) 837; (Dominion Exhibition) 840; (Health Statistics) 841, conc., 1115; (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 844.

*Civil Government* (Agriculture) 748, 1132.

*Immigration and Quarantine*, 845; conc., 1115; suppl., 1134, 1238.

Vital Statistics (Ans.) 56.

REID, Mr. J., *Cariboo*

Barkerville and Forks of Quesnelle Mail Service (M. for copies of Cor.) 302.

Cotton Wood Canon Improvements (Ques.) 315.

RICHEY, Mr. M. H., *Halifax*

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp B. (*Mr. Tupper*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 499.

Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. (B. 25, 1°\*) 56; 2° m., 225; in Com., 781.

**RICHEY, Mr. M. H.—Con.**

- Concurrence—Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1121.  
 Criminal Laws Consolidation (Ques.) 78.  
 Fishery Bounty Augmentation (Ques.) 1025.  
 Immigrant Children, Care of (Ques.) 501.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 918.  
 Inter-provincial Trade, Cheap Freights, conc., 1121.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1322, 1331, 1346, 1348; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1370.  
 Juvenile Offenders, Aiding and Abetting (Ques.) 78.  
 Presbyterian Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund Amalg. (B. 63, 1°\*) 140; in Com., 372.  
 St. Charles Branch and Ferry, conc., 1121.  
 SUPPLY—Pensions (*Mrs. Ed. Duckett*) 1134.

**RINFRET, Mr. C. J., Lotbiniere**

- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 580.  
 Lake St. Peter and St. Lawrence River and Canals, Deepening of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.\*) 903.  
 L'Avenir Postmaster, Complaints against (M. for copies) 902.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for 2°, 704.  
 Octave C. de la Chevretière, Dismissal of (M. for Ret.\*) 40.  
 St. Lawrence River, Restriction in the use of the Channels (Ques.) 657.  
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 399.

**RIOPEL, Mr. L. J., Bonaventure**

- Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. (B. 32, 1°\*) 77; 2° m., 125.

**ROBERTSON, Mr. T., Hamilton**

- Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. to recom., 284.  
 Criminal Cases, Evidence in (B. 4, 1°) 32.  
 Criminal Cases, Procedure in, before Justices of the Peace out of Session (B. 12, 1°\*) 38.  
 County Judges, Criminal Court, Cases before (B. 11, 1°) 38; 2° m., 103; M. to ref. B. to Sp. Com., 118.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of, on National Policy, on M. for copies, 503.  
 Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 70, 1°\*) 150.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1345, 1360; on M. for 3° (Amt to recom.) carried, 1375.  
 Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 321.  
 Navigable Waters, Unprotected Holes, &c. (B. 30, 1°) 67; 2° m. and ref. to Sel. Com., 125.

**ROBERTSON, Mr. T.—Con.**

- Petition for Private Bill: Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Ry. Co. (M. to read and receive) 139.  
 Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, B. 142 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 1337, 1340.  
 Speedy Trials Acts Amt. Consolidation (B. 86, 1°) 233.  
 Wife Beating, Punishment for, B. 81 (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 2° m. and ref. to Sel. Com., 287.

**ROBERTSON, Mr. T., Shelburne**

- Bounty to Fishermen, \$150,000 (M. for Ret.\*) 129.  
 Cable Extension from Barrington to Cape Sable Island (Ques.) 107.  
 Concurrence—Fishery Overseers and Wardens, 1116; Fishery Bounty (Services in connection with) 1224—1226.  
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1014, 1189; conc., 1116, 1224.  
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1090.  
 Inter-provincial Trade, on M. for Sel. Com., 115.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1376.  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1019.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLellan*) on M. for 2°, 705, 707.  
 P.E.I., Claim of Govt. of, for refund of expenditure on Public Works, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 232.  
 Shelburne Harbor Fog Whistle (Ques.) 107.  
 Steamboat Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1190.  
 SUPPLY—Fisheries (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1014, conc., 1116; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1189, conc., 1224.  
 Geological Survey, 1090.  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 1019.  
 Steamboat Inspection, 1190.  
 Westhaver's Point, Lighthouse at, on M. for Cor., 780.

**Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar**

- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 870; in Com., 880, 882.  
 Presbyterian Church Manse and Building Fund Incorp. (B. 75, 1°\*) 150.  
 Selkirk as a Port of Entry (Ques.) 315.

**Ross, Mr. G. W., West Middlesex**

- "A" and "B" Batteries, Number of Officers, &c., and Cost of each Battery (M. for Ret.\*) 659.  
 Acetic Acid, in Com. on W. M., 661.  
 Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 836, 837, 840, 841, 844; conc., 1128.  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 46 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 193; in Com., 282.  
 Books, on M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. on W. & M., 739.

Ross, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

- Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com., 520.
- Burland, G. B. & Co., Contracts for Lithographing (M. for copies of Cor.\*) 556.
- Canadian Pacific Ry., Contracts "A" and "B" (M. for Stmt.\*) 556.
- Cartridge Factory, Quebec, Cost of (M. for Ret.\*) 659.
- Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 743, 745, 746, 748, 751, 752, 1131, 1176, 1177; conc., 1114.
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 90 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 933, 934; in Com. on B., 1035.
- Civil Service Superannuation Acts Amt. B. 91 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 793; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> of B. (Amt.) 1364.
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1073, 1077.
- Concurrence—Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) 1114; Library (Salaries, &c.) 1114; Printing, &c., the Laws, 1114; Excise, 1120; *Canada Gazette*, 1120; Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1123; Trent Valley Nav. (Survey) 1123; J. L. Demers (Balance of Account) 1279; A. Audet (for Translating) 1280; C.P.R. Commission (Sundry Expenses) 1280; Unprovided Items, 1280.
- Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 101.
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1002, 1005.
- Debates, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks) 694; in Com. of Sup., 763, 765.
- Departmental Reps., Compilation of (prop. Res.) 298; withdn., 301.
- Grange Trust (limited) Incorp. B. 44 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. for Com., 701.
- Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 915.
- Intercolonial Ry. Commission, Claims settled by (M. for Ret.) 135.
- Intercolonial Ry., Purchase and Nature of Rolling Stock (M. for Ret.) 380.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1319, 1320, 1323, 1324, 1326—1328, 1330, 1331, 1340, 1354, 1358—1360, 1362; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt. to recom.) neg. (Y. 66, N. 79) 1366; on Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373.
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 757, 762, 763, 765, 766, 835; conc., 1114.
- Leprohon, Mr., Superannuation of, in Com. of Sup., 763.
- Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 952,
- Military Districts, Appointments of Officers, &c., in (M. for Ret.\*) 659.
- Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 533; in Com., 584, 729—732; on adjd. deb., 830.
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 853, 854, 856, 858, 860.
- Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 724.

Ross, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1038, 1041, 1045, 1195; conc., 1120.
- Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 955, 956.
- Ontario Elections, Interference of Senators, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 758.
- Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 852, 853.
- Peters, Major, Charges against (M. for Cor.) 781.
- Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 710.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in Relation to, B. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (Amt. to recom.) 302, 305.
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 908, 915, 926, 929, 930, 1183, 1184.
- Question of Privilege, on Correspondence in Toronto. Mail *in re* Increased Indemnity (remarks) 1057.
- Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1064, 1065, 1153.
- Royal Military Col. Instruction Staff (M. for Ret.\*) 659.
- Royal Society of Canada Incorp. B. 37 (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 264.
- Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1262, 1270.
- Salaries of Sessional Messengers (remarks) 1386.
- Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 957.
- Speaker of Senate's Picture, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 758.
- SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Care of Archives, &c.) 836; (Patent Record) 836, conc., 1128; (Criminal Statistics) 837; (Census) 836; (Dominion Exhibition) 840; (Health Statistics) 841; (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 844.
- Civil Government* (Privy Council Office) 743; (Interior) 745, suppl., 1176; (Auditor General's Office) 746; (Finance and Treasury Board) 746; (Post Office) 748; (Departmental Contingencies) 751; (Stationery Office) 751; (Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner) 751, suppl., 1177; (Post Office and Finance Depts., Contingencies) 752, conc., 1114; (Customs) 1131; (Indian Affairs) 1177.
- Collection of Revenues: Repairs and Working Expenses* (Intercolonial Ry.) 1073; (Canals) 1077.
- Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1002, 1005.
- Legislation* (Salaries &c., Senate) 757; House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 762; (Publishing Debates) 763, 765; (Grant to Library) 766; (Printing, &c., the Laws) 835, conc., 1114; (Miscellaneous Printing) 835.
- Mail Subsidies* (Lakes Huron and Superior) 952; (West Indies and Brazil) 952.
- Militia* (Military Branch and District Staff Salaries) 853; (Ammunition &c.) 855; (Drill Pay) 856; (Care of Military Properties) 858; (Royal Military College) 858; ("A" and "B" Batteries) 860; (Artillerymen at Shoeburyness) 860.



ROSS, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

*Miscellaneous (Canada Gazette)* 1038, conc., 1120; (*Miscellaneous Printing*) 1038; (*Dominion Statutes Consolidation*) 1041; (*Cases decided on B.N.A. Act*) 1045; (*Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings*) 1195.

*Ocean and River Service (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.)* 955; (*Triennial List of Shipping*) 956.

*Pensions (Veterans of 1812)* 852; (*Compensation in lieu of land*) 853.

*Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional)* 908. *Income: Buildings (Repairs, &c.)* 915, suppl., 1183; (*Que.*) 1182. *Harbors and Rivers (Ont.)* 926; *Dredging*, 929; *Miscellaneous*, 930; (*O. Dionne, for services*) 1184.

*Railways—Capital: Intercolonial (Rolling Stock)* 1061; (*Construction Account, old, Commission, &c.*) 1153. *General (Surveys and Inspections)* 1064; (*Town of Pembroke Bonus*) 1065.

*Scientific Institutions (Observatories)* 957.

*Unprovided Items*, 1199; conc., 1280.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1045, 1046 1048, 1051—1053.

*United States, Reciprocity with the (M. for Cor.)* 267. *Unprovided Items, in Com. of Sup.*, 1199; conc., 1280.

*Ways and Means—on the Budget*, 383; in *Com. on Res. 2 (acetic acid)* 661; conc. (*books*) 739.

*Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup.*, 1045, 1046, 1048, 1051—1053.

ROYAL, Mr. J., *Provencher*

*Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks)* 785.

*Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M.*, 682, 684. *Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup.*, 844.

*Canadian Pacific Ry., Construction in Manitoba, &c. (M. for Ret.\*)* 903.

*Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (Mr. Cameron, Huron)* on *M. to receive Rep. of Com.*, (*Amt.*) 201.

*Customs, in Com. of Sup.*, 1008.

*Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (Sir John A. Macdonald)* on *M. for Com.*, 866; in *Com.*, 873, 880, 886.

*Hudson's Bay, Season of Navigation, on M. for Ret.*, 62.

*Immigration, in Com. of Sup.*, 846.

*Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (Sir John A. Macdonald)* on *Amt. (Mr. Blake)* 1371.

*Legislation, in Com. of Sup.*, 765.

*Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. (correction)* 741.

*Lumber, Importation of, into Man. (M. for Ret.)* 94.

*Manitoba Land Claims Act Amt. (B. 109, 1°\*)* 660; *wthdn.*, 1034.

*Manitoba Roads and Road Allowances Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°\*)* 660; 2° *m.*, 1034.

ROYAL, Mr. J.—*Con.*

*Prince Albert and N.W.T. Lands, Claims of Inhabitants, on M. for Cor.*, 131.

*Quarantine, in Com of Sup.*, 1239.

*Repatriation of Canadians, on M. for Stmt.*, 895.

*Révérènds Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée des Territoires du Nord-Ouest Incorp. (B. 19, 1°\*)* 52; *M. for Com.* 244; 3° *m.*, 368.

*Salaries of Sessional Messengers (remarks)* 1386.

*SUPPLY—Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.)* 844.

*Customs (Salaries, &c.) Ques.*, 1008.

*Immigration*, 846.

*Legislation (Publishing Debates)* 765.

*Quarantine (Sydney, N.S.)* 1239.

*Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (agricultural implements)* 682, 684.

RYKERT, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln*

*Canadian Pacific Ry. Commission, Sundry Expenses, conc.*, 1280.

*Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. Abbott)* 2° *objected to*, 784.

*Concurrence—Excise*, 1120; *C.P.R. Commission, Sundry Expenses*, 1280.

*Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7 (Mr. Cameron, Huron)* in *Com. (Amt. that Com. rise)* 200.

*Debates, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks)* 694.

*Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (Sir John A. Macdonald)* on *M. to adj. deb.*, 951.

*Excise, conc.*, 1120.

*Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, on M. for Sel. Com. (Sir John A. Macdonald)* 250.

*Ontario Elections and Toronto Globe's charges, on Question of Priv. on Increased Indemnity (remarks)* 1058.

*Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper)* 1259, 1268.

*Ways and Means—on the Budget*, 392.

SCOTT, Mr. T., *Winnipeg*

*Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (Sir John A. Macdonald)* on *M. for Com.*, 872; in *Com.*, 875, 876, 880.

*Exhibition, Grant of Land for (M. for Cor.\*)* 1034.

*Fort Osborne Park (M. for Cor.\*)* 1034.

*Prince Arthur's Landing and Rat Portage, Ry. between (Ques.)* 1025.

*Winnipeg Post Office Sites (Ques.)* 889.

SCRIVER, Mr. J. C., *Huntingdon*

*Canadian Electric Light Co.'s B. 105 (Mr. Bergeron)* on *M. for 2°*, 702.

*Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (Mr. Bowell)* in *Com.*, 696, 700.

*Customs, in Com. of Sup.*, 1005, 1008.

SCRIVER, Mr. J. C.—*Con.*

- Indians, in Com., of Sup., 1094.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 918.  
 Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 256.  
 McMillan, J. D., Dismissal of (M. for Cor.\*) 77.  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 537.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 926.  
 Returning Officers in General Elections, on M. for List, 58.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 213.  
 SUPPLY—*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) Ques., 1005, 1008.  
*Indians* (Annual Grant to supplement Fund) 1094.  
*Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers* (Que.) 926; (Ont.) 926.

SHAKESPEARE, Mr. N., *Victoria, B.C.*

- Chinese Immigration into B.C. (prop. Res.) 323, 906.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 587.  
 Immigration into B.C., including Chinese (M. for Cor., &c.) 72.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1327, 1341, 1345.  
 Pilotage Authorities in B.C., on M. for Cor., 207.  
 Salaries of Sessional Messengers (remarks) 1386.  
 SUPPLY—*Penitentiaries* (British Columbia) 757.

SMALL, Mr. J., *East Toronto*

- Dominion Ry. Trust and Construction Co. Incorp. (B. 41, 1°\*) 89; 2° m., 164.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1360.  
 SUPPLY—*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Lifeboats, &c.) 954.  
 Toronto Harbor and Esplanade (B. 106, 1°) 574.

SMYTH, Mr. H., *Kent*

- Buckhorn, Lake Erie, Pier at (Ques.) 890.  
 Elm Logs, Export Duty on (Ques.) 889.  
 Jeannette's Creek, Obstruction of, by G. T. R. (Ques.) 890.

SOMERVILLE, Mr. J., *North Brant*

- Expenses of Members of the Govt. in England (M. for Ret.) 381.  
 Toronto *Mail's* Correspondence in re Increased Indemnity (Ques. of Priv.) 1058.

SPEAKER, THE (HON. G. A. KIRKPATRICK) *Frontenac*

- Accountant, Receipts and Expenditure (presented) 29.  
 Adjournment of Debate, verbal Motions: practice (remarks) 1369.  
 Bank Shareholders Lists (presented) 40, 77.  
 Canadian Electric Light Co.'s B., on Ques. as to Petition (Ans.) 547.

SPEAKER, The—*Con.*

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B., on objection to 2° (remarks) 784.  
 Commons, Rights and Privileges of, claimed in Sen., 3.  
 Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps. (read) 3, 4, 40, 187.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22, on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Houde*): ruled out of Order, no notice having been given, 219; attention called to expiration of time for consdn. of Private Bills, 313.  
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 7, on consdn. of B. as rep. from Com. as amended, 201.  
 Debate, Personal and Insulting allusions in, checked, 520.  
 Debates, Official Reps. of, on M. for copies containing Deb. on N. P.: ruled out of Order as involving a charge, 503.  
 Extract from Newspapers reflecting on Members: ruled should be read by Clerk at Table, 1170.  
 Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 5, on discharge of Order and ref. to Sel. Com. (remarks) 94.  
 General Elections and defeated ex-Ministers, irrelevant matter, 524.  
 Incorrect Statement: ruled that Ques. cannot be opened again for discussion, 1369.  
 Interest, Rate of, B., M. to place on Order Paper for 2° in order, 957.  
 Inter-provincial Trade, on M. for Sel. Com.: attention of H. drawn to notice of motion of names not having been given, 115.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, on formation of Sel. Com., objections to serve on Com. by *Mr. Blake* and others: ruled that Members, having declared against the principle of the Res., are exempt from serving on Com., 254.  
 Jacques Cartier Election, Judge's Rep., 4.  
 Joliette Election, Judge's Rep., 3.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election: Clerk of Crown in Chancery in attendance with Returns (notification to House) 52, Return altered, 827.  
 King's (N.B.) Election, Judge's Rep., 3.  
 King's (P.E.I.) Election, Judge's Rep., 40.  
 Library of Parliament, Rep. (presented) 4.  
 Member speaking twice allowed by courtesy of the House, 949, 1120.  
 Messages from His Ex. (read) '28, 77, 98, 288, 999, 1207, 1363.  
 Misdemeanors B. 6, dropped, on M. to place on Order Paper: ruled that no B. before the House can be killed by Com., 332.  
 New Members, Return of (announcement) 3.  
 Newspaper Extracts, reading of, not in Order, unless M. is to be made, 1169.  
 Northern Ry. Co.'s B., attention called to Amts. made by Sel. Standing Com. on Rys. on Sen. B.: ruled, it must be considered as having been amended in Com. of W., 1098.

SPEAKER, The—*Con.*

Paragraph in Speech from the Throne relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. to ref. to Sel. Com., on Ques. of Order that no B. relating to trade can be introduced except through Com. of W.: ruled, Res. to ref. par. to Sel. Com., in Order, 235.

Personal and Insulting Allusions in deb. checked, 520.

Personal Explanation allowed if member has been misquoted, 552.

Petition for Private B., on M. to read and receive: ruled that Petitions from Foreigners seeking incorporation may be received, 138.

Proceedings of the House, altering King's County (P.E.I.) Election Return (remarks) 827.

Prorogation, Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1391.

Queen's County (P. E. I.) Election, Supreme Court Judgment (read) 84.

Question of Order (Intoxicating Liquors B.) on Amt. to Amt. and main motion being similar: Precedents quoted, and Amt. to Amt. ruled in order, 176.

Questions of Privilege: Notice of adjd. deb. not appearing on Order Paper; practice (remarks) 102.

Rathbun, H. B., and Sons Incorp. B. 26 (explanation) 77.

Rouville Election, Judge's Rep., 187.

South Norfolk Election, Judges's Rep., 3.

Speech from the Throne (rep.) 3.

Speaker, Election as, 2.

St. Hyacinthe Election, Judge's Rep., 187.

St. Peter's Road (P.E.I.) Ry. Crossing, on Ques.: ruled that no argument or opinion can be offered, nor fact stated, 107.

Suspension of Rule 78, objection by *Mr. Blake*: ruled that notice having been given it is within the power of the House to suspend Rule, 253.

Tariff Debate, latitude in, Member to use his discretion, 551; permitted, 552.

Terrebonne Election, Judge's Rep., 3.

Throwing Paper in the House, Members requested to desist, 1086.

Unparliamentary Language (Communication with P.E.I.) 71; (Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge) 519, 520; (Dom. Lands Acts Consolidation B.) 948, 950; (Intoxicating Liquors B.) 1367.

Verchères Election, Judge's Rep., 3.

SPOULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey*

Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 689.

Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 842.

Books, on M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. on W. & M., 740.

Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 203.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1297.

SPOULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 144.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 875—888; on Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) to M. for 3°, 947.

Fever contracted while in Camp, in Com. on Militia B., 585; in Com. of Sup., 856.

Immigration and Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 849.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1326, 1357.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 646.

Masters and Mates, Certificates of, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. McLellan*) 430.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Con., 585.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 856.

Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 724, 725.

Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1383.

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 956.

Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Repeal Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 427.

Regina as the Capital of the N.W., on M. for O.C., &c., 279.

Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 212.

SUPPLY—*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Health Statistics) 842. *Immigration and Quarantine*, 849.

*Militia* (Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, &c.) 856.

*Miscellaneous* (Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I.) 1383.

*Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life-boats, &c.) 956.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1049, 1054.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 468; in Com. on Res. 2 (agricultural implements) 689; conc. (books) 740.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, in Com. of Sup., 1049, 1054.

SUTHERLAND, Mr. H., *Selkirk*

Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 683.

Agricultural Implements, &c., imported into Man. (Ms. for Stmnts.\*) 525.

Brandon as a Customs Port of Entry (Ques.) 166.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 114 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 889; on M. to recom., 889.

Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 665.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 865; in Com., 874—881.

Lands South of C.P.R., withdrawal from Homestead and Preemption (M. for O.C., &c.\*) 525.

SUTHERLAND, Mr. H.—*Con.*

- Manitoba and North-Western Fire Ins. Co. Incorp. (B. 24, 1°\*) 56.  
 Post Office, New, at Brandon (Ques.) 166.  
 Subsidies or Grants for Man. (M. for Cor., &c.\*) 525.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 480; in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 665; (agricultural implements) 683.

SUTHERLAND, Mr. J., *North Oxford*

- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1361.  
*Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 679.

TASSÉ, Mr. J., *Ottawa City*

- Address, on the, 29.  
 French Rights and Privileges: remarks on the Address, 29.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 851.  
 Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co. Incorp. (B. 66, 1°\*) 140; M. for Com., 941.  
 Repatriation of Canadians (M. for Stmnt.) 890.  
 Royal Society of Canada Incorp. (B. 37, 1°\*) 89; 2° m., 262.  
 Subsidies to Rys., on [prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1273.  
 SUPPLY—*Immigration*, 854.

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *South Leeds*

- Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 683, 691  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Cottons, Printed and Dyed, in Com. on W. & M., 681.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 910.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1325, 1347, 1361.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 586.  
 Walpole Island, Sale of Oak Timber on, on M. for Cor., 1033.  
*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 475; in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 681; (agricultural implements) 683, 691.

THOMPSON, Mr. D., *Haldimand*

- Annual Camps, on 3° of B. 31 (Ques.) 834.  
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 583.  
 Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 723, 725.  
 Paper throwing in the House (Ques. of Order.) 1086.  
 Veterans of 1812-15, or Widows of, Pensions or Grants of Land to (Ques.) 657.

TILLEY, Hon. Sir LEONARD, *St. John, N.B.*

- Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) in Com., 262.  
 Adjournments (M.) 931.

TILLEY, Hon. Sir LEONARD.—*Con.*

- Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 682.  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) in Com., 782.  
 Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 35.  
 Bank Act Amt. (B. 46) Res. 98; in Com., 99; 1°\* of B., 100; 2° m., 187, 189, 192; in Com., 282.  
 Books, on M. to conc. in Res. rep. from Com. on W. & M., 732, 735.  
 Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters Act Amt. (B. 144, 1°\*) 1384.  
 Canada Central Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 998.  
 Canadian Consolidated Five per cent. Loan (B. 21) prop., Res., 39; in Com., 53; 1°\* of B., 54; 2° m., 81; 3° m. 102.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Rep. in account with Govt. (presented) 66.  
 Canadian Tobacco Regulations (Ans.) 41.  
 Cereals, Duties and Imports, on M. for Stmnt., 776.  
 Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 743.  
 Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 743, 746, 750—752, 1235; conc., 1114.  
 Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation (B. 91, 1°\*) 283; prop. Res., 791; in Com., 792; conc. in, 860; 2° of B. m., 1227, 1231; in Com., 1234.  
 Commercial Treaties, on M. for Ret., 76.  
 Concurrence—Post Office and Finance Depts. (Contingencies) 1114; Library (Salaries, &c.) 1114; Printing, &c., the Laws, 1114; *Canada Gazette*, 1120; Unprovided Items, 1280.  
 Cordage, in Com. on W. & M., 667—670.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 663—666.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 162.  
 Departmental Reps., Compilation of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 300.  
 Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1380.  
 Dress or Costume Cloths, in Com. on W. & M., 682.  
 Elm Logs, Export Duty on (Ans.) 889.  
 Estimates, The, 1883-84; Mess. from His Ex., 288; ref. to Com. of Sup., 288; Suppl. Est., 1882-83, Mess., 999; Suppl., 1883-84, Mess., 1207; Further Suppl., 1883-84, Mess., 1363.  
 Factories, Offences against Persons employed in (B. 117, 1°) 827; withdn., 1386.  
 Factory Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1197.  
 Fisher, Judge, [Services of the late (explanation) 1387.  
 Government Business (M. to take in Thursdays) 412.  
 Gulf of St. Lawrence Telegraph (Ans.) 68.  
 Hemlock Bark, Duties on (Ans.) 78.  
 Hemlock Bark, Export Duty on (Ans.) 1025.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 790.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1341; on Amts. to recom. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373, 1374.

TILLEY, Hon. Sir LEONARD.—*Con.*

- Iron, and Manufactures of, in Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 Jellies and Jams, in Com. on W. & M., 692.  
 Land Improvement Fund, on M. for Ret., 39.  
 Land Plaster, Duty on (Ans.) 376.  
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 764, 765, 835; conc., 1114.  
 Lévis Graving Dock (B. 129, Res. and 1°\*) 1213.  
 Liquor Certificates granted by Physicians, on M. for Ret., 777.  
 Loan, Five per cent. Canadian Consolidated (B. 21,) prop. Res., 39; in Com., 53; 1°\* of B., 54; 2° m., 81; 3° m., 102.  
 Lord's Day, Observance of (Ans.) 767.  
 Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 952, 953.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. McLelan*) 430.  
 Merchants Bank vs. Regina, Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1379.  
 Milling Wheat in Bond (Ans.) 56.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1038, 1379, 1381; conc., 1120.  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 953.  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on (B. 131,) prop. Res. 693; in Com., 710—716; conc. in, 743; 1°\* of B., 1226.  
 Premiums of Insurance, on M. for Stmnt., 1030.  
 Printed and Dyed Cottons, in Com. on W. & M., 675.  
 Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Repeal Act Amt. B. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*) in Com., 427.  
 Public Accounts (presented) 35.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1381.  
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 130) Res., 1213; 1°\*, of B., 1214.  
 Queddy River Driving and Boom Co., on M. to receive Petition, 187.  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 998.  
 Reciprocal Trade with Brazil, &c., on M. for Cor., 773.  
 Refund of Duties paid by Merchants in P. E. I., in Com. of Sup., 1381.  
 Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec (B. 142,) prop. Res., 1316; M. for Com., 1336; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1338.  
 Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 209; (Ans.) 1025.  
 Standing Orders Com., on prop M. (*Mr. Beaty*) for Mess. to Sen. (M. to adj. deb.) 292.  
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (B. 138) prop. Res., 1199; M. for Com., 1333, 1°\* of B., 1335; 3° m., 1363.  
 Superannuation Fund, on M. for Ret., 301.  
 Supply (B. 128, 1°\*) 1388; 2°, 1391.  
 SUPPLY—Res. for Com., 28. *Administration of Justice* (Widow of Judge Fisher) 1236.  
*Charges of Management*, 743.  
*Civil Government* (Gov. General's Secretary's Office) 743, suppl., 1235; (Privy Council Office) 743;

TILLEY, Hon. Sir LEONARD.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.*

- (Auditor General's Office) 746; (Finance and Treasury Board) 746, suppl., 1235; (Departmental Contingencies) 750; (Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner) 751, suppl., 1177; (Post Office and Finance Depts., Contingencies) 752, conc., 1114; (Secretary of State) 1235; (Railways and Canals) 1235.  
*Dominion Lands—Income* (Land Guides) 1380.  
*Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 764; (Grant to Library) 765; (Salaries, &c., Library) 835, conc., 1114; (Printing &c., the Laws) 835, conc., 1114.  
*Mail Subsidies* (Magdalen Islands) 952; (West Indies and Brazil) 852; (France and Quebec) 952; (Liverpool and St. John, N.B.) 952; (Cape Canoe and Port Hood) 952; (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 953; (Halifax to Murray Harbor and Charlottetown) 953; (Canada and Antwerp) 953; (Canada and Germany) 953.  
*Miscellaneous* (*Canada Gazette*) 1038, conc., 1120; (Miscellaneous Printing) 1038; (Refund to Merchants Bank) 1379; (Costs of litigated matters) 1381; (Refund of Duties Paid by Merchants in P.E.I.) 1381; (Governor General's Expenses to B.C.) 1191; (Factory Commission) 1197.  
*Ocean and River Service* (*Sir James Douglas*) 953; (Hamilton and Point Lévis) Ans., 953.  
*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1381.  
*Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canada Central Subsidy) 998.  
 Tariff of Duties of Customs Act Amt. (B. 119, 1°\*) 1251.  
*Tariff*—reply to *Mr. Mackenzie*, 600.  
 Tobacco and Snuff, in Com. on W. & M., 673.  
*Ways and Means*—Res. for Com., 28; Budget Speech, 332. [For Debate, see WAYS AND MEANS]; in Com. on Res. 1 (Free List) 629; in Com. on Res. 2 (acetic acid) 661, (sulphuric acid, &c.) 662, (playing cards) 662, (printed music) 662, (braces or suspenders) 662, (carriages) 662, (railway cars, &c.) 662, (children's carriages) 663, (cotton duck) 663—666, (cordage) 667, 670, (glazed and unglazed pipes) 671, (fruits, dried) 671, (show cases) 671, (furniture, &c.) 671, (iron, and manufactures of) 672, (leather) 672, (marble) 672, (carbolic and heavy oil) 672, (lubricating oils) 673, (paper hangings, &c.) 673, (union collar paper cloth) 673, (spices) 673, (tobacco and snuff) 673, (spirits of turpentine) 674, (vegetables) 674, (vinegar) 674, (wools and woollens) 674, (printed and died cottons) 675, (dress or costume cloths) 682, (agricultural implements) 682, (coal dust) 692, (india rubber clothing) 692, (jellies and jams) 692, (pumps, iron, &c.) 692, (steel) 692; on conc. (books) 732, 735. Res. conc. in, 741; Res. rep. from Com., 1388; see *Supply Bill*.

**TILLEY, Hon. Sir LEONARD—Con.**

Wools and Woollens, in Com. on W. & M., 674.

**TROW, Mr. J., South Perth**

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 874, 877, 881.

Irish Immigration (Ques.) 547.

Negotiations with B.C. in re Dry Dock and Island Ry., on explanations (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1394.

Prorogation, Congratulations, &c. (remarks) 1397.

SUPPLY—*Collection of Revenues: Maintenance and Repairs* (Telegraph Lines, Man. and N.W.T.) 1079.

*Legislation* (Sessional Indemnity, Mr. Houde) 1380.

*Militia* (Drill Pay) 857; (Royal Military College) 858.

*Public Works—Income: Buildings* (Que.) 1182.

**TUPPER, Mr. C. H., Pictou**

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. (B. 40, 1°\*) 89; in Com., 262, 372; 3° m., 372, 422; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 425.

Address, The (moved) 5.

Bank of N.S. and Union Bank of P.E.I. Amalg. (B. 10 1°\*) 38.

Chinese Immigration into B.C., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 330.

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 146.

Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 6. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com., 319.

Regina as the Capital of the N.W., on M. for O.C., &c., 275.

**TUPPER, Hon. Sir CHARLES, Cumberland**

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 1132.

Acadia Powder Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. to adj. deb., 498.

Bonus, Town of Pembroke, in Com. of Sup., 1065.

Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, on M. (*Mr. Hawkins*) for Sp. Com. (Ques. of Order) 520.

Bridge over Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1158.

Campbellton and Gaspé Steam Service, on M. for Cor., 504.

Canada and Spain, Trade Relations between, Instructions to Sir A. T. Galt, on M. for Ret., 547.

Canada Central Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 998.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 114 (*Mr. Abbott*) on M. for 2°, 783.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Contracts (copies presented) 116.

Canadian Pacific Ry., in Com. of Sup., 998, 999, 1137, 1141—1149; conc., 1218, 1219.

Canadian Pacific Ry., Location and Lands, on M. for Maps, 76, 87.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Monopoly, on M. for Ret., 113.

Canadian Pacific Ry., North of Lake Superior and East of Current River (Ans.) 502.

**TUPPER, Hon. Sir CHARLES—Con.**

Canadian Pacific Ry., on M. for Com. of Supply (Annual Statement) 957.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rep. as to route, progress, &c. (presented) 66; (remarks) 67, 77, 80, 81.

Cape Traverse Ry. (Ans.) 66; in Com. of Sup., 1064.

Charges on Revenue, in Com. of Sup., 1160, 1169; conc., 1222.

Civil Government, in Com. of Sup., 751, 1235.

Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1073, 1076, 1077, 1245.

Comparative Local Freight Rates, Table of, 968.

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 142.

Concurrence—Health Statistics, 1115; Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1117; Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1121; Adulteration of Food, 1125; Claim of James Dick, 1218; Contract 15 (Joseph Whitehead) 1219; Heney, Stewart & Co. Award, 1221; Refund to Mr. Ketchum, 1220; Canals (Capital) 1317; Trent Valley Nav., 1123.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 32 (*Mr. Riopel*) on M. for 2°, 125.

Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. (B. 127, 1°) 1084; 2° m., 1209, 1293, 1294, 1296; in Com., 1297—1302, 1305—1309; 3° m., 1317.

Contract 15, and Joseph Whitehead, on Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Mackintosh*) 1283.

Dartmouth Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1380.

Dick, James, Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1137, conc. 1218.

Duckett, Mrs. Edward, in Com. of Sup., 1134.

Dunn and Page, Messrs., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1160.

Edmunston and Rivière du Loup Ry. (Ans.) 41.

Elgin Station Depot (Ans.) 40.

Ferry Boat at Terminus of North Shore Ry. (Ans.) 35, Georgian Bay Branch (C.P.R.) in Com. of Sup., 1137.

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Returns (Ans.) 204.

Halifax Extension (Intercol. Ry.) in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1150.

Hébert, H., case of (Ans.) 78.

Heney, Stewart & Co. Award, in Com. of Sup., 1158 conc., 1221.

Intercolonial Ry., Coast and Island Communication with (Ans.) 81.

Intercolonial Ry. Commission, Claims settled by, on M. for Ret., 134; in Com. of Sup., 1150.

Intercolonial Ry. Freight Earnings per ton per mile, (Ans.) 1121.

Intercolonial Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1061, 1063, 1064, 1073, 1077, 1150, 1154, 1156—1158, 1244, 1245, 1380, conc., 1120, 1121.

Intercolonial Ry. Office in Quebec (Ans.) 376.

TUPPER, Hon. Sir CHARLES—*Con.*

- Intercolonial Ry., Purchase and Nature of Rolling Stock, on M. for Ret., 380.  
 Ketchum, Mr., Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1154; conc., 1220.  
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorpor. Act Amt. B. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*) in Com., 372.  
 Lieutenant Governors, Occupations of, in Com. of Sup. 1243.  
 Mackenzie, Judge, Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1132.  
 Mann, Mr., Claim of, in Com. of Sup., 1157.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. Mc Lelan*) in Com., 708.  
 McInnis, Mrs. A. A., Compensation to, in Com. of Sup., 1160; conc., 1222.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1379.  
 Morin, Lucien, Official Arbitrators Award to (Ans.) 220.  
 Murray Canal and Presqu' Isle and Weller's Bay Harbors, on M. for Ret., 204.  
 Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 375.  
 North Shore Ry., Ferry Boats at Terminus of (Ans.) 35.  
 Passenger Accommodation at "The Crossing," Intercolonial Ry. (Ans.) 376.  
 Pelletier and others, Claims of (Ans.) 1025.  
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 757.  
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1134.  
 Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 714.  
 Point des Cascades and Lake St. Francis Canal (Ans.) 266.  
 Prince Arthur's Landing and Rat Portage, Ry. between (Ans.) 1025.  
 Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River (C.P.R.) in Com. of Sup., 998.  
 Prince Edward Island and Mainland Mail Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1376.  
 Prince Edward Island Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1076.  
 Pullman Car Charges on Intercolonial Ry. (Ans.) 1122.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1243.  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 998, 999, 1060, 1061, 1063—1065, 1068, 1070—1073, 1137, 1141—1150, 1154, 1156—1160, 1380; conc., 1121, 1218—1221, 1245, 1317.  
 Railways and Canals Rep. (presented) 77.  
 Railway Ferry Boats (Ans.) 376.  
 Railway Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1065.  
 Receiver General and Min. of Pub. Works Act Amt. (B. 94, 1°) 298.  
 Rivière du Loup Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1157.  
 Rolling Stock transferred by Purcell & Co., in Com. of Sup., 1149.  
 Schreiber, Mr., Allowance to, in Com. of Sup., 1158.  
 Senators and Local Elections, in Com. of Sup., 759.

TUPPER, Hon. Sir CHARLES—*Con.*

- Shanly, Frank, Widow of, in Com. of Sup., 1379.  
 Shorthand Writers, on M. to employ for Sel. Com., 129.  
 Speaker of Senate's Picture, in Com. of Sup., 759.  
 Statistical Account of Railways (Ans.) 80.  
 St. Charles Branch and Ferry, in Com. of Sup., 1063, 1244; conc., 1121.  
 St. Peter's Road (P.E.I.) Ry. Crossing (objection to Ques) 107; (Ans.) 126.  
 Steam Com. between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Sel. Com., 71.  
 Subsidies to Rys. (B. 137) prop. Res., 1252, 1260 1275; in Com., 1284—1290; conc. in, 1317; 1°\* of B., 1317; in Com., 1331.  
 Summerside Ry. Station (Ans.) 84.  
 Swing Bridge at Valleyfield, in Com. of Sup., 1072.  
 SUPPLY—*Administration of Justice* (Widow of Judge Mackenzie) 1132.  
 Canals—*Capital*: Lachine, 1068; Cornwall, 1070, (Enlargement) 1159; Williamsburg (Entrance and Lock Rapide Plat Canal) 1070, (Lands taken for Construction of Rapide Plat Canal, Compensation to Owners) 1159, Galops Canal, 1245; St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1070; Murray, 1071; Welland, 1071, (Compensation to Messrs. Dunn and Page) 1160; Trent River Nav. (Locks, &c., between Lakefield and Balsam Lake) 1071; Ste. Anne, 1071; Carillon (Canal, Dam and Slide) 1071; Grenville, 1072, (Honey, Stewart & Co. Award) 1158, conc., 1221; Tay (Construction of Works) 1072; Culbute, 1159, suppl., 1245; St. Peter's, 1245. *Income*: Beauharnois (Swing Bridge at Valleyfield) 1072; Welland (Cleaning out Ditches) 1072; (Purchase of Steam Pump) 1160; Burlington (Removal of Pier) 1072; Trent Valley (Survey of Nav.) 1072, conc., 1123; Chambly (Raising Bank, &c.) 1073; Rideau (Toll House for Collector) 1073.  
 Charges on Revenue: P.E.I. Ry. (Compensation to Mrs. A. A. McInnis) 1160, conc., 1222; Canals, 1169.  
 Civil Government (Departmental Contingencies) 751; (Railways and Canals) 1235.  
 Collection of Revenues: Repairs and Working Expenses (Intercolonial Ry.) 1078; (P.E.I. Ry.) 1076; (Windsor Branch Ry.) 1076; (Canals) 1077, suppl., 1245.  
 Miscellaneous (Widow of Frank Shanley) 1379.  
 Penitentiaries (B.C.) 757.  
 Pensions (Mrs. Edward Duckett) 1134.  
 Public Works—*Income*: Buildings (Man.) 1243.  
 Railways—*Capital*: C.P.R. (Canada Central Subsidy) 998; (Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River) 998; (B.C.) 998; (Georgian Bay Branch) 1137; (West of Red River) 1137; (Dawson Route, Claim of James Dick) 1137, conc., 1218; Contract 15, and

**TUPPER, Hon Sir CHARLES—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

Joseph Whitehead) 1141—1149, conc., 1219; (Rolling Stock, transferred by Purcell & Co.) 1149; (Station Accommodation) 999; (Canadian Pacific Subsidy) 999. Intercolonial Ry. (Increased Accommodation at St. John) 1060, suppl., 1150; (Halifax Extension) 1061, suppl., 1150; (Rolling Stock) 1061; (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1063, conc., 1121, suppl., 1244; (Construction Account, old, Commission, &c.) 1150; (Refund to Mr. Ketchum) 1154, conc., 1220; (Land and other claims) 1156; (Claim of C. H. Mann) 1157; (Mr. Walsh, damage to property) 1158; (Legal Expenses in re Western Counties Ry.) 1157; (Rivière du Loup Branch) 1157; (Dartmouth Branch) 1380. Cape Traverse Ry. (P.E.I.) 1064. General (Surveys and Inspections) 1064; (Subsidy, Bridge over Red River) 1158; (Allowance to Mr. Schreiber) 1158; (Railway Statistics) 1065; (Town of Pembroke Bonus) 1065.

Walsh, Mr., Damage to Property, in Com. of Sup., 1158. Western Counties Ry., &c., Legal Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 1157.

Whitehead, Joseph, Contract 15 Account, in Com. of Sup., 1141—1149, conc., 1219.

Windsor Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1076.

**TYRWHITT, Mr. R., South Simcoe**

Debates, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks) 694. Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m.h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 643.

**VAIL, Hon. W. B., Digby**

Concurrence—Intercolonial Ry. (St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1122.

Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 591.

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1006, 1007.

Digby Pier Wharfage Dues Collected (M. for Stmt. \*) 525.

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1021.

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1016, 1188.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1322; on Amt. to reecom. (*Mr. Blake*) 1369, 1370.

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 1191.

Masters and Mates, Certificates, of B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 429; in Com. on B., 708.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 530; in Com., 544—546, 584; on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) to M. for 3°, 834.

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 853, 854, 857, 858, 860.

Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 724.

Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1134.

**VAIL, Hon. W. B.—Con.**

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1083.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 909, 911, 913, 914, 923, 1245.

Pullman Car Charges on Intercolonial Ry. (Ques.) 1122.

Quebec Harbor Commissioners Act. Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1214.

Subsidies to Rys. B. 137 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1285, 1287; in Com. on B., 1332.

SUPPLY—Customs (Salaries, &c.) 1006, 1007.

Excise (Salaries, &c.) 1021.

Fisheries (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 1016; (Services in connection with Bounty) 1188.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cape Race Lighthouse Dues) 1191.

Pensions (Mrs. Ed. Duckett) 1134.

Post Office (Mail Service, &c.) 1079, 1083.

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 909. Income: Buildings (Que.) 911; (Generally) 913; (Repairs, &c.) 914. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 923, suppl., 1245.

Militia (Military Branch and District Staff Salaries) 853; (Ammunition, &c.) 853, 854; (Drill Pay) 857; (Drill Sheds) 858; ("A" and "B" Batteries) 860; (Artillerymen at Shoeburyness) 860.

Weights and Measures and Gas, 1047, 1050, 1056.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 494; in Com. on Res. 2 (cordage) 669; (leather) 672.

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com., of Sup., 1047, 1050, 1056.

Westport (N.S.) Pier (Ques.) 376.

**VALIN, Mr. P. V., Montmorency**

Customs Acts Consolidation B. 35 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 695, 696.

Ex-Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, Occupation of, in Com. of Sup., 1243.

Hudson's Bay Winter Navigation (remarks) 1137.

Immigration and Naturalization of Germans, on M. for Cor., 97.

Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 718.

Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 303, 306.

Spruce Logs, Export Duty on, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 212.

SUPPLY—Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 1243.

Tobacco, Seizure of, from brig *Adeline* (M. for Ret. \*) 382.

Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 664; (cordage) 668.

**VANASSE, Mr. F., Yamaska**

National Policy, Translation of Rep. of Sel. Com. on (Ques.) 89; (M. for Appendix to Rep. \*) 116.



- VANASSE, Mr. F.—Con.**  
 Provincial Governments' Claims against Dom. for Administration of Justice, &c. (M. for copies of Cor.) 266.  
 Railway Subsidies, Applications, &c., for (M. for Stmt.) 301.
- WALLACE, Mr. N. C., West York**  
 Cottons, printed and dyed, in Com. on W. M., 679.  
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 880.  
 Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1347.  
 Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2°, 255; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 639.  
 Stewart, John, Volunteer of 1837-38 (M. for copies of Cor.) 266.  
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (printed and dyed cottons) 679.
- WATSON, Mr. R., Marquette**  
 Agricultural Implements, in Com. on W. & M., 691.  
 Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. Richey*) on M. for 2°, 229.  
 Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 845.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 666.  
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 869; in Com. 874—888, 935, 936.  
*Glendon*, Steamer to replace the (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1106, 1108.  
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 852.  
 Lumber, Importation of, into Man., on M. for Ret., 95.  
 Portage La Prairie as a Customs Out-port (Ques.) 166.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 928—930.  
 Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co. (M. for Ret.) 85.  
 SUPPLY—Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural, &c., Statistics, Man.) 845.  
 Immigration, 852.  
 Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1106, 1108.  
 Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 928; Dredging, 929; Roads and Bridges, 930; Telegraphs, 930.  
 Tariff—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on W. & M., 627.  
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck) 666; (agricultural implements) 691.
- WELDON, Mr. C. W., St John, N.B., City and County**  
 "A" and "B" Batteries, Vacant Commissions in (Ques.) 204.  
 Acadia Power Co. Incorp. B. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for Com., 262; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 500  
 Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*) in Com., 313.
- WELDON, Mr. C. W.—Con.**  
 Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 786; in Com., 789.  
 Carriers by Land B. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 203, 315.  
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 1074, 1075.  
 Concurrence—Refund to Mr. Ketchum, 1220.  
 Cordage, in Com. on W. & M., 667, 668.  
 Cotton Duck, in Com. on W. & M., 666.  
 Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 216.  
 Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1200, 1203, 1204.  
 Fisheries, in Com of Sup., 1189.  
 Fishery Inspector for N. B. and Dept. (M. for Ret.\*) 660.  
 Fishing Leases and Licenses in N.B. (M. for Ret.) 287; in Com. on B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) 1200, 1204.  
 Intercolonial Ry. Casualties, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 129.  
 Intercolonial Ry. Depot (St. John, N.B.) Tenders for, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 Ketchum, Mr., Refund to, in Com. of Sup., 1154; conc., 1220.  
 King's and Albert County Courts (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 159; on M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 796; (Amt.) 800; on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 823.  
 Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 952.  
 Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. 89 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 429; on M. for 2° of B., 702; in Com., 708.  
 Mill and Pond Streets, Damages for lands expropriated in, for Intercol. Ry. (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 Miscellaneous, in Com of Sup., 1194, 1197.  
 Naturalization Act of Canada (Ques.) 104.  
 New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 57, 1°\*) 129.  
 New Brunswick Subsidy, Moneys advanced to Govt. of N.B. (M. for Ret.\*) 659.  
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 953.  
 Port Lorne Breakwater (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Acts Amt. (B. 83, 1°\*) 304; 2° m., 322.  
 Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Repeal Act Amt. (B. 78, 1°) 150; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 315; in Com., 427.  
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 925.  
 Quaco (N.B.) Lighthouse, Building of (M. for Ret.\*) 106.  
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1154, 1156; conc., 1220.  
 Riparian Rights, in Com. on B. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*) 1200.  
 Royal Military College Graduates (M. for Ret.\*) 288.

**WELDON, Mr. C. W.—Con.**

- Salmon Fishing Licenses, &c. (M. for Ret.)\*** 129.  
**SUPPLY—Collection of Revenues: Repairs and Working Expenses (Intercolonial Ry.)** 1074, 1075.  
**Fisheries (Services in connection with Bounty)** 1189.  
**Mail Subsidies (Liverpool and St. John, N.B.)** 952.  
**Miscellaneous (Phair vs. Venning, Costs and Legal Expenses)** 1194; (**Robertson vs. The Queen**) 1197.  
**Ocean and River Service (Glendon and Fox Hound)** 953.  
 (Purchase of Life-Boats, &c.) 954.  
**Post Office (Mail Service, &c.)** 1083.  
**Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.)** 925.  
**Railways—Capital: Intercolonial (Increased Accommodation at St. John)** 1060; (**Refund to Mr. Ketchum**) 1154; conc., 1220; (**Land and other Claims**) 1156.  
**Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. 2 (cotton duck)** 666; (**cordage**) 667, 668.

**WELLS, Mr. R. M., East Bruce**

- Naturalization of Aliens (B. 60, 1°)** 129.  
**Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°\*)** 67.

**WHEELER, Mr. G., West Ontario**

- Land Plaster, Duty on (Ques.)** 376.  
**Milling Wheat in Bond (Ques.)** 56.  
**Newspapers, Free Delivery of (Ques.)** 890.  
**Salt Duties (M. for copies of Cor., Petitions, &c.\*)** 232.

**WHITE, Mr. J., East Hastings**

- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (Mr. Desjardins)** on Amt. 6 m. h. (**Mr. Auger**) 217, 312.  
**Debate, Official Reps. of, on omission (remarks)** 694.  
**Increased Indemnity, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks)** 1060.  
**Loyal Orange Association Incorp. (B. 87, 1°\*)** 254; **M. to fix day for 2°, 254; order for 2° allowed to stand, 501; M. for 2°, 632, 656.**  
**Rathbun, H. B., and Sons Incorp. (B. 26, 1°\*)** 67; **M. for 2°, 77.**

**WHITE, Mr. P., North Benfrew**

- Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (Sir Hector Langevin), in Com.,** 935.  
**Canada Central Ry. and Town of Pembroke Bonus, on M. for copies of Petitions, &c.,** 230.  
**Carriers by Land B. 14 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com.,** 203.  
**Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper)** on M. for 2°, 1295; in Com., 1298, 1300.  
**Court of Ry. Commissioners for Can. B. 3 (Mr. McCathy) on M. for Com.,** 567.  
**Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (Mr. Beaty) on M. for 2°,** 120.  
**Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 36 (Mr. Gunn) in Com.,** 372.  
**Lumber, Importation of, into Man, on M. for Ret.,** 96.  
**Promissory Notes, &c., Repeal of Duty Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Weldon) in Com.,** 428.

**WHITE, Mr. P.—Con.**

- Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co. Incorp. B. 66 (Mr. Tasse) on M. for Com.,** 941.  
**Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. (B. 69, 1°)** 140; 2° m., 287.  
**Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (Sir Charles Tupper)** 1291.  
**SUPPLY—Railways—Capital: General (Town of Pembroke Bonus)** 1066, 1068.  
**Timber and Lumber Tolls and Dues B. 126 (Mr. Costigan) in Com.,** 1208.

**WHITE, Mr. T., Cardwell**

- Accommodation in the Buildings (remarks)** 784.  
**Adultery, Seduction, &c., B. 13 (Mr. Charlton) on M. to recom. (M. to adj. deb.)** 286.  
**Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Abbott) in Com.,** 889.  
**Canadian Pacific Ry., Duty paid on Articles Imported by Co. (M. for Stmt.)\*** 659.  
**Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper)** on M. for 2°, 1213; on 2°, 1297; in Com., 1303.  
**Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22 (Mr. Desjardins)** on Amt. 6 m. h. (**Mr. Auger**) 370.  
**Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (Mr. Bowell) in Com.,** 698.  
**Debates, Official Reports of: First Rep. of Com. (presented)** 98; **M. to conc. in,** 204; **French Reporting Staff (remarks)** 415; **Second Rep.,** 497; **Third Rep.,** 593; **on omission (remarks)** 694; **Fourth Rep.,** 860; **Fifth Rep.,** 930; **M. to conc. in Fourth and Fifth Reps.,** 1134; **Sixth Rep.,** 1310.  
**Exchange of Public Documents (remarks)** 784.  
**Grange Trust (limited) Incorp. (B. 44, 1°\*)** 98; **M. for Com.,** 701.  
**Immigration, in Com. of Sup.,** 854.  
**Increased Indemnity, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks)** 1059.  
**Insolvents, Discharge of Past, B. 35 (Mr. Beaty) on M. for 2°,** 119.  
**Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com.,** 1344, 1358; **on Amt. (Mr. Blake)** 1367; **on M. for 3° (Amt. to recom.) carried (Y. 88, N. 63)** 1372; **on printing extra copies (remarks)** 1396.  
**King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mackenzie)** 181.  
**Library of Parliament (M. to conc. in First Rep.)** 897.  
**Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (Mr. White, Hastings) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Curran) to M. for 2°,** 637.  
**Meharg and Cooney, Provision for Widows of (Ques.)** 126.  
**Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 93, 1°\*)** 283; 2° m., 375; (**remarks**) 803.  
**Pembina Branch, gravel claim, on M. for copies of Cor.,** 902.  
**Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. 5 (Mr. Casgrain) on Amt. (Mr. Ross, Middlesex)** 304.

**WHITE, Mr. T.—*Con.***

Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Ry. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 58, 1°\*) 129.

Railway Traffic on the Lord's Day, on M. for Ret., 901.  
Stationery furnished to Members (remarks) 1251.

SUPPLY—*Immigration*, 854.

Tariff Alterations, on M. for Ret., 553.

United States, Reciprocity with, on M. for Cor., 269.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 357; conc. (books) 738.

**WIGLE, Mr. L., *South Essex***

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 460.

**WILLIAMS, Mr. A. T. H., *East Durham***

Building Societies, Permanent, Act Amt. (B. 17, 1°) 40; 2° m., 124.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 539; in Com., 587.

Saskatchewan, University of, Incorp. (B. 18, 1°\*) 52; M. for Com., 244; consdn. of B. m., 261.

**WILSON, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin***

Drill Shed at St. Thomas, removal of (M. for Ret.) 132.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 115 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 918, 920.

Prisoners, Cost of Conveyance of (M. for Stmt.) 133.

SUPPLY—*Customs* (Salaries, &c.) 1001.

*Public Works—Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 911.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1048.

**WOOD, Mr. J. F., *Brockville***

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1344.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 640.

Wife Beating, Punishment for (Criminal Law Amt. B. 81, 1°\*) 161.

**WOOD, Mr. J., *Westmoreland***

Address, The (sec.) 10.

Booms, &c., in Navigable Waters B. 96 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 789.

*Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 466.

**WOODWORTH, Mr. D. B., *King's, N.S.***

Amos. Rowe and the Govt., relations between (M. for Cor.) 1028, 1030.

Customs Acts Consolidation B. 34 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 697.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1369.

King's County (P.E.I.) Election, on Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 176.

Loyal Orange Association Incorp. B. 87 (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 651.

Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 719.

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1246.

Salaries of Judges B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1315.

Subsidies to Rys., in Com. on Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1286.

SUPPLY—*Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1246.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, 1052, 1054.

*Weights and Measures and Gas*, in Com. of Sup., 1052, 1054.

**WRIGHT, Mr. A., *Ottawa County***

Militia, Pay of Officers and Men, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 726, 728.

Pig Iron, Bounty on, in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 718.

Prorogation, Congratulations, &c. (remarks) 1396.

Royal Academy of Arts: Picture to commemorate Confederation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1172, 1174.

Subsidies to Rys., on prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1267; in Com., 1284, 1287.

**YEO, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.***

Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 46.

Malpeque Breakwater Repairs (Ques.) 889.

Post Office and Custom House, Summerside (Ques.) 140.

Summerside Harbor Survey, on M. for copy of Engineer's Rep. (M. to adj. deb.) 215; deb. resmd., 225.

Summerside Ry. Station (Ques.) 84.

# INDEX—PART II.

## SUBJECTS.

- "A" AND "B" BATTERIES. See "Militia."
- ABOLITION OF DUTY ON GRAIN, FLOUR AND COAL: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.
- Acadia Powder Co.'s B. No. 40 (*Mr. Tupper*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 138; in Com., 262, 372; M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 372, 422; Amt. as to constitutionality (*Mr. Amyot*) 422; Deb. adjd., 426; resmd., 498; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) 499, carried, 501; in Com., 557; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 557. (46 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- ACETIC ACID: in Com. on W. & M., 661.
- ACCIDENT AT MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 126.
- ACCIDENTS AND CASUALTIES ON G.T.R., RETURNS OF: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 166, 232.
- ACCIDENTS ON RYS.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 659.
- ACCOMMODATION IN THE BUILDINGS: Remarks, on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Printing Com., 784, 785.
- ACCOUNTANT OF H. OF C.: Receipts and Disbursements presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 29.
- ADDITIONAL INDIAN AGENTS IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- ADDRESSES FOR RETURNS, &c. See respective headings.
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH: moved (*Mr. Tupper*) 5; sec. (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) 10; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 13; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 22; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 27; (*Mr. Tassé*) 28; agreed to, 28; His Ex.'s reply, 71.
- ADDRESS TO HIS EX. ON HIS DEPARTURE: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1384; acknowledged in Speech proroguing Parl., 1399.
- "ADELINE," BRIG, TOBACCO SEIZURE ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 382.
- ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY: M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 931.
- ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 281; remarks, 289.
- ADJOURNMENT OF DEBATE, VEBRAL MOTIONS: practice (*Mr. Speaker*) 1369.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, in Com., of Sup.:  
Duval, Geo., Purchase of Books from, 1133.  
Fisher, Judge, Widow of, 1236; Explanation, 1387.  
Mackenzie, Judge, Gratuity to Widow of, 1132.  
Richards, S, Allowance for holding Assizes, 1178.  
Russell vs. Woodward, Legal Expenses, 1133.  
Stipendiary Magistrates Expenses, 753.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3.
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: Rep. presented (*Mr. Costigan*) 36; in Com. of Sup., 1113.
- Adultery, Seduction, &c., (Criminal Law Amt.) B. No. 13 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 38; 2<sup>o</sup> and ref. to Sel. Com., 123; M. for Com., 220; B. in Com., 222; Order for consdn. read, 283; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Charlton*) carried (Y. 91, N. 73) 286; in Com., 286; M. for consdn., 286; deb. adjd., 287; M. to recom. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried (Y. 73, N. 61) 307; in Com., 313; rep., 314.
- ADVANCES TO GOVT. OF N.B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 659.
- AGENTS, IMMIGRANT, TEMPORARY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 86.
- AGREEMENTS BETWEEN COMPANIES AND GOVT. RESPECTING COLONIZATION GRANTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.
- AGRICULTURAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com of Sup., 844.
- AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS, FRAUD IN: M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Massue*) 116; M. for Sel. Com., 207.
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, &c., IMPORTED INTO MAN.: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 525.
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, CUSTOMS DUTIES ON: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. on W. & M., 682—692.
- AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS AND NATIONAL POLICY: Translation of Rep. of Sel. Com., Ques (*Mr. Vanasse*) 89; M. for copies of Rep. of Sel. Com., 116.
- AGRICULTURE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 748, 1132.
- AGRICULTURE, REP. OF DEPT.: presented (*Mr. Pope*) 583.
- AIDING AND ABETTING THE ESCAPE OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS: Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78.
- ALBERT AND KING'S COUNTY COURTS, CAUSES TRIED AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- ALLOWANCES TO MANUFACTURERS OF GOODS REQUIRED BY C.P.R. Co.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 41.
- ALTERATIONS IN THE TARIFF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; Deb. (*Mr. Bowell*) 547; (*Mr. Blake*) 548; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 549, 551; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 549; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 549; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 550; (*Mr. Burns*) 551; (*Mr. Farrow*) 552; (*Mr. Charlton*) 552; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 553; (*Mr. Casey*) 555; neg (Y. 65, N. 115) 555.
- AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 853.
- AMOS ROWE AND THE GOVT., RELATIONS BETWEEN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1028.

- Animals, Cruelty to, Acts Amt. B. No. 25** (*Mr. Richey*). 1°\*, 56; M. for 2°, 225; 2°\*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 229; B. in Com., 781; 3°\*, 903.
- ANNUAL CAMPS OF MILITIA: QUES.** (*Mr. Thompson*) on 3° of Militia Acts Amt. B., 834.
- ANNUAL GRANTS TO INDIANS:** in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1096.
- ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOURGH MAIL ROUTE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirk*) 77.
- ARBITRATORS' AWARD IN FAVOR OF L. MORIN:** QUES. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 220.
- ARBITRATORS' AWARD TO CONTRACTOR FOR GRENVILLE AND CARILLON CANAL:** M. for copy (*Mr. Casey*) 903.
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF:** in Com. of Sup., 836.
- ARMOUR, Mr.** See "Returning Officers."
- ARTILLERY BATTERY, AND CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS:** in Com. of Sup., 1239.
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:** Census Returns, Distribution of, QUES. (*Mr. Amyot*) 89; Males over Twenty-one in Electoral Divisions: M. for Stmt., (*Mr. Fisher*) 104; in Com. of Sup., 836, 837, 840, 841, 844; conc., 1115, 1128.
- Art Societies (Exempt from Lotteries Act) B. 136**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\* 1316; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 935. (46 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- ASCENSION DAY, ADJOURNMENT FOR:** M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 931.
- "ASIA," LOSS OF THE.** See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- Asia, Marine Telegraph with, Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. 116** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°\*, 791; 2°\*, 860; in Com and 3°\*, 935. (46 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- Atlantic and North-West Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 59** (*Mr. Colby*). 1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com., and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- Atlantic, Pacific and Peace River Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 62** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*), 1°, 140; 2°\*, 165.
- AUDET, A., TRANSLATING:** conc., 1280.
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE:** in Com., of Sup., 746.
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.:** presented (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 35.
- BAYE DES CHALEURS RY, SUBSIDY TO CO.:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284. See B. 137.
- BAKER, DAVID, APPOINTMENT OF, AS FISHERY OVERSEER:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scriver*) 77.
- BANK DE ST. JEAN, ANNUAL RETURNS:** M. for copies (*Mr. Bergeron*) 86.
- Bank of London, Canada, Incorp. B. No. 29** (*Mr. Dawson*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 106; in Com. and 3°\*, 375. (46 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- Bank of Nova Scotia and Union Bank of P. E. I. Amalg. B. No. 10** (*Mr. Tupper, Pictou*). 1°\*, 38; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 374. (46 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BANK SHAREHOLDERS LISTS:** presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 40, 77.
- Banks and Banking Acts Amt. B. No. 46** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 98; in Com., 99; 1°\* of B., 100; 2°, 87; in Com., 281; 3°\*, 383. (46 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BARKERVILLE AND FORKS OF QUESNELLE MAIL SERVICE:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Reid*) 302.
- BARRACKS, MOUNTED POLICE:** in Com. of Sup., 1041.
- BARRINGTON AND CAPE SABLE ISLAND CABLE:** QUES. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.
- BAYFIELD (N. S.) HARBOR BREAKWATER:** QUES. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 657.
- BAYFIELD (ONT.) BREAKWATER:** M. for copies of Repts. of Engineers (*Mr. McMillan, Huron*) 774.
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.** See "Canals."
- BELL, PROFESSOR:** on Hudson's Bay, 62.
- BERMUDA, TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH:** QUES. (*Mr. Daly*) 39; explanation (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 81.
- BETTER PREVENTION OF FRAUD IN RELATION TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS.** See B. 5.
- BILLS ASSENTED TO, 1397, 1398.**
- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, P. E. I. B. 135**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1316; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1339. (46 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- Bills of Lading Act Amt. B. No. 84** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 233; 2°, 428.
- BILLS, PRIVATE:** Ms. to extend time (*Mr. Beaty*) 36, 66, 88, 161; (*Mr. Abbott*) 288.
- BILL STAMPS:** QUES. (*Mr. Ives*) 40.
- BILL STAMPS, REDEMPTION OF:** QUES. (*Mr. McMullen*) 502.
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.**—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 3.
- BILL (No. 2) To amend an Act respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases and other matters relating to Criminal Law.**—(*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 29; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 87; incorp. with B. 6.
- BILL (No. 3) For constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.**—(*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 29; 2°, 140; M. for Com., 558; neg., 571.
- BILL (No. 4) To amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.**—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 32; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 93; incorp. with B. 6.
- BILL (No. 5) For the better prevention of Fraud in relation to Contracts involving the Expenditure of Public Moneys.**—(*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°, 32; 2°, 93; ref. to Sel. Com., 102; B. in Com., 287; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 302; neg. (Y. 49, N. 90) 306; 3°\*, 306.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 6) To provide that persons charged with Misdemeanor shall be competent as Witnesses.**—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 32; 2°, 87; M. for Com., 315; B. in Com., 322; M. that Com. rise (*Mr. Curran*) 322; carried on a div. 322; M. to reconsd. B. neg. (Y. 77, N. 101) 332.
- BILL (No. 7) To amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person.**—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 32; 2°, 87; in Com., 116; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) 195; carried and in Com., 200; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 67, N. 101) 201; 3°\*, 302.

BILL (No. 8) For the Discharge of Past Insolvents.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)

1°\*, 35; 2° m., 118; deb. adjd., 123.

BILL (No. 9) For the Equitable Distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)

1°, 35.

BILL (No. 10) To provide for the Amalgamation of the Bank of Nova Scotia with the Union Bank of Prince Edward Island.—(*Mr. Tupper, Pictou.*)

1°\*, 38; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 374.—(46 Vic., c. 48.)

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Law in reference to Trial of Cases before the County Judges' Criminal Court.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

1°, 38; 2°, 103; ref. to Sp. Com., 118.

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Law with reference to Procedure in Criminal Cases, and the Duties of Justices of the Peace out of Session, in relation to persons charged with Indictable Offences.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

1°\*, 38.

BILL (No. 13) To provide for the Punishment of Adultery, Seduction, and like Offences.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)

1°, 38; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 123; M. for Com., 220; B. in Com., 222; Order for consdn. read, 283; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Charlton*) carried (Y. 91, N. 73) 286; in Com., 286; M. for consdn., 286; deb. adjd., 287; M. to recom. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried (Y. 73 N. 61) 307; in Com., 313; rep., 314; 3°\*, 315.

BILL (No. 14) Respecting Carriers by Land.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

1°, 38; 2°, 124; in Com., 202, 314; rep., 315; M. for consdn., 415; Amt. as to constitutionality (*Mr. Ouimet*) 415; resmd., 426; deb. adjd., 426; Order to resume allowed to stand, 558.

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. Mulock.*)

1°, 39; 2°, 103; withdn., 281.

BILL (No. 16) To incorporate the Central Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Small.*)

1°\*, 40; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 106; 3°\*, 161.—(46 Vic., c. 50.)

BILL (No. 17) To further amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 50, respecting Permanent Building Societies in Ontario.—(*Mr. Williams.*)

1°, 40; 2°, 125;

BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the University of Saskatchewan, and to authorize the establishment of Colleges within the limits of the Diocese of Saskatchewan.—(*Mr. Williams.*)

1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 244; consd. and recom., 261; 3°\*, 261.—(46 Vic., c. 47.)

BILL (No. 19) To incorporate "Les Révérends Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée des Territoires du Nord-Ouest."—(*Mr. Royal.*)

1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 244; recom. and 3°, 368.—(46 Vic., c. 96.)

BILL (No. 20) To empower the National Insurance Company to wind up its affairs and to relinquish its Charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.—(*Mr. Coursol.*)

1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 426; 3°\*, 471.—(46 Vic., c. 82.)

BILL (No. 21) To authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money required for the Public Service.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)

Res. prop., 39; in Com., 53; 1°\* of B., 54; 2° and in Com., 81; 3°, 102.—(46 Vic., c. 3.)

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien.—(*Mr. Desjardins.*)

1°\*, 56; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 161, 261; 3° m., 215; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 215; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Houde*) 218; ruled out of Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 219; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) neg. (Y. 18, N. 144) 219; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. on a div., 220; 3° m., Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 307; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 310; recom., 369; on M. for 3°, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 145) 370; 3°\*, 371.—(46 Vic., c. 85.)

BILL (No. 23) To further reduce the Capital Stock of the Quebec Fire Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Bossé.*)

1°\*, 56; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 375.—(46 Vic., c. 83.)

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Manitoba and North-Western Fire Insurance Company.—(*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk.*)

1°\*, 56; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 261.—(46 Vic., c. 84.)

BILL (No. 25) To amend the Acts respecting Cruelty to Animals.—(*Mr. Richey.*)

1°\*, 56; 2° m., 225; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 229; B. in Com., 781; 3°\*, 903.

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate a Company under the name of "H. B. Rathbun & Sons."—(*Mr. White, Hastings.*)

1°\*, 67; 2°, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 471.—(46 Vic., c. 89.)

BILL (No. 27) To amend an Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. Wells.*)

1°\*, 67; 2°, 88; in Com. and 3°\*, 261.—(46 Vic., c. 58.)

BILL (No. 28) To continue an Act to incorporate sundry Persons by the name of the President, Directors, and Company of the Farmers' Bank of Rustico.—(*Mr. Davies.*)

1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 501.—(46 Vic., c. 49.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Bank of London, in Canada.—(*Mr. Dawson.*)

1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 106; in Com. and 3°\*, 375.—(46 Vic., c. 52.)

BILL (No. 30) To amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a Misdemeanor to have unguarded and exposed holes, openings, &c., in the ice on any navigable waters.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

1°, 67; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 125; incorp. with B. 6.

BILL (No. 31) To consolidate and amend the Laws affecting the Militia of Canada.—(*Mr. Caron.*)

- 1°; 67; 2° m., 5-6; 2°\*, 544; in Com., 544, 583; Res. prop., 693; Res. in Com., 721; B. again in Com., 729; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 731; deb. adjd., 732, resmd., 830; Amt. neg. (Y. 60, N. 113) 834; 3°\*, 835.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 32) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. Riopel*)  
1°\*, 77; 2°, 125.
- BILL (No. 33) To provide for the admission to the profession of Dominion Land Surveyors of Graduates of the Royal Military College.—(*Mr. Casgrain*)  
1°\*, 77; withdn., 1034.
- BILL (No. 34) To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Customs.—(*Mr. Bowell*)  
Res. prop., 100; Res. in Com., 101; 1°\* of B., 102; 2°\*, 546; in Com., 587, 694, 702; 3°\*, 702; Sen. Amts conc. in, 1037.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Federal Life Assurance Company.—(*Mr. Kilvert*)  
1°\*, 88.
- BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act incorporating the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Co., and the Act amending, the same.—(*Mr. Gunn*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 106; in Com., 371; ref. back to Ry. Com. 372; B. again in Com. and 3°\*, 556.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 37) To incorporate the Royal Society of Canada.—(*Mr. Tasse*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°, 262; in Com. and 3°\*, 471.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 38) To incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Company.—(*Mr. Dawson*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138.
- BILL (No. 39) To amend the Act of the Dominion of Canada, 45 Victoria, Chapter 124, respecting the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(*Mr. Charlton*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°, 162; withdn., 288.
- BILL (No. 40) To grant certain powers to the Acadia Powder Company.—(*Mr. Tupper*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138; in Com., 262, 372; 3° m., 872, 422; Amt. as to constitutionality (*Mr. Amyot*) 422; deb. adjd., 426; resmd., 498; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) 499; carried, 501; in Com., 557; 3°\*, 557.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Dominion Railway Trust and Construction Company of Canada, limited.—(*Mr. Small*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 164; in Com. and 3°\*, 749.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 42) To amend and continue in force the Act incorporating the Grafton Harbor Company, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Guillet*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 106; in Com., 471; 3°\*, 557.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 43) To amend the Act to incorporate the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.—(*Mr. McCarthy*)  
1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138; in Com., and 3°\*, 471.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 44) To incorporate the Grange Trust, limited.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell*)  
1°\*, 98; 2°\*, 138; in Com. and 3°, 701.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 45) Further to amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*)  
1°, 98; 2°\*, 546; M. for Com., 860; in Com., 873, 935; on M. for 3°, 936; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) 940; deb. resmd., 943; Amt. neg. (Y. 49, N. 101) 951; 3°\*, 951; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1310.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 46) Further to amend the Act intituled An Act relating to Banks and Banking, and the several Acts amending the same.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*)  
Res. prop. 98; in Com., 99; 1°\* of B., 100; 2°, 187; in Com., 281; 3°\*, 383.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 47) To revive and amend certain Acts respecting the Union Assurance Company of Canada, and to change the name of the Company to the Crown Assurance Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Beatty*)  
1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 138.
- BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Wood Mountain, Qu'Appelle and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(*Mr. Beatty*)  
1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 138; in Com. and 3°\*, 471; Sen. Amts. disagreed to, 767.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 49) To incorporate the Dominion Phosphate and Mining Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*)  
1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 165; in Com., 373; 3°\*, 374; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 804.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 50) To amend an Act respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*)  
1°\*, 106; 2°, 164; in Com. and 3°\*, 471; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1098.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 51) To amend the Act to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, limited.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*)  
1°\*, 106; 2° m., 164; 2°, 244; in Com. and 3°\*, 701.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Brant County Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Paterson, Brant*)  
1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 501.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 53) To declare the meaning and effect of certain provisions of the Act to incorporate the London and Ontario Investment Company, limited.—(*Mr. Hay*)  
1°\*, 116; 2°\* 244; in Com. and 3°\*, 501.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Quebec and James' Bay Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bossé*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 606.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Royal Canadian Passenger Steamship Company.—(*Mr. Mitchell*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 501.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway and Navigation Company.—(*Mr. Dawson*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165.

- BILL (No. 57) To further amend the Acts relating to the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(*Mr. Weldon.*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 767.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 58) To amend the several Acts incorporating the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Great Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 501.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 59) To amend the Acts incorporating the Atlantic and North-West Railway Company.—(*Mr. Colby.*)  
1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 471.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 60) To facilitate the Naturalization of Aliens, 1883.—(*Mr. Wells.*)  
1°, 129.
- BILL (No. 61) To incorporate the Niagara and Railway Bridge Company.—(*Mr. Ferguson, Welland.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165.
- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Atlantic, Pacific and Peace River Telegraph Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°, 140; 2°\*, 165.
- BILL (No. 63) To amalgamate the Presbyterian Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund in connection with the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, and the Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and to create a Trust to administer the said Funds.—(*Mr. Richey.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; in Com., 372; 3°\*, 426.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Pacific and Peace River Railway Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 749.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 65) To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\* 165; in Com., and 3°\*, 556.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the Quinze Pier, Boom, and Improvement Company.—(*Mr. Tassé.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165, M. for Com., 940; in Com. and 3°\*, 943.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Citizen's Insurance Company of Canada.—(*Mr. Curran.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 374.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Bridge and Manufacturing Company.—(*Mr. Curran.*)  
1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165.
- BILL (No. 69) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)  
1°, 140; 2°, 287.
- BILL (No. 70) To amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Colby.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Western Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 471.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the Great North-Western Railway Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 701.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund, of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West.—(*Mr. Ross, Lisgar.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. 373; 3°\*, 426.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 76) To amend the Act intituled: An Act to incorporate the Northern, North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, and to change the name of the said Company to the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 767.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 77) To fix the Rate of Interest in Canada.—(*Mr. Catudal*)  
1°\*, 150; M. for 2° reg., 903; M. to place on Orders, neg., 957.
- BILL (No. 78) To amend the Act passed in the 45th year of Her Majesty, intituled: An Act to Repeal the Duty on Promissory Notes, Drafts, and Bills of Exchange, and to declare the Law relating to Stamps on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange.—(*Mr. Weldon.*)  
1°, 150; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 315; in Com., 426; 3°\*, 557.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Davies and Lawrence Manufacturing Company.—(*Mr. Curran.*)  
1°\*, 161; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 631.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 80) To amend the Act incorporating the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(*Mr. Massue.*)  
1°\*, 161; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 557.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 81) To amend the Criminal Law, and to make special provision for the punishment of persons convicted of wife-beating.—(*Mr. Wood, Brockville.*)  
1°\*, 161; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 287.



- BILL (No. 82)** To amend the Act to incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(*Mr. Beatty*)  
1°\*, 185.
- BILL (No. 83)** To amend the Acts respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases, and other matters relating to Criminal Law.—(*Mr. Weldon*)  
1°\*, 204; 2° and in Com. 322; 3°\*, 383.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 84)** To amend the Law relating to Bills of Lading.—(*Mr. McCarthy*)  
1°\*, 233; 2°, 428.
- BILL (No. 85)** To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Bolduc*)  
1°, 233; 2°, 903; in Com., 903, 1034; 3°\*, 1034.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 86)** To consolidate and amend the Acts for the more speedy trial of persons charged with felonies and misdemeanors in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*)  
1°, 233.
- BILL (No. 87)** To incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of British America.—(*Mr. White, Hastings*)  
1°\*, 254; prop. M. to fix day for 2°, 254; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Coursol*) 254; neg. (Y. 89, N. 94) 260; Order for 2° allowed to stand, 501; 2° m., 632; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) 632; carried (Y. 106, N. 70) 657.
- BILL (No. 88)** To unite the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company and the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company, under the name of the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*)  
1°\*, 261; 2°\*, 426; in Com. and 3°\*, 749.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 89)** Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates of Inland and Coasting Ships.—(*Mr. McLelan*)  
Res. in Com., 428; 1°\* of B., 431; 2° m., 702; 2° and in Com., 708; 3°, 743.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 90)** To amend the Canada Civil Service Act, 1882—*from the Senate*.—(*Sir Hector Langevin*)  
1°\*, 282; 2° m., 931; 2°, 933; Res. prop., 933; Res. in Com., 933; B. in Com., 1035; 3°, 1060.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 91)** To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Superannuation of the Civil Service of Canada—*from the Senate*.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*)  
1°\*, 283; Res. prop., 791; in Com., 792; 2° of B. m., 1227; 2° and in Com., 1234; 3° m., 1363; Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 47, N. 100) 1364; 3°, 1364.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 92)** To amend the Post Office Act, 1875—*from the Senate*.—(*Mr. Carling*)  
1°\*, 283; 2°, 1037; in Com. and 3°\*, 1037.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 93)** Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada—*from the Senate*.—(*Mr. White, Cardwell*)  
1°\*, 283; 2°, 375; ref. back to Com. on Rys., 803; 3° m., 1095; 3°\*, 1098.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 94)** To amend an Act respecting the Offices of Receiver General and Minister of Public Works, as to the powers of the Minister of Railways and Canals.—(*Sir Charles Tupper*)  
1°\*, 298; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1037.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 95)** Further to amend The Interpretation Act—*from the Senate*.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*)  
1°\*, 298; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1310.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 96)** Respecting Booms and other works constructed in Navigable Waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts or otherwise—*from the Senate*.—*Sir Hector Langevin*)  
Introd., 298; 1°\*, 315; 2° m., 786; 2°, 783; in Com., 788, 935; 3°\*, 935.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 97)** For the declaration of Titles to Land, and to facilitate its Transfer in the Territories of Canada.—(*Mr. McCarthy*)  
1°, 572.
- BILL (No. 98)** For the better prevention of Fraud in connection with the Sale of Patent Rights.—(*Mr. Mulock*)  
1°\*, 315.
- BILL (No. 99)** To provide for the Distribution of the Assets of Insolvent Traders.—(*Mr. Curran*)  
1°, 367.
- BILL (No. 100)** To limit the Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Appeal.—(*Mr. Landry*)  
1°, 383.
- BILL (No. 102)** To amend and extend the province of chap. 71 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, respecting Charitable, Philanthropic and Provident Associations.—(*Mr. Colby*)  
1°, 497.
- BILL (No. 101)** Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(*Mr. McLelan*)  
Res. in Com. and 1° of B., 526; 2°\*, 860; in Com., 1200; 3°\*, 1207; Sen. Amts., 1383.
- BILL (No. 103)** Respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations—*from the Senate*.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*)  
1°\*, 631; 2°, 791; in Com. and 3°\*, 791.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 104)** Further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Costigan*)  
Res. in Com. and 1°\*, 526; 2°, 828; in Com., 829; 3°\*, 860.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 105)** To confer certain powers on the Canadian Electric Light Company.—(*Mr. Bergeron*)  
1°, 547; 2°, 701; in Com. and 3°\*, 871.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 106)** To increase the harbor accommodation of the city of Toronto, extend the Esplanade, and control the use thereof by railway companies.—(*Mr. Small*)  
1°, 574; 2°, 709.
- BILL (No. 107)** Respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*)  
1°, 593; withdn., 1387.

- BILL (No. 108)** Further to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of Pictou.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)  
Res. in Com., 741; 1° of B., 741; 2°\*, 860; in Com. and 3°\*, 922.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 109)** To amend the Act for the final settlement of Claims to Lands in Manitoba by occupancy under the Act. 33 *Vic.*, chap. 3—*from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Royal.*)  
1°\*, 660; withdn., 1034.
- BILL (No. 110)** To amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in Manitoba—*from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Royal.*)  
1°, 660; 2°, 1034.
- BILL (No. 111)** To amend and consolidate the laws relating to Penitentiaries—*from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°\*, 693; Res. in Com., 1035; 2° of B., 1038; in Com., 1309; recom. and 3°\*, 1387.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 112)** To amend the Act to incorporate the North-Western Bank—*from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Beatty.*)  
1°\*, and 2°\*, 693; in Com., and 3°\*, 871.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 113)** To authorize the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to extend their Traffic Arrangements with the North Shore Railway to fifty years from the date thereof.—(*Mr. Colby.*)  
1°, 692; 2°, 693; in Com., 803; recom. and 3°\*, 888.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 114)** Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)  
1°, 783; 2°, 784; in Com. and 3° m., 888; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Sutherland*) 888; recom. and 3°\*, 889.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 115)** To consolidate and amend the several Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
Res. prop., 574; in Com., 790; 1°\* of B., 791; 2° and in Com., 915; 3°, 999; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1279.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 116)** Further to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific Coast of Canada and Asia.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)  
1°\*, 791; 2°\*, 860; in Com. and 3°\*, 935.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 117)** To define certain Offences against persons employed in Factories.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
1°, 827; withdn., 1386.
- BILL (No. 118)** To amend the Act incorporating the European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Company, limited, and to change the name thereof to the American, British and Continental Cable Company, limited.—(*Mr. Colby.*)  
1°\* and 2°\*, 828; in Com. and 3°\*, 943.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 119)** Further to amend the Tariff of Duties of Customs.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
1°\*, 1251; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 120)** To incorporate the Canadian Rapid Telegraph Company, limited—*from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Davies.*)  
1°\*, 922; 2°, 943; in Com. and 3°\*, 1098.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 121)** Respecting the Harbor Master of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)  
1°\*, 999; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1038.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 122)** To amend the Patent Act—*from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Pope.*)  
1°\*, 957; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1227.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 123)** Respecting County Court Judges in the Province of Ontario—*from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°\*, 1024; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1386.
- BILL (No. 124)** Respecting the High Court of Justice for Ontario—*from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°\*, 1024; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1386.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 125)** To make provision for the taking of Evidence in relation to any Criminal matters pending in Courts of Justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions, or before foreign tribunals—*from the Senate.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)  
1°\*, 1024; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1338.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 126)** To make further provision respecting the regulation and collection of Tolls on Government Timber Slides and other works constructed to facilitate the transmission of timber, lumber, and saw-logs.—(*Mr. Costigan.*)  
Res. prop., 709; in Com., 1037; 1°\* of B., 1037; 2° and in Com., 1207; 3°\*, 1227.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 127)** Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and to declare certain lines of railway to be works for the general advantage of Canada.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)  
1°, 1084; 2° m., 1209; 2° and in Com., 1297; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to recom. neg. (Y. 42, N. 78) 1317; recom. and 3°\*, 1318.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 128)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending respectively 30th June, 1883, and 30th June, 1884; and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
1°\*, 1338; 2° m., 1338; 2°\* and 3°\*, 1391.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 129)** To amend the Act 38 *Vic.*, chap. 56, intitled: An Act respecting the Graving Dock in the Harbor of Quebec, and authorizing the raising of a loan in respect thereof.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
Res. in Com., 1213; 1°\* of B., 1213; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1279.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 130)** To amend the Act 36 *Vic.*, chap. 62, and the Act 43 *Vic.*, chap. 17, respecting the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)  
Res. in Com., 1213; 1°\* of B., 1214; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1279.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 39.)

**BILL (No. 131)** To encourage the Manufacture of Pig Iron in Canada from the Canadian ore.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)  
 Res. prop., 593; in Com., 710—716; conc. in, 743; 1°\* of B., 1226; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 14)

**BILL (No. 132)** Respecting the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of Licenses therefor.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 Res., 1226; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1227; 2° m., 1318; 2° and in Com., 1319, 1339; M. for 3°, 1364; Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) carried (Y. 148, N. 1) 1365; Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 66, N. 79) 1366; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1366; neg. (Y. 46, N. 105) 1371; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (Y. 88, N. 63) 1372; Amt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 95) 1372; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried, 1372; Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373, neg. (Y. 58, N. 80) 1374; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1374; Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) neg., 1374; Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) carried, 1375; Amt. (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) carried, 1375; Amt. (*Mr. Foster*) carried, 1375; Amt. (*Mr. Gigault*) neg., 1375; Amt. (*Mr. Fleming*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1375; Amt. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1376; 3°, 1376.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

**BILL (No. 133)** To continue for a limited time the Acts therein mentioned (41 *Vic.*, c. 17 and 43 *Vic.*, c. 36).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°, 1310; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1366.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 133.)

**BILL (No. 134)** To provide for the Salaries, Superannuation and Travelling Expenses of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 Res. in Com., 1310; 1°\* of B., 1316; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

**BILL (No. 135)** Relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in the Province of Prince Edward Island from the Senate.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°\*, 1316; 2°, in Com., and 3°\*, 1339.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 22.)

**BILL (No. 136)** To amend the Law respecting Lotteries— from the Senate.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°\*, 1316; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1339.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

**BILL (No. 137)** To authorize the Granting of Subsidies for the Construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(*Sir Charles Tupper*.)  
 Res. prop., 1252; in Com., 1233; Rep. of Com. consid., 1317; 1°\* of B., 1317; 2°\*, 1331; in Com., 1332; on M. for 3°, Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1333; 3°\*, 1333.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

**BILL (No. 138)** To provide for advances to be made by the Government of Canada to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)  
 Res. prop., 1199; M. for Com., 1333; Res. in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1335; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°, 1363.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 26.)

**BILL (No. 139)** To amend the Act 36 *Vic.*, chap. 4, intituled: An Act to provide for the Establishment of the Department of the Interior, and to amend the Indian Act, 1880— from the Senate.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°, 1335; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1387.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 6)

**BILL (No. 140)** To legalize proceedings taken for the Naturalization of certain Aliens in the Province of Manitoba— from the Senate.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°, 1335; 2°\* and in Com., 1387; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg., and 3°\*, 1387.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 31)

**BILL (No. 141)** To amend the Act of the present Session, intituled: An Act to incorporate the Railway and Construction Company of Canada, limited.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)  
 1°\*, 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

**BILL (No. 142)** To make further provision for Deepening the Ship Channel of the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)  
 Res., 1336; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1338.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

**BILL (No. 143)** To extend to British Columbia the Act relating to Fishing by Foreign Vessels.—(*Mr. Bowell*.)  
 1°, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1363.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

**BILL (No. 144)** To amend an Act of the present Session respecting Booms and other works constructed in Navigable Waters, whether under the authority of Provincial Acts or otherwise— from the Senate.—(*Sir Hector Langevin*.)  
 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1384.—(46 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

**BLACK ROD**: Messages summoning Commons to Senate, 1, 3, 1397.

**BLAKELY, MR.** ADVANCE TO: in Com. of Sup. 1197.

**BLANDFORD (N.S.) BREAKWATER**: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 68.

**BLANKETS, MILITIA, PURCHASE OF**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 230.

**B. N. A. ACT (1867) CASES DECIDED UNDER**: in Com. of Sup., 1045; conc., 1128.

**BOISVERT, JULIE, INVESTIGATION INTO TRIAL OF**: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 41; (*Mr. Coursol*) 107.

**BONUS, TOWN OF PEMBROKE, TO CAN. CENTRAL RY.**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 229; in Com. of Sup., 1065.

**BOOKS**: on M. to conc. in Rep. from Com. on W. & M. (*Mr. Blake*) 732; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 732, 735; (*Mr. Fisher*) 736; (*Mr. Hall*) 738; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 738; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 739; (*Mr. Sproule*) 749.

**Booms and other Works on Navigable Waters B. No. 96**— from the Senate (*Sir Hector Langevin*). B. introd., 298; 1°\*, 315; 2° m., 786; 2°, 788; in Com., 788, 935; 3°\*, 935. (46 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

**Booms and other Works on Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 144** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°\*, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1384. (46 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

**BOTHWELL ELECTION AND CONDUCT OF COUNTY JUDGE**: M. for Sp. Com. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 508, 524; Deb. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 513; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 517, 523; (*Mr. Casey*) 518; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 520; (*Mr. McCallum*) 521; (*Mr. Blake*) 522; neg., 522.

**BOUNDARIES OF ONT., NORTHERN AND WESTERN**: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 556.

**BOUNTY ON PIG IRON**: prop. Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 693; Deb. in Com. on Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 710—714; (*Mr.*

- Blake* 711—716; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 716; (*M. Cameron, Victoria*) 716; (*Mr. Charlton*) 717—721; *Mr. Mc Lelan* 718; (*Mr. Wright*) 718; (*Mr. Valin*) 718; (*Mr. McNeill*) 719; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 719. See B. 131.
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: AMOUNT PAID OUT OF APPROPRIATION:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 129; Augmentation of: Ques. (*Mr. Fortin*) 1025; Expenses in connection with, conc., 1223.
- BOURINOT, MR. J. G. (Clerk of the House):** Commissioner to administer Oath, 1; Speaker declared elected, 2; Warrants issued for Elections, 3.
- BRACES OR SUSPENDERS:** in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- BRANDON AS A PORT OF ENTRY:** Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.
- BRANDON POST OFFICE:** Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.
- BRANDY POTS, SEMAPHORE AT:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.
- Brant County Bank Incorp. B. No. 52 (M. Paterson, Brant).** 1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 501. (46 Vic., c. 51.)
- BRANT, JOSEPH, MONUMENT TO:** in Com. of Sup., 1249.
- BREAKWATERS.** See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- BRECKEN, MR. F. DE ST. CROIX, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT RESPECTING:** read (*Mr. Speaker*) 84.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA:**
- Barkerville and Forks of Quesnelle Mail Service: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Reid*) 302.
  - Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 998.
  - Chinese Immigration: Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 323.
  - Cottonwood Canon, Upper Fraser: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 315.
  - Dry Dock and Island Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 657; explanations (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1392.
  - Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Gordon*) 301.
  - Geological Survey of Vancouver Island: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 376.
  - Governor-General's Visit: in Com. of Sup., 1,91.
  - Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 927, 1133.
  - Immigration to, including Chinese: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 72.
  - Immigration into; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 776.
  - Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1101, 1378.
  - Lake Shushwac and Lake Okanagan Canal: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Barnard*) 237.
  - Little Bear Creek, Navigation of: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
  - Negotiations between Federal and Local Govts.: Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 657; explanations (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1392.
  - Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 756.
  - Pilots and Pilotage in B.C.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Baker*) 205.
  - Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 913, 1244.
  - Squatters on Ry. Reserve, Vancouver Island: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gordon*) 382.
  - Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1199.
  - Two Creeks Harbor: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
- BREWING AND DISTILLING MATERIALS, AMOUNT OF:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Foster*) 78.
- BRIDGE OVER RED RIVER AT EMERSON:** in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- BUCKHORN (ONT.) PIER AT:** Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 890.
- BUDGET THE:** Speech of Finance Minister (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 332. [For Deb. See "WAYS AND MEANS."]
- Building Societies, Permanent, Act Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. Williams).** 1°, 40; 2°, 125.
- BUOYS AND BEACONS IN LAKE HURON:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 79.
- BURGESS, JOHN, LEGAL EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 1192.
- BURLAND, G. B. & Co., CONTRACTS FOR LITHOGRAPHING:** M. for copies (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 556.
- BURLINGTON CANAL.** See "CANALS."
- BURPEE, S. G., CHARGES AGAINST:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 505.
- CABLE EXTENSION FROM BARRINGTON TO CAPE SABLE ISLAND:** Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.
- CADETS, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, COMMISSIONS IN IMP. SERVICE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 288.
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ STEAM SERVICE:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 504.
- CANADA AND GERMANY, STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96; in Com. of Sup., 953.
- CANADA AND SPAIN, TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 547.
- CANADA AND THE POSTAL UNION:** Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 106.
- CANADA AND WEST INDIES AND BRAZIL MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 952.
- CANADA AT INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXHIBITION:** Telegram read (*M. Howell*) 1207.
- CANADA, BRAZIL, WEST INDIES AND MEXICO, TRADE BETWEEN:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 767.
- CANADA CENTRAL RY. AND TOWN OF PEMBROKE BONUS:** M. for copies of Petitions, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 229.
- CANADA CENTRAL RY. SUBSIDY.** See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY." "CANADA GAZETTE:" in Com. of Sup., 1038; conc., 1120.
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, PHYSICIANS CERTIFICATES GRANTED UNDER:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 777.
- Canadian Consolidated Five Per Cent. Loan B. No. 21 (Sir Leonard Tilley).** Res. prop., 39; in Com., 53; 1°\* of B., 54; 2° and in Com., 81; 3°, 102. (46 Vic., c. 3.)
- Canadian Electric Light Co.'s B. No. 105 (Mr. Bergeron).** 1°, 547; 2°, 701; in Com. and 3°\*, 871. (46 Vic., c. 80.)
- CANADIAN EXTRADITION ACT:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 42.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. Abbott)** 1°, 783; 2°, 784; in Com., 888; on M. for 3°, Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Sutherland*) 888; recom. and 3°\*, 889. (46 Vic., c. 55.)
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. COMMISSION:** M. for Stmt. of Expenses (*Mr. Blake*) 41; in Com. of Sup., 1280.

**CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:**

Allowances to Canadian Manufacturers of goods required by Company: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 41;  
 Annual Statement (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 957; reply (*Mr. Blake*) 977; remarks (*Mr. Pope*) 997.  
 British Columbia Sections: in Com. of Sup., 998.  
 Canada Central Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 997.  
 Comparative Local Freight Rates: Table, 968.  
 Commission, Sundry Accounts: in Com. of Sup., 1280.  
 Construction and Land Grants in Man.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Royal*) 903.  
 Contract 15, and Mr. Whitehead, 1141; conc., 1219.  
 Contract between Co. and the North American Contracting Co.: M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 778.  
 Contracts laid on Table (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 116.  
 Contracts A and B, reduction in, through change: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 556.  
 Dawson Route, Award to Capt. Dick: in Com. of Sup., 1139; conc., 1214.  
 Georgian Bay Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1137.  
 Homesteads and Preemption Lands south of Line, withdrawal of; M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 525.  
 In Com. of Sup., 998, 999, 1137, 1141—1149; conc., 1214, 1218, 1219.  
 Leases of other Lines (Credit Valley). See B. 114.  
 Location and Lands: M. for Maps (*Mr. Blake*) 75, 86.  
 Monopoly by Co.; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 107.  
 North of Lake Superior and East of Current River: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.  
 Official Memorandum of Co.: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 107.  
 Pembina Branch, Gravel claim of D. B. Woodworth: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 902, 1034.  
 Petition from Co. for B., read, 741 (vol. ii.).  
 Prince Arthur's Landing and Rat Portage: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 1025.  
 Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River: in Com. of Sup., 998.  
 Rates and Tolls: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 81.  
 Red River, West of: in Com. of Sup., 1137.  
 Rep. in account with Govt.: presented (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 66.  
 Reps. as to route, progress &c. presented (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 66.  
 Rolling Stock purchased from Purcell & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 1149.  
 Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 999.  
 Subsidy to Company: in Com. of Sup., 999.  
 Town of Pembroke Bonus; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 229; in Com. of Sup., 1065.  
**CANADIAN TOBACCO LICENSED MANUFACTURERS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gigault*) 86.  
**CANADIAN TOBACCO REGULATIONS:** Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 41.

**CANADIAN TOBACCO:** Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 574; Deb. (*Mr. Laurier*) 576; (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 576; (*Mr. Landry*) 577; (*Mr. Lesage*) 578; (*Mr. Béchard*) 578; (*Mr. Gigault*) 579; (*Mr. Dugas*) 579; (*Mr. Labrosse*) 580; (*Mr. Dupont*) 580; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 580; (*Mr. Amyot*) 581; (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 582.

**Canadian Rapid Telegraph Co. Incomp. B. Co. 120**—from the Senate (*Mr. Davies*). 1°\*, 922; 2°, 943; in Com. and 3°\*, 1098. (46 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

**CANALS:**

Beauharnois: Swing Bridge at Valleyfield: in Com. of Sup., 1072.  
 Burlington, Renewal of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 1072.  
 Carillon Canal, Dam and Slide: in Com. of Sup., 1071.  
 Chambly, Raising Banks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1073.  
 Cornwall: in Com. of Sup., 1070; Enlargement, 1159; Drain, 1072.  
 Culbute: in Com. of Sup., 1159, 1245.  
 Dunn and Page, Messrs., Compensation to: in Com. of Sup., 1160.  
 General (Charges on Revenue): in Com. of Sup., 1169.  
 Grenville, Arbitrator's Award to Contractor: M. for copy (*Mr. Casey*) 903; in Com. of Sup., 1072; Heney, Stewart & Co. Award, 1158; conc., 1221.  
 Lachine: in Com. of Sup., 1068.  
 Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 1245.  
 Murray: prop. Routes: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Platt*) 204; in Com. of Sup., 1071.  
 Point des Cascades and Lake St. Francis: Ques. (*Mr. De Beaujeu*) 266.  
 Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1077.  
 Rideau, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1073.  
 Salaries, &c., Canal Officers: in Com. of Sup., 1078.  
 Ste. Anne: in Com. of Sup., 1071.  
 St. Lawrence River and Canals in Com. of Sup., 1070.  
 St. Peter's: in Com. of Sup., 1245.  
 Tay, Construction of Works: in Com. of Sup., 1072.  
 Trent River Nav.: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1072; conc., 1123.  
 Welland: in Com. of Sup., 1072; Compensation to Messrs. Dunn and Page, 1160; cleaning out back ditches, 1072; purchase of steam pump, 1160  
 Compensation to T. Munroe, 1245.  
 Williamsburg: in Com. of Sup. (Lock at Rapide Plat) 1070; (Compensation to owners of land), 1159, 1245; conc., 1317.  
**CAPE BRETON UNDER CONFEDERATION:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 412.  
**CAPE CANSO AND PORT HOOD MAIL SUBSIDY:** in Com. of Sup., 952.  
**CAPE GEORGE (N.S.) BREAKWATER:** Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 502.  
**CAPE RACE LIGHT DUES:** in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
**CAPE TRAVERSE RY.** See "PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND."  
**CAPE TRAVERSE RY.:** in Com. of Sup., 1064.  
**CARAQUETTE RY., SUBSIDY TO Co.:** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1264. See B. 137.

**CARBOLIC AND HEAVY OILS:** in Com. on W & M., 672.

**CARDS, PLAYING:** in Com. on W. & M., 662.

**CARILLON CANAL, DAM AND SLIDE.** See "CANALS."

**CARRIAGES:** in Com. on W. & M., 662.

**Carriers by Land B. No. 14** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 38; 2°, 124; in Com., 202, 314; rep., 315; M. for consdn., 415; Amt. as to constitutionality (*Mr. Ouimet*) 415; resmd., 426; deb. adjd., 426; Order to resume allowed to stand, 558.

**CARTIER, SIR GEO. E, WIDOW OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1378.

**CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYÉS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659.

**CASCUMPEC HARBOR:** in Com. of Sup., 924.

**CASUALTIES ON INTERCOL. RY.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 129.

**CATUDAL, MR. M.:** confirmed in Seat on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 3.

**CENSUS:** in Com. of Sup., 837.

**CENSUS RETURNS, DISTRIBUTION OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 89; Males over twenty-one in Electoral Divisions: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Fisher*) 104.

**Central Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 16** (*Mr. Small*). 1°, 40; 2°, 77; in Com., 106; 3°, 161. (46 *Vic., c. 50*.)

**CEREALS, DUTIES AND IMPORTS:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Gigault*) 775.

**CEREMONIES AT OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

**CERTIFICATES OF MASTERS AND MATES:** Deb. on 2° of B. (*Mr. Weldon*) 702; (*Mr. McLelan*) 703, 707; (*Mr. Cockburn*) 703; (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 704; (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 704; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 705; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 705; (*Mr. Dawson*) 705; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 705; (*Mr. Lister*) 705; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 706; (*Mr. Platt*) 706; (*Mr. Landry*) 706; (*Mr. Paint*) 707; (*Mr. Fortin*) 707. See B. 89 (Masters and Mates).

**CHAGNON, MR. JUSTICE:** Napierville Controverted Election Rep., 3.

**CHAMBLY CANAL.** See "CANALS."

**CHANNEL, SHIP, BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.** See "Quebec."

**CHAPLEAU, HON. J.:** confirmed in Seat on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 3; introd., 1317.

**CHARGES AGAINST H. HÉBERT:** M. for copies (*Mr. Landry*) 381.

**CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT:** in Com. of Sup., 743.

**CHARGES ON REVENUE:** in Com. of Sup., 1160, 1169, 1198, 1199, 1222.

**"CHARYBDIS" CORVETTE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 135.

**CHASTITY, OFFENCES AGAINST.** See Bs. 7 and 13.

**Charitable, Philanthropic and Provident Associations B. No. 102** (*Mr. Colby*). 1°, 497.

**CHATHAM AND ESCUMINAC LIGHTHOUSE TELEGRAPH:** Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.

**CHEVRETIÈRE, OCTAVE C. DE LA, DISMISSAL OF:** M. for copies of O. C. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 40.

**CHIEF JUSTICESHIP OF QUEEN'S BENCH, MAN.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 60.

**Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 51** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 106; 2°, m. 164; 2°, 244; in Com. and 3°, 701. (46 *Vic., c. 60*.)

**CHILDREN'S CARRIAGES, IMPORTATION OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 777.

**CHILDREN'S CARRIAGES:** in Com. on W. & M., 663.

**CHINESE IMMIGRATION INTO B.C.:** Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*) 323, 906; Deb. (*Mr. Baker*) 325, 906; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 326; (*Mr. Gordon*) 328, 907; (*Mr. Foster*) 329; (*Mr. Tupper*) 330; (*Mr. Homer*) 904, 907; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 905.

**Citizens Ins. Co. of Canada B. No. 67** (*Mr. Curran*). 1°, 140; 2°, 165; in Com. and 3°, 374.—(46 *Vic., c. 81*.)

**CIVIL GOVERNMENT:** in Com. of Sup., 743—752, 1131, 1132, 1177, 1235, 1249; conc., 1114.

**Civil Service Act (1882) Amt. B. 90**—from the Senate (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°, 282; 2° m., 931; 2°, 933; Res. prop. and in Com., 933; in Com. on B., 1035; 3°, 1060. (46 *Vic., c. 7*.)

**CIVIL SERVICE BOARD:** in Com. of Sup., 752.

**Civil Service Superannuation Acts Consolidation B. No. 91**—from the Senate (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 283; Res. prop., 791; 2° of B. m., 1227; 2° and in Com., 1234; 3° m., 1363; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 47; N. 100) 1364; 3°, 1364. (46 *Vic., c. 8*.)

**CIVIL SERVICE:**

Employés in Depts. charged to Pub. Works: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 86.

Employés in Montreal: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Coursol*) 78.

Examinations in Ont.: Ques. (*Mr. Kilvert*) 107.

[See "Civil Government" under "SUPPLY."]

Examiners' Rep.: presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 177.

Supernumerary Clerks in Montreal Custom House: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Curran*) 72.

**CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOMINION BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 266.

**CLAIMS OF NARCISSE ANDRÉ PELLETIER AND OTHERS:** Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1025.

**CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY:** List of Members returned, 1; Writs of Election for Controverted Elections, 3; ordered to attend House with Returns in re King's County (P.E.I.) Election, 40; in attendance, 52, 526; in Com. of Sup., 835.

**CLERK OF THE HOUSE.** See "Bourinot."

**CLOSE SEASON FOR LOBSTER FISHING, REGULATIONS FOR:** M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Kirk*) 659.

**COAL DUST:** in Com. on W. & M., 692.

**COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.

**COAL EXPORTS FROM N.S.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

**COAL EXPORTS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

- COAL LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST, SALES AND LEASES OF:**  
M. for copies of applications (*Mr. Blake*) 41.
- COAST SERVICE.** See "LIGHTHOUSES."
- CODIFICATION OF DOMINION LAWS:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- COFFIN'S ISLAND (N.S.) Works at:** Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 501.
- COLCHESTER REEF LIGHTHOUSE:** in Com. of Sup., 956.
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES:** in Com. of Sup., 1073, 1077, 1078, 1245.
- COLLECTION OF SEAMEN'S WAGES:** M. to introd. B. (*Mr. O'Brien*) withdn., 53.
- COLONIZATION LANDS UNDER PLANS NOS. ONE AND TWO:**  
M. for Rets. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55; remarks on delay, 557.
- "COLUMBIA," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 76.
- COMMISSION, C.P.R.** See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- COMMISSIONERS, COURT OF RY.** See B. 3; also "Court."
- COMMISSIONERS TO ADMINISTER OATH, 1.**
- COMMISSION, INTERCOL. RY:** in Com. of Sup., 1150, 1244.
- COMMITTEES:**  
Debates, Official Reps. of: Sel. Com. to [supervise, appointed, 28. See "Debates."  
Inter-provincial Trade: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Paint*) 113; Com. appointed, 135.  
Library: Sel. Com. to assist *Mr. Speaker*, 36.  
Printing: M. for Joint Com. of both Houses, 38.  
Privileges and Elections: M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on King's County (P.E.I.) Election (*Mr. Blanchet*) 793; Res. conc. in, 826.  
Standing Orders: M. for Joint Com. to Revise Rules, &c. (*Mr. Beatty*) 233; M. for Mess. to Sen., 291.  
Steam Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Jenkins*) 68.  
Select Standing: M. for, 4; Com. to prepare lists, 28; Lists presented, 35; conc. in, 36.
- COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COMMUNICATION BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND.** See P.E.I.
- COMPARATIVE STATEMENTS OF FREIGHT RATES,** 968, 991.
- COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES, P.E.I. RY.:** in Com. of Sup., 1166.
- COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS OF MOUNTED POLICE:** in Com. of Sup., 1041.
- CONCURRENCE.** See "SUPPLY."
- CONFEDERATION DEBATES, INDEX TO:** Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 266; (*Mr. Landry*) 785.
- CONFEDERATION, PICTURE TO COMMEMORATE:** on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1171.
- CONGRATULATIONS, &c.:** Remarks before Prorogation (*Mr. Wright, Mr. Tröw, Mr. Brecken, Mr. Landry*) 1396, 1397.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE:** M. for Rst. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.
- Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 15** (*Mr. Muloch*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 39.
- CONSOLIDATED RY. ACT:** Ques. (*Mr. Muloch*) 383.
- CONTINGENCIES:** in Com. of Sup. (Departmental) 750, (High Commissioner) 751, 1177; (Post Office and Finance Depts.) 752, conc., 1114; (Militia) 857; (Privy Council Office) 1249.
- CONTRACTS:**  
P.O.D.: Carriage of Mails: M. for Copies (*Mr. Laurier*) 86.  
Canadian Pacific, laid on Table (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 116.  
Contract 15, C.P.R.: in Com of Sup., 1141; conc., 1259.  
C.P.R. Co. and the North American Contracting Co. M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 778.  
Contracts, Public: Fraud in Relation to. See B. 5.
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, 1874:** Ques. (*Mr. Dugas*) 56.
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.** Special cases, see respective Districts; also "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- CORDAGE:** in Com. on W. & M., 666—671.
- CORNWALL CANAL.** See "CANALS."
- COTTON DUCK:** in Com. on W. & M., 663—666.
- COTTONS, PRINTED AND DYED:** in Com. on W. & M., 675—682.
- COTTON WOOD CANON, B.C.:** Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 315.
- County Court Judges (Ont.) B. No. 123**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1024; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1386.
- COUNTY JAILS AND PENITENTIARIES, REMOVAL OF PRISONERS, COST OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 133.
- COUNTY JUDGES, CONDUCT OF.** See "Bothwell Election."
- County Judges, Criminal Court Act Amt. B. No. 11** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 38.
- COURT OF RY. COMMISSIONERS:** Deb. on 2<sup>o</sup> of B. (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) 140; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 142; (*Mr. Orton*) 144; (*Mr. Sproule*) 144; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 145; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 145; (*Mr. Tupper*) 146; (*Mr. Blake*) 147; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 147; (*Mr. Haggart*) 147; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 148; (*Mr. Charlton*) 148; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 149; Deb. on M. for Com. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 558; (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 563; (*Mr. Mc Callum*) 564; (*Mr. Casey*) 565; (*Mr. Orton*) 566; (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 567; (*Mr. McNeill*) 567; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 570; (*Mr. Fairbank*) 571. See B. 3 (Railway Commissioners).
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. No. 22** (*Mr. Desjardins*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 56; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 77; in Com., 161, 261; M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 215; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 215; Amt. to Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Houde*) 218; ruled out of Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 219; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Orton*) neg. (Y. 18, N. 144) 219; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. on a div., 220; 3<sup>o</sup> m., Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 307; Amt. to Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 310; recom., 369; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 145) 370; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 371. (45 Vic., c. 85.)
- Credit Valley Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 50** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 106; 2<sup>o</sup>, 164; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 471; Sen. Amts. 1098. (46 Vic., c. 57.)
- Crimes of Violence Act Continuation in Force B. No. 133** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1310; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1366. (46 Vic., c. 33.)

CRIMINAL CASES, LAW OF EVIDENCE IN. *See* B. 4.

**Criminal Cases, Procedure in before Justices of the Peace, Act Amt. B. 12** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 38.

**Criminal Evidence before Foreign Tribunals Provision B. No. 125**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1024; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1338, (46 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

**Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) Adultery, Seduction &c. B. No. 13** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°, 38; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com. 123; M. for Com., 220; B. in Com., 222; Order for consdn. read, 283; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Charlton*) carried (Y. 91, N. 73) 286; in Com., 286; M. for consdn., 286; deb. adjd. 287; M. to recom. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried (Y. 73, N. 61) 307; in Com., 313; rep., 314; 3°\*, 315.

**Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) Incest, punishment of, B. No. 7** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 32; 2°, 87; in Com., 116; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) 195; carried and in Com., 200; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 67, N. 101) 201; 3°\*, 302.

CRIMINAL LAWS CONSOLIDATION: Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78.

**Criminal Law Amt. (Procedure in Criminal Cases) B. No 2** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 29; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 87. Incorp. with B. (No. 6.)

**Criminal Law Amt. (Procedure in Criminal Cases) prosecution of Corporations, B. No. 83** (*Mr. Weldon*). 1°\*, 204; 2° and in Com., 322; 3°\*, 383. (46 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

**Criminal Law (Wife Beating) Amt. B. No. 81** (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*). 1°\*, 161; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 287.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 837.

**Cruelty to Animals Acts Amt. B. No. 25** (*Mr. Richey*). 1°\*, 56; 2° m., 225; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 229; B. in Com., 781; 3°\*, 903.

CULBUTE CANAL. *See* "CANALS."

**Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Bill No. 71** (*Mr. Colby*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607. (46 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

**Customs, Tariffs of Duties of, Act Amt. B. No. 119** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°\*, 1251; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336. (46 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

CUSTOM HOUSE, MONTREAL, ACCIDENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 126.

CUSTOMS:

Agricultural Implements, Duties on: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.

Brandon as a Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.

Coal entered ex-Warehouse, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.

Drawbacks, Claims for: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 66; on M. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) for Com. of Sup., 1129; on 2° Supply B., 1388—1390.

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Dufferin Bridge, Remission of Duty on Iron imported for: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 897.

Dustan, Mr., Claim of, for Remission of Duty on Machinery: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 659.

Duties on Articles imported by C. P. Ry. Co.: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 659.

Frauds upon: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 42.

Imports and Duties on Cereals: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Gigault*) 775.

Imports and Exports: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

Insuring Goods in Bond: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 204.

Laws and Regulations and U.S. National Distillers' Association: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 507.

Liquors, Distilled and Fermented, Imported: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Foster*) 78.

Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 1000, 1198; conc., 1226.

Preventive Officer at Woodstock: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 289.

Refund of Duties at Port of Toronto: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 660.

Regina as a Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.

Seizures: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 41.

Selkirk as a Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Ross, Selkirk*) 315.

Shipbuilding Materials, Claims for Drawbacks on: M. for Ret., 76.

Sugar, Claims for Drawbacks on: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.

Tea, Differential Duty on: Ques. (*Mr. Gunn*) 412.

Trade and Navigation Tables; presented (*Mr. Bowell*) 36.

**Customs Acts Consolidation B. No. 34** (*Mr. Bowell*). Res. prop., 100; Res. in Com., 101; 1°\* of B., 102; 2°\*, 546; in Com., 587, 694, 702; 3°\*, 702; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1037. (46 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

CUSTOMS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 741, 1131.

CUSTOMS, MAN.: conc., 1226.

CUSTOMS, OUTSIDE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1000; conc., 1226.

DALHOUSIE BRANCH INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1244

DAMOUR, DAVID, DISMISSAL OF: M. for copies of Q.C. (*Mr. Laurier*) 903.

DAUPHENÉ, JAMES, CLAIMS OF: M. for copies of Petitions (*Mr. Keefer*) 781.

DARTMOUTH BRANCH, INTERCOL. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1380.

**Davis and Lawrence Manufacturing Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 79** (*Mr. Curran*). 1°\*, 161; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 631. (46 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

DEBATE, ADJOURNMENT OF, VERBAL MOTIONS: practice (*Mr. Speaker*) 1369.

DEBATE, PERSONAL AND INSULTING ALLUSIONS IN: checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 71, 519, 520, 943, 950, 1367.

DEBATES, CONFEDERATION, INDEX TO: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 266; (*Mr. Landry*) 785.

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REPORTING OF: Com. to supervise appointed, 28; First Rep. of Com., presented, 98; M.



- to conc. in Rep., 204; French Reporting Staff (*Mr. Landry, &c.*) 415; M. to conc. in Second Rep., 497; M. for copies containing Deb. on N. P. (*Mr. Curran*) 502; Third Rep., 593; attention of Hs. called to an omission (*Mr. Casgrain*) 693; Fourth Rep., 860; Fifth Rep., 931; M. to conc. in, 1134; Sixth Rep., 1310; in Com. of Sup., 763.
- DEEPENING OF CHANNEL BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC:** Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 785; M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 903; Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1246, 1251. See B. 142.
- DEMERS, L. J., PRINTING EVIDENCE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. COMMISSION:** conc., 1279.
- DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYÉS, SALARIES CHARGED TO PUBLIC WORKS:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 86.
- DEPARTMENTS, PUBLIC.** See "SUPPLY;" also respective Depts.
- DEPARTMENTAL REPS., COMPILATION OF:** prop. Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 298.
- DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.** See "REPORTS PRESENTED."
- DEPUTY GOVERNOR.** See "Ritchie."
- DICK, CAPT., ARBITRATOR'S AWARD TO:** in Com. of Sup., 1139; conc., 1214.
- DIGBY PIER (N.S.) WHARFAGE DUES:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Vail*) 525.
- DILLON, J., YEAR'S SALARY TO:** in Com. of Sup., 1236.
- DIONNE, O., SERVICES OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1184.
- Discharge of Past Insolvents B. No. 8** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 35.
- DISMISSAL OF J. D. McMILLAN:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scriver*) 77.
- DISPUTED TERRITORY, TIMBER AND MINING PERMITS IN:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 232; (*Mr. McCraney*) 777.
- DISTILLED AND FERMENTED LIQUORS, CONSUMPTION OF, &c.:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Foster*) 78.
- DIVISIONS:**
- Adultery, Seduction, &c., Punishment of, B. 13* (*Mr. Charlton*): on M. to receive Rep. of Com., M. to recom. (*Mr. Charlton*) 283, carried (Y. 91, N. 73) 286; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried (Y. 73, N. 61)
- Consolidated Railway Act (1879) Amt. B. 127* (*Sir Charles Tupper*): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 78) 1317.
- Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22* (*Mr. Desjardins*): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 215; Amt. to Amt. to recom., to change the words from eight to seven per cent. (*Mr. Orton*) neg. (Y. 18, N. 144) 218; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Auger*) 370; neg. (Y. 35, N. 145) 370.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 7* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): on M. to receive Rep. of Com. of W., Amt. to recom., that trials shall be private, &c. (*Mr. Ives*) 195; agreed to, recom. and rep., 200; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 67, N. 101) 201; M. to receive Rep. of Com. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) carried on a div., 202.
- DIVISIONS—Con.**
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 45* (*Sir John A. Macdonald*): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. to sub-section 1, section 24 (*Mr. Charlton*) 940, neg. (Y. 49, N. 101) 951.
- Fraud in Public Contracts, Prevention of, B. 5* (*Mr. Casgrain*): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 302, neg. (Y. 49, N. 90) 306.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of:* Res. for Sp. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 234; carried (Y. 111, N. 63) 253; B. 132, on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1364, carried (Y. 148, N. 1) 1365; Amt. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 66, N. 79) 1366; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1366, neg. (Y. 46, N. 105) 1371; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1371, carried (Y. 88, N. 63) 1372; Amt. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) neg. (Y. 40, N. 95) 1372; Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373, neg. (Y. 58, N. 80) 1374; Amt. (*Mr. Fleming*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1373.
- King's County (P.E.I.) Election:* M. declaring that Mr. J. E. Robertson being second highest at the poll he ought to have been returned, &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 92; Amt. to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 151; Amt. to Amt., that this House declares that J. E. Robertson should have been returned, &c. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 175; neg. (Y. 60, N. 118) 185; Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) carried on same div.
- King's County (P.E.I.) Election:* M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (*Mr. Blanchet*) 793; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 800; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 806, neg. (Y. 64, N. 108) 825; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) neg. on same div.; Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) neg. (Y. 66, N. 108) 826; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. (*Mr. Blanchet*) carried (Y. 107, N. 66) 826.
- Loyal Orange Association, B. 87* (*Mr. White, Hastings*) on M. to appoint day for 2<sup>o</sup>, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Coursol*) 254, neg. (Y. 89, N. 94) 260; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 632; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) 637, agreed to (Y. 106, N. 70) 657.
- Procédure, Question of, Criminal Law Amts. Bs. 6, 2, 4, and 30:* M. to appoint day for further consdn. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 331, neg. (Y. 77, N. 101) 332.
- Superannuation (Civil Service) Acts Amt. B. 91* (*Sir Leonard Tilley*): on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. to abolish present system (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 47, N. 100) 1364.
- Tariff Alterations:* M. for copies of letters, memorials, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 347, neg. (Y. 65, N. 115) 555.
- DOMINION BAILIFFS, APPOINTMENT OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 133.
- Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 85** (*Mr. Bolduc*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 233; 2<sup>o</sup>, 903; in Com., 903, 1034; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1034. (46 Vic., c. 4.)

- DOMINION ELECTION EXPENSES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 383.
- DOMINION EXHIBITION:** in Com. of Sup., 840.
- DOMINION LANDS ACTS AMT. B. NO. 45** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 98; 2°, 546; M. for Com., 860; in Com., 873, 935; 3° m., 936; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) 940; deb. resmd., 943; Amt. neg. (Y. 49, N. 101) 951; 3°, 951; Sen. Amts., 1310. (46 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- DOMINION LANDS:** Deb. on B. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 860, 873, 940; (*Mr. Charlton*) 864, 936, Amt., 940, 950; (*Mr. Sutherland*) 865; (*Mr. Royal*) 866; (*Mr. Orton*) 868; (*Mr. Watson*) 869; (*Mr. Ross, Lisgar*) 870; (*Mr. Scott*) 872; (*Mr. Sproule*) 947; (*Mr. Bergin*) 948; (*Mr. Rykert*) 951; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 101) 951. See B. 45.
- DOMINION LANDS:** in Com. of Sup., 1111, 1113, 1199, 1300.
- DOMINION LANDS.** See "PUBLIC LANDS."
- DOMINION LAWS, CODIFICATION OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- DOMINION PHOSPHATE AND MINING CO.'S INCORP. B. NO. 49** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 106; 2°, 165; in Com., 373; 3°, 374; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 804. (46 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- DOMINION POLICE EXPENDITURE:** Stmt. presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 40; in Com. of Sup., 753, 1192; conc. 1126.
- DOMINION PIERS IN P.E.I.:** Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 1249.
- DOMINION RY. TRUST AND CONSTRUCTION CO.'S INCORP. B. NO. 41** (*Mr. Small*). 1°, 89; 2°, 164; in Com., and 3°, 749. (46 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- DOMINION STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION OF, EXPENDITURE IN CONNECTION WITH:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 57; in Com. of Sup., 1040, 1378; conc., 1387.
- DOMINION STEAMERS.** See "Government Steamers."
- DOMINION, THE, PERSONS ENTERING, LEAVING AND SETTLING:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*), 295.
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY:** in Com. of Sup., 755.
- DRAWBACKS, CLAIMS FOR:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 66.
- DRAWBACKS:** on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1129; on M. for 2° Supply B., 1388.
- DRAWBACKS:** SHIPBUILDING, SUGAR, &c. See "CUSTOMS."
- DREDGING:** in Com. of Sup., 929.
- DRESS OR COSTUME CLOTHS:** in Com. on W. & M., 68.
- DRIED FRUITS:** in Com. on W. & M., 671.
- DRILL INSTRUCTION AND DRILL PAY:** in Com. of Sup., 855.
- DRILL SHED AT IONA:** M. for copy of Contract (*Mr. Casey*) 133.
- DRILL SHED AT ST. THOMAS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 132.
- "DRUID." See "Government Steamers."
- DRY DOCK AND ISLAND RY. (B.C.) PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS:** Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 657; explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1392.
- DUCKETT, MRS. ED., GRATUITY TO:** in Com. of Sup., 1134.
- DUCK ISLANDS, SALE OF:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 660.
- DUFFERIN BRIDGE, REMISSION OF DUTY ON IRON IMPORTED FOR:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 897.
- DUNN AND PAGE, MESSRS., COMPENSATION TO:** in Com. of Supply, 1160.
- DURHAM AND WALKERTON MAIL ROUTE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 86.
- DUSTAN, MR., CLAIM OF, FOR REMISSION OF DUTIES ON MACHINERY:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 659.
- DUTIES ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.
- DUTIES ON ARTICLES IMPORTED BY C.P.R. CO.:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 659.
- DUTIES ON SALT:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 232.
- DUTY, ABOLITION OF, ON GRAIN, FLOUR AND COAL:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.
- DUTY ON HEMLOCK BARK:** Ques. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 1025.
- DUTY ON SPRUCE LOGS:** Ques. (*Mr. Boduc*) 1025.
- DUTY ON LAND PLASTER:** Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 376.
- DUVAL, GEO., PURCHASE OF BOOKS FROM:** in Com. of Sup. 1133.
- EASTER, ADJOURNMENT FOR:** M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 281; remarks, 289.
- Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56** (*Mr. Dawson*). 1°, 129; 2°, 165.
- EDMUNSTON TO RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY.:** Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 41.
- ELECTION OF SPEAKER.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, ACT, 1874:** Ques. (*Mr. Dugas*) 56.
- ELECTIONS, GENERAL (1882) NUMBER OF VOTES POLLED AT:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
- ELECTIONS, GENERAL (1882) RETURNING OFFICERS:** M. for List (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- ELECTIONS.** See "CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS."
- ELECTORAL DIVISIONS IN MAN.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 659.
- ELECTORAL DIVISIONS, MALES OVER TWENTY-ONE IN, ACCORDING TO CENSUS:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Fisher*) 104.
- Electoral Franchise B. No. 107** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 593; withdn., 1387.
- ELGIN STATION DEPOT.** See "INTERCOLONIAL RY."
- ELMIRA AND HARMONY STATION RY. SURVEYS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 115.
- ELM LOGS, EXPORT DUTY ON:** Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 889.
- EMIGRANTS ENTERING, LEAVING AND SETTLING IN MAN.:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 295.
- EMIGRANT SHEDS AND IMPROVEMENTS AT REGINA:** Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 262.
- EMPLOYÉS.** See "CIVIL SERVICE."
- EMPLOYMENT OF SHORTHAND WRITER:** M. (*Mr. Hackett*) 129.
- ENGLAND'S COMMERCIAL POLICY:** on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. McNeill*) 1084.
- ENGLISH ARTISTS vs. CANADIAN:** in Com. of Sup., 762.
- ENGLISHMEN AS FOREIGNERS:** in Com. of Sup., 761.
- Equitable Distribution of Insolvents' Estates B. No. 9** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°, 35.
- ESCAPE OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS:** Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78.

- ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gordon*) 301. See "BRITISH COLUMBIA."
- ESTIMATES, THE: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 281; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting same for 1883-84, 288; ref. to Com. of Sup., 288; Suppl. Est., 1882-83, 999; Suppl. Est., 1883-84, 1207; Further Suppl. Est., 1883-84, 1363. See "SUPPLY."
- European, American, Canadian and Asiatic Cable Co.'s Incomp. Act Amt. B. No. 118 (*Mr. Colby*). 1<sup>o</sup>\* and 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 828; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 943. (46 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- EVIDENCE, AFFIRMATION. See B. 95.
- Evidence in Criminal Matters pending in Courts in Her Majesty's Dominions provision B. No. 125—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1024; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1338. (46 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- Evidence, Law of, in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. No. 4 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 32; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 93. Incomp. with (No. 6).
- EVIDENCE, UNSTAMPED NOTES, IN. See B. 78.
- EXAMINATION OF MASTERS AND MATES. See "Masters and Mates;" also "Certificates."
- EXAMINATIONS, CIVIL SERVICE, IN ONT.: Ques. (*Mr. Kilvert*) 107.
- EXCHANGE OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS: remarks on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Printing Com., 784.
- EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1020, 1198, 1249, 1383; conc., 1117, 1317.
- EX-LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF MAN., OCCUPATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1243.
- EXPEDITION TO JAMES' BAY: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1136.
- EXPENDITURE ON RYS. AND CANALS IN ALL THE PROVINCES: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 412.
- EXPENDITURE ON TELEGRAMS, PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 84.
- EXPENSES OF DOMINION ELECTIONS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 383.
- EXPENSES OF MINISTERS IN ENGLAND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 381.
- Expiring Laws Continuation B. 183 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1310; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1866. (46 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- EXPORT DUTY ON ELM LOGS: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 889.
- EXPORT DUTY OF HEMLOCK BARK: Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 78.
- EXPORT DUTY ON SPRUCE LOGS: Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 207.
- EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS IN ST. JOHN FOR INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- EXTRADITION ACT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 42.
- FABRE, HON. H., APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 84; in Com. of Sup., 1136, 1379.
- FACTORY COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1197.
- Factories (Offences against Persons) definition B. No. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 827; withdn., 1386.
- Farmer's Bank of Rustico Continuation Act B. No. 28 (*Mr. Davies*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 77; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 501. (46 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- FARNHAM AND GUILLAUME MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 125.
- Federal Life Assurance Co.'s Incomp. B. No. 35 (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 88.
- Felonies and Misdemeanors, Speedy Trial of Persons charged with, B. No. 86 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 233.
- FERRY BOATS AT TERMINUS OF NORTH SHORE RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 35, 376.
- FERTILIZERS, AGRICULTURAL, FRAUD IN: M. for Com. of W. on Res. (*Mr. Massue*) 116; M. for Sel. Com., 207.
- FEVER CONTRACTED WHILE IN MILITIA CAMPS: in Com. on Militia B., 585; in Com. of Sup., 855.
- FINANCE AND POST OFFICE DEPTS. CONTINGENCIES: conc., 1114.
- FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 746, 1235.
- Fisheries Act Amendment B. No. 101 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 526; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 860; in Com., 1200; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1207; Sen. Amts. 1383.
- FISHERIES:
- Bounty, Amount paid out of appropriation: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 129; Augmentation of: Ques. (*Mr. Fortin*) 1025; Services in connection with: conc., 1224—1226.
  - Canada at International Exhibition: Telegram read (*Mr. Bowell*) 1207; in Com. of Sup., 1191.
  - Dismissal of J. D. McMillan as Fishery Overseer: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scriver*) 76.
  - Fishing in Inland Waters: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 82.
  - Fishing Inspector for N.B. and Dept: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*), 660.
  - Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Protection of: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 657.
  - Inspectors' Instructions: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 129.
  - Leases or Licenses to fish in N.B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 287; Res. (*Mr. McLelan*) 526. See B. 101.
  - Lobster Fishing, Close Season for: M. for copies of O.C. (*Mr. Kirk*) 659.
  - Rep. of Dept.: presented (*Mr. McLelan*) 66.
  - Smelt Fishery of Miramichi, Claim of ex-Overseer Perley: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 660.
  - Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens: in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1186; conc., 1116, 1223.
- FISHER, JUDGE, WIDOW OF: in Com. of Sup., 1236; further explanation, 1387.
- Fishing by Foreign Vessels Act Extension to B.C. B. 143 (*Mr. Bowell*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\* 1363. (46 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- FIVE PER CENT. LOAN, CONSOLIDATED. See B. 21.
- FLESHERTON AND VANDELEUR MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.
- FLORENCEVILLE (N.B.) POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 505.
- FOOD, ADULTERATION OF: Rep. presented (*Mr. Costigan*) 36; in Com. of Sup., 1113.

- FOG WHISTLE AT SHELBURNE HARBOR (N.S.): Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.
- FOREIGNERS SEEKING INCORPORATION: Petitions from, 138.
- FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS. See "Fishing."
- FOREIGN TRIBUNALS, EVIDENCE BEFORE. See "Evidence."
- FORT DUFFERIN, ST. JOHN, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184; 1245.
- FORT OSBORNE PARK, GRANT OR LEASE OF LANDS FOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scott*) 1034.
- FOSTER, MR. G. E.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 3.
- FRANCE AND QUEBEC MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 952.
- Fraud in Relation to Contracts B. No. 5 (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°, 32; 2°, 93; ref. to Sel. Com., 102; B. in Com., 287; on M. for 3°, Amt., to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 302; neg. (Y. 49, N. 90) 306; 3°\*, 366. (46 *Vic., c. 5.*)
- FREE DELIVERY OF NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 890.
- FREIGHT SHEDS, &c., INTERCOL. RY., ST. JOHN, N.B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- FRENCH CANADIAN RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES: Remarks (*Mr. Tassé*) on the Address, 28.
- FRENCH TRANSLATION OF REP. OF SEL. COM. ON NATIONAL POLICY: Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 89.
- FRONTENAC TERRACE (QUE.): M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 54.
- FRUITS, DRIED: in Com. on W. & M., 671.
- "FULGER," STEAMER, AND MURRAY BAY AND RIVER OUELLE WINTER SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blondzau*) 106.
- FURNITURE: in Com. on W. & M., 671.
- GALT, SIR ALEXANDER, RESIGNATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 266; INSTRUCTIONS TO: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 317. See "High Commissioner."
- GASPÉ AND CAMPBELLTON STEAM SERVICE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 504.
- GATINEAU VALLEY RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284. See B. 137.
- GENERAL INSPECTION ACT. See "Inspection."
- GENERAL ELECTIONS AND DEFEATED EX-MINISTERS: remarks (*Mr. Hawkins*) 524.
- "GENII," MASTER OF, AND DEPT. OF MARINE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 380.
- GEOFFRION, HON. F.: confirmed in Seat on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 3.
- GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1088.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 376.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPS. OF INVERNESS, RICHMOND AND VICTORIA COUNTIES, N.S.: M. for copies (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 779.
- GEORGIAN BAY BRANCH RY. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- GEORGIAN BAY, DISASTERS ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 29.
- GEORGIAN BAY FISHERIES, PROTECTION OF THE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 657.
- GERMAN IMMIGRATION: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96; carried, 104.
- GERMANY AND CANADA, STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96; in Com of Sup., 953.
- GIROUARD, MR. D.: confirmed in Seat on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 4.
- GLAZED AND UNGLAZED PIPES: in Com. on W. & M., 671.
- "GLENDON." See "GOVERNMENT STEAMERS."
- GLEN EDEN AND MOUNT FOREST MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.
- GOOSE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 166.
- GOVERNMENT BUSINESS: M. to take in Thursdays, 412; Wednesdays, 596; Mondays, 1136.
- GOVERNMENT, MEMBERS OF, EXPENSES TO ENGLAND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 381.
- GOVERNMENT STEAMERS:
- Northern Light*. See "PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND."
- Glendon*, Steamer to replace: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Newfield* and wrecked *Moravian*: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Forbes*) 301; Ques. 1025.
- Napoleon III, Druid, Newfield, Sir James Douglas, Northern Light* and *La Canadienne*: in Com. of Sup., 953.
- GOVERNOR, DEPUTY: Summoning Commons to Senate, 1.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL:
- Address on Departure: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1384; sec. (*Mr. Blake*) 1384.
- Speech from the Throne on Opening of Parliament, 3; reply to Address in answer to, 77.
- Speech from the Throne proroguing Parliament, 1399.
- Summoning Commons to Senate, 3, 1397.
- Visit to British Columbia: in Com. of Sup., 1191.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 743, 1235.
- GOVERNOR GENERAL, SUCCESSOR TO: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) withdn., 65.
- Graduates, Royal Mil. College, admission to profession of D.L.S. B. No. 33 (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1°\*, 77; withdn., 1034.
- Grafton Harbor Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 42 (*Mr. Guillet*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 106; in Com., 471; 3°\*, 557. (46 *Vic., c. 93.*)
- GRAIN AND PRODUCTS OF GRAIN, DUTIES AND IMPORTS: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Gigault*) 775.
- GRAIN, FLOUR AND COAL DUTY. See "CUSTOMS."
- GRAND TRUNK AND NORTH SHORE RYS.: Petition for B. presented (*Mr. Colby*) 630; M. to suspend 51st Rule, 692.
- GRAND TRUNK, GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE ERIE RY. BI-DAILY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 781.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. AND THE PURCHASING OF BONDS, &c., OF OTHER CAN. ROADS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 232.
- Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s Authorization B. No. 113 (*Mr. Colby*). 1°, 692; 2°, 693; in Com., 803; recom. and 3°, 888. (46 *Vic., c. 54.*)
- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.'S SALE OF THE RIVIERE DU LOUP BRANCH: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 232.

- GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.'S RETURNS OF ACCIDENTS OR CASUALTIES: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 166, 204, 232.
- Grange Trust (limited) Incorp. B. No. 44 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°\*, 98; 2°\*, 138; in Com. and 3°, 701. (46 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- GRAVENHURST TO CALLANDER RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290; Deb. (*Mr. Dawson*) 1290; (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1291; (*Mr. Blake*) 1291; (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1292; (*Mr. Dundas*) 1292; (*Mr. Foster*) 1292. See B. 137.
- GRAVEL CLAIM OF D. B. WOODWORTH: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 902; 1034.
- GRAVING DOCK, QUEBEC. See B. 129.
- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 1284, 1285; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1284—1286; (*Mr. Vail*) 1285, 1288; (*Mr. Casey*) 1285; (*Mr. Fairbank*) 1286; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1286; (*Mr. Irvine*) 1287; (*Mr. Wright*) 1287; (*Mr. Pickard*) 1238. See B. 137.
- Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 80 (*Mr. Massue*). 1°\*, 161; 2°\*, 245; in Com. and 3°\*, 557. (46 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- Great North-Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 74 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 171. (46 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 70 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607. (46 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- GRENVILLE AND CARILLON CANAL CONTRACT, ARBITRATOR'S AWARD: M. for copy (*Mr. Casey*) 903.
- GRENVILLE CANAL. See "CANALS."
- GRINDING IN BOND AND TRANSPORT OF CAN. WHEAT THROUGH U.S.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
- GRIST MILL, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: conc., 1127.
- GROSSE ISLE, SEMAPHORE COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 78, 890.
- GUILBAULT, MR. E.: Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election Petition, 3.
- GULF TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.
- GUNS FOR RICHMOND FIELD BAT.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 204.
- GUNS, MANUFACTURE OF: M. for copies of Contract (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- GUYSBOROUGH AND ANTIGONISH MAIL ROUTE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirk*) 77.
- HALIFAX AND CAPE BRETON RY. AND COAL CO.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 129.
- HALIFAX AND MURRAY HARBOR, &C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 953.
- HALIFAX EXTENSION, INTERCOLONIAL RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1150.
- HALIFAX, WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.
- HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, QUEBEC. See B. 130.
- HARBORS AND BREAKWATERS: See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- HARBORS AND RIVERS. See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- HARBORS AND SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 1078.
- HARBOR POLICE, QUEBEC: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- HARMONY STATION AND ELMIRA RY. SURVEYS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 115.
- HARTNEY, MR. H.: Commissioner to Administer Oath, 1.
- HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, RECIPROCITY WITH THE: Ques. (*Mr. Homer*) 67; prop. Res., 231.; withdn., 232.
- HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 841; conc., 1115.
- HÉBERT, HUBERT, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 78, 1169; M. for copies (*Mr. Landry*) 381.
- HEMLOCK BARK, DUTY ON: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 78; (*Mr. Bolduc*) 1025.
- HENEY STEWART & CO., AWARD OF ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 1158; conc., 1221.
- "HENRY FOLGER," LOSS OF THE. See "Life-saving Stations."
- HIGH COMMISSIONER, SUCCESSOR TO: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 376. See "Galt, Sir Alexander."
- High Court of Justice (Ont.) B. No. 124—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1024; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1386. (46 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- HIS EXCELLENCY'S SUCCESSOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 65.
- HOMESTEAD AND PREEMPTION LANDS. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- HOUDE, MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 1380.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:
- Accountant, Receipts and Disbursements of, 29.
  - Adjournments: Easter, 289; Assension Day, 931.
  - Ceremonies at Opening: remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 4.
  - Clerk of Crown in Chancery: in Com. of Sup., 835.
  - Clerk of the House. See "Bourinot."
  - Commissioners for Administering the Oath, 1.
  - Election, General (1852) Number of Votes Polled at: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
  - Houde, Mr., Sessional Indem.: in Com. of Sup., 1380.
  - Indemnity, Increase of: Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Charlton and others*) 1057.
  - Internal Commission, Appointment of, by Mess., 98.
  - Jacques Cartier Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 4.
  - Joliette Elec., Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.
  - King's County (P.E.I.) Elec.: M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend House with Returns (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40; Clerk in attendance, 52, 827; Return altered, 824.
  - King's (N.B.) Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.
  - King's (P.E.I.) Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 40.
  - Library of Parliament: Rep. presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 4. See "Library."
  - New Members, Return of, 3.
  - Official Reports. See "Debates."
  - Opening: Speech from the Throne, 3.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- Piteau, Indemnification to: in Com. of Sup., 1238.  
 Printing, Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 835.  
 Privileges confirmed by His Ex., 3.  
 Procedure of the House, recording Votes: remarks  
 (*Mr. Casgrain*) 827.  
 Prorogation, Communication from Gov. Gen's. Sec.:  
 1391; Speech from the Throne, 1399.  
 Rights and Privileges claimed in Sen. (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.  
 Rouville Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 187.  
 Royal Assent to Bills, 1397.  
 Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 763.  
 Select Standing Coms.: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 4.  
 Senate, summoned to, by Mess., 1, 3, 1397.  
 Shorthand Writers: conc. 1214.  
 South Norfolk Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.  
 Speaker, Election of, 1.  
 St. Hyacinthe Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr.*  
*Speaker*) 187.  
 Suspension of Rule 78 objected to (*Mr. Blake*) 253.  
 Terrebonne Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.  
 Votes and Proceedings, Translation of: remarks (*Mr.*  
*Landry*) 828.  
 Verchères Elec.: Judge's Rep. read (*Mr. Speaker*) 3.  
 Writs of Election, Warrants issued for, 3.  
 [See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."]  
 HUDSON'S BAY, SEASON OF NAVIGATION: M. for Ret. (*Mr.*  
*Dawson*) 62.  
 HUDSON'S BAY, WINTER NAVIGATION: on M. for Com. of  
 Sup. (*Mr. Valin*) 1137.  
 HUDSON'S STRAITS, EXPLORATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 1137.  
 "HURON," LOSS OF THE. See "Life-saving Stations."  
 HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 82.  
 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF GERMANS: M. for  
 copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96; carried, 104.  
 IMMIGRATION INTO B.C., INCLUDING CHINESE: M. for Ret.  
 (*Mr. Curran*) 72.  
 IMMIGRATION INTO B. C.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*)  
 776.  
 IMMIGRATION OF CHINESE INTO B.C.: Res. (*Mr. Shakespeare*)  
 323.  
 IMMIGRATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr.*  
*Casey*) 659.  
 IMMIGRATION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 845, 1134;  
 conc., 1114, 1214.  
 IMMIGRATION TO CANADA DURING 1882: M. for Stmt. (*Mr.*  
*Burpee, Sunbury*) 80.  
 IMMIGRATION AGENTS, TEMPORARY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee,*  
*Sunbury*) 86.  
 IMMIGRANT CHILDREN, CARE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 501.  
 IMPORTATION OF CHILDREN'S CARRIAGES: M. for Ret. (*Mr.*  
*McCraney*) 777.  
 IMPORTATION OF LUMBER INTO MAN.: M. for Ret. (*Mr.*  
*Royal*) 94.

- IMPORTATION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 502.  
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*)  
 76.  
 IMPROVEMENT FUND, LAND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 39.  
 INCEST: See "Criminal Law Amt."  
 INCORRECT STATEMENT IN DEBATE: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*)  
 that question cannot be again opened for discussion,  
 1369.  
 INCREASED SUBSIDY TO QUEBEC: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*)  
 779.  
 INDEMNITY, INCREASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Charlton and*  
*others*) 1057.  
 INDEX TO CONFEDERATION DEBATES: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*)  
 266; (*Mr. Landry*) 785.  
 INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (*Sir John A.*  
*Macdonald*) 36; in Com. of Sup., 746, 1177.  
 INDIAN HARBOR BREAKWATER: M. for papers, &c. (*Mr.*  
*Kirk*) 116.  
 INDIANS:  
 Additional Agents in B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1378.  
 Annual Grants to suppl. Fund: in Com. of Sup., 1094,  
 1098.  
 Bannon, Rev. Mr., Compensation to: in Com. of Sup.,  
 1191.  
 British Columbia Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1101.  
 In Com. of Sup., 1094, 1098, 1101, 1102, 1191, 1249.  
 Industrial Schools, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1376.  
 Manitoba Agency: M. for Rep. on condition (*Mr.*  
*Charlton*) 902.  
 Manitoba and N.W. Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1102, 1191.  
 Missionary, Medical Grant, &c., N.B.: in Com. of Sup.,  
 1249.  
 Nova Scotia Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1101.  
 Rep. of Dept.: presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 36.  
 Surveys, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1101.  
 Sale of Oak on Walpole Island: M. for copy of Cor.  
 (*Mr. Lister*) 1031.  
 INDIA-RUBBER CLOTHING: in Com. on W. & M., 692.  
 INLAND FISHERIES: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 82.  
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. No. 115  
 (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., 574; in Com., 790;  
 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 791; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 915; 3<sup>o</sup>, 999; Sen.  
 Amts., 1279. (46 *Vic.*, c. 15.)  
 INLAND REVENUE, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (*Mr. Costigan*)  
 36; in Com. of Sup., 746, 1131.  
 INLAND SHIPPING DISASTERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 29.  
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance, Loan and Trading  
 Co.'s B. No. 103—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Mac-*  
*donald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 631; 2<sup>o</sup>, 791; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 791.  
 (46 *Vic.*, c. 23.)  
 Insolvents' Estates, Equitable Distribution of,  
 B. No. 9 (*Mr. Beatty*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 35.  
 Insolvents, Past, Discharge of, B. No. 8 (*Mr.*  
*Beatty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 35; 2<sup>o</sup> m. 118; deb. adjd., 123.  
 Insolvent Traders' Assets, Distribution of, B.  
 No. 99 (*Mr. Curran*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 367.

- Inspection Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 104** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. in Com. and 1°\* of B., 526; 2°, 828; in Com., 829; 3°\*, 860. (46 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- INSPECTION OF PETROLEUM: in Com. of Sup., 1199.
- INSPECTION OF STEAMERS: Ques. (*Mr. Dawson*) 1025.
- INSPECTORS', FISHERY, INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 129.
- INSTRUCTION STAFF, ROYAL MIL. COL.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659.
- INSTRUCTIONS TO SIR A. T. GALT (CANADA AND SPAIN): M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 547.
- INSURANCE OF GOODS IN BOND: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 204.
- INSURANCE, PREMIUMS ON: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1030.
- Indian Affairs (Superintendent General) Acts Amt. B. 139** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 1335; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1337. (46 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
- Casualties: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 129.
  - Claims of N. A. Pelletier and others: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1025.
  - Coast and Island Communication with: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
  - Commission, Claims Settled by: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 52; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 135; Staff and Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1244.
  - Construction Acts., old, Commission, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1150.
  - Dalhousie Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1244.
  - Dartmouth Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1330.
  - Elgin Station Depot: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 40.
  - Freight Sheds and Warehouses at St. John (N.B.): M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
  - Halifax Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1061, 1150.
  - Increased Accommodation at St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1150.
  - Ketchum, Refund to: in Com. of Sup., 1154; conc., 1219.
  - Land and other Claims: in Com. of Sup., 1156.
  - Lands Expropriated on Mill and Pond Streets in St. John: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
  - Mann, Mr., Claim of: in Com. of Sup., 1157.
  - Office at Quebec: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 376.
  - Quebec Central Ry., Accommodation at "The Crossing:" Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 376.
  - Revenue and Working Expenses: M. for Stmnt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.
  - Rivière du Loup Town Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1244.
  - Rolling Stock, Purchase of: Ms. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 380.
  - Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 1061.
  - Shunting and Station Yard, Point Levis: in Com. of Sup., 1244.
  - St. Charles Branch and Ferry: in Com. of Sup., 1063; conc., 1121.
  - Walsh, Mr., Damage to Property: in Com. of Sup., 1158.
  - Western Counties Ry. vs. Windsor and Annapolis, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1157.
- Interest, Rate of, in Canada, B. No. 77** (*Mr. Catudal*). 1°\*, 150; M. for 2°\* neg., 903; M. to place on Orders, neg., 957.
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF, ACTS AMT. B. See "Indian Affairs."
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 331; in Com. of Sup., 744, 1174, 1237.
- INTERNAL COMMISSION. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES EXHIBITION, CANADA AT: Telegram read (*Mr. Howell*) 1207; in Com. of Sup., 1044, 1191.
- INTERNATIONAL RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1288. See B. 137
- Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 95**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 298; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1310. (46 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- INTER-PROVINCIAL TRADE: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Paint*) 113; Com. appointed, 135; M. to send for persons, &c., 139.
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, SALE OF, IN QUEBEC: M. for copies of Petition (*Mr. Gigault*) 213; M. to ref. Pet. to Sel. Com., 383. See B. 132.
- Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. 1226; in Com. and 1°\*, 1227; 2° m., 1318; 2°, 1319; in Com., 1319, 1339; 3° m., 1364; Amts (*Mr. Ouimet*) carried (Y. 148, N. 1) 1365; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 66, N. 79) 1366; (*Mr. Blake*) 1366, (Y. 46, N. 105) 1371; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (Y. 88, N. 63) 1372; (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) neg. (Y. 40, N. 95) 1372; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried, 1372; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1373, neg. (Y. 53, N. 80) 1374; (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1374; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) neg., 1374; (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) carried, 1375; (*Mr. McCarthy*) carried, 1375; (*Mr. Foster*) carried, 1375; (*Mr. Gigault*) neg. 1375; (*Mr. Fleming*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1375; (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 90) 1375; 3°, 1376 (46 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, LAWS RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 380.
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, SALE OF: M. to read par. in Speech from the Throne and to ref. to Sel. Com. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 234; Ques. of Order (*Mr. Casgrain*) 234; ruling (*Mr. Speaker*) 235; Speech (*Mr. Blake*) 236—250; (*Mr. Rykert*) 250—253; M. for Sel. Com. carried (Y. 111, N. 63) 253; M. submitting names, 254; M. substituting names, 526. See B. 132.
- IONA, DRILL SHED AT: M. for copy of Contract (*Mr. Casey*) 133.
- IRELAND, IMMIGRATION FROM: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 547.
- IRISH RESOLUTIONS: Mess. from His Ex. transmitting copy of Imp. Despatch, 29.
- IRON AND MANUFACTURES OF: in Com. on W. & M., 672.
- IRON IMPORTED FOR DUFFERIN BRIDGE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 897.
- IRON, FIG, MANUFACTURES OF. See B. 13; also "Bounty."
- IRON PIPES, &c.: in Com. on W. & M., 692.
- ISLE AUX NOIX AND ST. JOHNS BARRACKS: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 1025; M. for copies of Reps. of Engineers, 1034.

- JACKSON, MR. J.: confirmed in Seat on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 3.
- JACQUES CARTIER CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 4.
- JACQUES, JAMES L., APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 289; M. for copies of Cor., 506.
- JAMES' BAY EXPEDITION: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1136.
- "JANE MILLER," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- JEANNETTE'S CREEK (ONT.) OBSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 830.
- JELLIES AND JAMS: in Com. on W. & M., 692.
- JENKINS, J. T., SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT RESPECTING: read (*Mr. Speaker*) 84.
- "JESSIE," LOSS OF THE SCHOONER. See "Life-saving Stations."
- JEWISH REFUGEES, RUSSIAN: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 659.
- JOLIETTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 3.
- "JOSEPHINE KIDD," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- JUDGES AND REGISTRARS OF VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS, EMOLUMENTS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Richey*) 902.
- JUDGES, COUNTY COURT (ONT.) B. See "County Court."
- Judges' Salaries, &c., certain Provincial Courts B. No. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. in Com., 1310; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1316; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1336. (46 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- JULIE BOISVERT, INVESTIGATION INTO TRIAL OF: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 41; (*Mr. Coursol*) 107.
- Justice, Administration of, in Disputed Territory (Ont.) Continuation B. No. 133 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 1310; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1366 (46 *Vic.*, c. 33)
- JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: See SUPPLY.
- JUSTICE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 744; Library of: in Com. of Sup., 1044; conc., 1128.
- JUSTICE, HIGH COURT OF (ONT.) B. See B. 124.
- Justice of the Peace, Procedure in Criminal Cases before, Act Amt. B. No. 12 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 38.
- JUVENILE OFFENDERS, AIDING AND ABETTING THE ESCAPE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78.
- KEARNEY, CHARLES, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 506.
- KERWATIN, EXPENSES OF GOVT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 1040.
- KETCHUM, MR., REFUND TO: in Com. of Sup., 1154; conc., 1219.
- KING'S AND ALBERT (N.B.) COUNTY COURTS, CAUSES TRIED in: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- KING'S (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges Rep. 3.
- KING'S (P.E.I.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges's Rep., 40.
- KING'S (P.E.I.) ELECTION: M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend House with Returns (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40; Clerk in attendance, 52; Res. declaring Mr. Robertson elected (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 89; Deb. adjd., 93; on Order for resuming adjd. deb. not appearing on Order Paper, 102; Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 116, 140; deb. resmd., 150; Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 151; Deb. (*Mr. Davies*) 151; (*Mr. Brecken*) 153; (*Mr. Blake*) 154; (*Mr. McCarthy*) 157; (*Mr. Weldon*) 159; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 166; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 172, Amt. to Amt., 175; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 176; (*Mr. Fleming*) 178; (*Mr. Amyot*) 179; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 181; (*Mr. Davies*) 183; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg. (Y. 60, N. 118) 185; ref to Com. 185; M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 793; Deb. (*Mr. Hall*) 793; (*Mr. Weldon*) 796, Amt., 800; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 800, 804, Amt. to Amt., 806; (*Mr. Macmaster*) 806; (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 813; (*Mr. Davies*) 816; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 821; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 806, 824; (*Mr. Blake*) 824; (*Mr. Brecken*) 825; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 64, N. 108) 825; Amt. neg. (Y. 66, N. 108) 826; M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend House with Returns and alter same, 826; Correction made, 827.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 36 (*Mr. Gunn*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 89; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 106; in Com., 371; ref. back to Ry. Com., 372; B. again in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 556. (46 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 753, 1237; conc., 1127.
- LACHINE CANAL. See "CANALS."
- LA CLOCHE ISLAND, SALE OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 660.
- LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 125.
- LAKE HURON FISHERIES, PROTECTION OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 657.
- LAKE ST. FRANCIS AND POINT DES CASCADES CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. De Beaujeu*) 266.
- LAKE ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 525.
- LAKE ST. PETER AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS, Deepening of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 903; Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Landry*) 1363.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 952.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, SURVEYS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1191.
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR, WATER LOTS IN HARBORS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Dawson*) 503.
- LAKE SHUSHWAC AND LAKE OKANAGON (B.C.) CANAL: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Barnard*) 232.
- Land Carriers B. No. 14 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 38; 2<sup>o</sup>, 124; in Com., 202, 314; rep., 315; M. for consdn., 415; Amt. as to constitutionality (*Mr. Ouimet*) 415; resmd., 426; deb. adjd., 426; Order to resume allowed to stand, 558.
- LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 39.
- LAND PLASTER, DUTY ON: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 376.



- LAND SALES AND AMOUNT REALIZED IN MAN. AND THE N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.
- LANDS (N. W.) SIMPLIFICATION OF SYSTEM OF TRANSFER: M. for Com. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.
- LANGUAGE, UNPARLIAMENTARY: Communication with P.E.I., 71; Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge, 519, 520; Dom. Lands Acts Consolidation B., 948, 950; Intoxicating Liquors B., 1367.
- L'AVENIR, POSTMASTER OF, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for copies (*Mr. Rinfret*) 902.
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. No. 4** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 32; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 93. Incorp with B. (No. 6).
- LAW REPORTS FOR SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 835.
- LAWYERS, PRINTING OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 835.
- LAWYERS RESPECTING INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 380.
- LEASES OR LICENSES TO FISH IN N.B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 287; Res. (*Mr. McLellan*) 526. See B. 101.
- LEATHER: in Com. on W. & M., 672.
- LEBEL, DR., ACCOUNT OF: M. for copy (*Mr. Massue*) 40.
- "LA CANADIENNE." See "Government Steamers."
- LEFROY, SIR J. H.: on Hudson's Bay, 63.
- LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 757, 762, 765, 835, 836, 1133, 1238, 1380; conc., 1114, 1214.
- LEPROHON, MR., SUPERANNUATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 763.
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION ON: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 106.
- LETTERS, UNDELIVERED: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 889.
- LEVIS GRAVING DOCK. See B. 129.
- LICENSE BILL, Printing Extra Copies: Remarks (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1396. See "Intoxicating Liquors."
- LICENSED MANUFACTURERS OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gigault*) 86.
- LICENSES TO CUT TIMBER IN ONT.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McNeill*) 292.
- LICENSES, TIMBER: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 61; adjd. deb. resmd., 229.
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: Rep. of Librarian presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 4; M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sel. Com., 36; M. (*Mr. Colby*) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 630, 897, 1035; in Com. of Sup., 765, 835, 1133; conc., 1114.
- LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS, SALARIES AND OCCUPATIONS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1241, 1242.
- LIFE-BOATS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 953, 1249.
- LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Platt*) 126; Ques., 502.
- LIGHTHOUSES AND COAST SERVICE:**  
 Buoys and Beacons in Lake Huron: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 79.  
 Cape Race Light: in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
 Colchester Reef Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 956.  
 Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 166.  
 Hydrographic Survey: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 82.  
 Life-saving Stations: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Platt*) 126; Ques., 502.  
 Lighthouses and Fog Alarms: in Com. of Sup., 1019; conc., 1116.
- LIGHTHOUSES AND COAST SERVICE—Con.**  
 Liverpool Harbor Buoy: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.  
 Meteorological Observations: in Com. of Sup., 957.  
 Montreal Harbor Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1191.  
 Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 957.  
 Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers: in Com. of Sup., 956; conc., 1116.  
 Shelburne Harbor Fog Whistle: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.  
 Signal Stations: in Com. of Sup., 957.  
 Surveys Lakes Huron and Superior: in Com. of Sup., 1191.
- LIQUOR LEGISLATION AND LICENSED VICTUALLERS; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 80.
- LIQUOR LICENSE B. See "Intoxicating Liquors."
- LIQUORS, DISTILLED AND FERMENTED: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Foster*) 78.
- LIQUORS, IMPORTATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 502.
- LITHOGRAPHING, CONTRACT FOR: M. for copies (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 556.
- LITIGATION, COSTS OF: in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- LITTLE BEAR CREEK (B.C.) NAVIGATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
- LIVERPOOL AND ST. JOHN (N.B.) MAIL SUBSIDY. in Com. of Sup., 952.
- LIVERPOOL BAY (N.S.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 84; M. for Ret., 383.
- LIVERPOOL HARBOR (N.S.) BUOY OR FOG WHISTLE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.
- LOAN COMPANIES. See "Insolvent."
- Loan for Public Service Authorization B. No. 11** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 39; in Com., 53; 1°\* of B., 54; 2° and in Com., 81; 3°, 102. (46 Vic., c. 3.)
- LOANS AUTHORIZED. See respective B.'s:  
 Quebec Graving Dock B. 129.  
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners B. 130.  
 Ship Channel, St. Lawrence, B. 142.  
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension B. 138.
- LOBSTER FISHING REGULATIONS, CLOSE SEASON FOR: M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Kirk*) 659.
- LOCAL OPTION: Deb. in Com. on License B., 1339—1345, 1347—1357. See B. 132.
- London and Ontario Investment Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 53** (*Mr. Hay*). 1°\*, 116; 2°\*, 244; in Com. and 3°\*, 501. (46 Vic., c. 87.)
- LORD'S DAY, BETTER OBSERVANCE OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 767; Railway Traffic on: M. for Ret., 899.
- Lotteries (Art Societies Exemption) Law Amt. B. 136**—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 1316; 2°, in Com. and 3°\* 1339. (46 Vic., c. 36.)
- LOTTERY CIRCULARS. See B. 92.
- LOYAL ORANGE ASSOCIATION. See "Orange."
- LUMBER, IMPORTATION OF, INTO MAN.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Royal*) 94.
- LUMBER ON GOVT. SLIDES. See B. 126.

MACDONELL, MR. D. W., Commissioner to administer Oath, 1.  
 MACKENZIE, JUDGE, GRATUITY TO WIDOW OF: in Com. of Sup., 1132.  
 McCALLUM, W. D., REMOVAL AND DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Forbes*) 55.  
 McINNIS, MRS. A. A., COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 1160; conc. 1222.  
 McLENNAN, RODERICK, CLAIM TO LAND IN N. W. T.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 778.  
 McMILLAN, J. D., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scriver*) 77.  
 MAIL CONTRACTS. See "CONTRACTS."  
 MAIL ROUTE via REGINA: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.  
 MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: remarks (*Mr. Davies*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1276.  
 MAIL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1197.  
 MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 952, 953.  
 MALPQUE (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 889.  
**Manitoba and North-Western Fire Insurance Co Incorp. P. No. 24** (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*). 1°\* 56; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 261. (46 *Vic.*, c. 84.)  
 MANITOBA:  
 Agricultural Implements, &c., Imported: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 525.  
 Brandon as a Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.  
 Brandon Post Office: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.  
 Bridge over Red River at Emerson: in Com. of Sup., 1158.  
 Canadian Pacific Ry. constructed and Land Grants to Co.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Royal*) 903.  
 Customs (Outside Service): in Com. of Sup., 1198, 1226.  
 Electoral Divisions, Metes and Bounds: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 659.  
 Fort Osborne Park, Lease or Grant of Land for: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scott*) 1034.  
 Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 927.  
 Indian Agency: M. for Rep. on condition of (*Mr. Charlton*) 902.  
 Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1102, 1191, 1376.  
 Land for Exhibition purposes, Winnipeg: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scott*) 1034.  
 Land Sales and amounts realized: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.  
 Lumber, Importation of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Royal*) 94.  
 Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 757.  
 Persons Entering by Rail: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 295.  
 Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 912, 1182, 1242.  
 Queen's Bench, Chief Justiceship: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 60.  
 Selkirk, Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Ross, Lisgar*) 315.  
 Subsidies or Grants: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 525.  
 Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1160.  
 Winnipeg General Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 1134; conc. 1214.  
 Winnipeg Post Office Site: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 889.

**Manitoba Road and Road Allowances Act Amt. B. No. 110** (*Mr. Royal*). 1°, 660; 2°, 1034.  
**Manitoba, Settlement of Claims to Land in, B. No. 109** (*Mr. Royal*). 1°\*, 660; withdn., 1034.  
 "MANITOULIN," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."  
 MANN, MR., CLAIM OF: in Com. of Sup., 1157.  
 MANUFACTURE, IRON. See "Bounty;" also B. 131.  
 MARBLE: in Com. on W. & M., 672.  
 MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT OF: Rep. presented (*Mr. McLelan*) 66; in Com. of Sup., 748.  
 MARINE:  
 Genii, Master of, and Dept.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 380.  
 Government Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 953. See "Government."  
 Hydrographic Survey: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 82.  
 Inspection of Steamers: Ques. (*Mr. Dawson*), 1025; in Com. of Sup., 1190.  
 Life-boats, purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 954, 1249.  
 Life-saving Stations: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 502.  
 Masters and Mates, Examination of: in Com. of Sup., 953.  
 Montreal Harbor Commission. See "Ship Channel."  
 Newfield and Moravian Steamships: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Forbes*) 301.  
 Pictou Harbor Dues: Res. (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 741. See B. 108.  
 Richibucto River Obstructions: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1025.  
 River Sydenham, Nav. on: Ques. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 1025.  
 St. Lawrence Channel: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 657.  
 Triennial List of Shipping: in Com. of Sup., 956.  
**Marine Telegraph (Pacific Coast and Asia) Co's Act Amt. B. 116** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°\*, 791; 2°\*, 860; in Com. and 3°\*, 935. (46 *Vic.* c. 45.)  
 MARITIME COURT (ONT.) RULES, PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 105.  
**Masters and Mates, Certificates of, B. No. 89** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 428; 1°\* of B. 431; 2° m., 702; 2° and in Com., 708; 3°, 743. (46 *Vic.*, c. 28.) For deb. see "Certificates."  
 MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 953.  
 MATHIEU, MR. JUSTICE: Joliette and Terrebonne Controverted Elections Reps., 3.  
 MATTOCK, C. P., PETITION FOR PRIVATE B.: M. to read and receive (*Mr. Hall*) 138.  
 MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF VOLUNTEERS: in Com. of Sup., 857.  
 MEHARG AND COONEY, PROVISION FOR WIDOW OF: Ques. (*Mr. Curran*) 126.  
 MEMBER INTRODUCED: HON. J. A. CHAPLEAU, by *Sir John A. Macdonald* and *Sir Hector Langevin*, 1373.  
 MEMORANDUM, OFFICIAL, OF THE C. P. R. Co: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 107.  
 MERCHANTS' BANK vs. REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 1197, 1379.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

- Address, Reply to, in answer to Speech, 77.
- Internal Commission (I. of C.) Appointment of, 98.
- Irish Resolutions, on the, transmitting copy of Imperial Despatch, 29.
- Transmitting Estimates for 1883-84, 288.
- Transmitting Further Suppl. Estimates, 1883-84, 1363.
- Transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1882-83, 999.
- Transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1883-84, 1207.

MESSENGERS, SESSIONAL, SALARIES OF: remarks (*Mr. Royal and others*) 1386.

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 957.

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE AND MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY, TORONTO: in Com. of Sup., 1190.

Methodist Missionary Society's Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 43 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138; in Com. and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

"METROPOLIS" LOSS OF THE: See "Life-saving Stations."

MIDLAND HARBOR (ONT.) IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 165.

MILLING WHEAT IN BOND: Ques (*Mr. Wheeler*) 56.

MILL AND POND STREETS, DAMAGE TO LAND IN. See "INTERCOL. RY."

MISCELLANEOUS PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 835, 1038.

Misdemeanor, Persons Charged with, B. No. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 32; 2°, 87; M. for Com., 315; B. in Com., 322; M. (*Mr. Curran*) that Com. rise, 322; carried on a div., 322; M. to reconsd. B. neg. (Y. 77, N. 101) 322.

MILITIA:

- "A" and "B" Batteries, Vacancies in: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 204; Staff of Officers, &c., Instruction and Cost: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659; in Com. of Sup., 860.
- Ammunition, Clothing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 853.
- Artillery Battery and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239.
- Associations, Grants to: in Com. of Sup., 857.
- Blankets, Purchase of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 230.
- Cartridge Factory, Quebec, Officers and Employés: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659.
- Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 857.
- Drill Instruction and Drill Pay: in Com. of Sup., 855.
- Employés in Military Districts: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659.
- Guns, Manufacture of: M. for copy of Contract (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- Medical Examination of Volunteers: in Com. of Sup., 857.
- Military Stores, purchase of Property for: conc., 1316.
- Pay of Officers and Men: prop. Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 693.
- Properties, care of: in Com. of Sup., 858.
- Rep. of Dept.: presented (*Mr. Caron*) 6.
- Richmond Field Battery, Guns for: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 204.
- Royal Military College, Cadets' Commissions in Imp. Service: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 288; Instruction Staff: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 659; in Com. of Sup., 858.

MILITIA—Con.

- Schools of Gunnery: in Com. of Sup., 860.
- Shoeburyness, Artillerymen's Expenses to: in Com. of Sup., 860.
- Staff, Military Branch and District: in Com. of Sup., 853.
- Veterans of 1812: M. for Stmt. of number surviving, &c. (*Mr. Massue*) 40; M. for Stmt. of Names and Residences (*Mr. Mourassa*) 55; Ques. (*Mr. Amyat*) 56; Increase of Pensions: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 657.
- MILITIA ACT AMT. B.: Deb. on 2° (*Mr. Caron*) 526, 540; (*Mr. Vail*) 530; (*Mr. O'Brien*) 531; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 533; (*Mr. Ives*) 534; (*Mr. Hesson*) 536; (*Mr. Lister*) 536; (*Mr. Scriver*) 537; (*Mr. Bergin*) 538; (*Mr. Williams*) 539; (*Mr. Dawson*) 539. See B. 31.
- Militia of Canada, Consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 31 (*Mr. Caron*). 1°, 67; 2° m., 526; 2°, 514; in Com., 544, 583; Res. prop., 693; in Com., 721; B. again in Com., 729; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 731; deb. adjd., 732; resmd., 830; Amt. neg. (Y. 60, N. 113) 834; 3°\*, 835. (46 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- MILLER, CHIEF JUSTICE, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for R.t. (*Mr. Blake*) 60.
- MINGAN, SEIGNIORY OF, DOCUMENTS RESPECTING: M. for copies (*Mr. Abbott*) 659.
- MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 32.
- MINISTERS IN ENGLAND, EXPENSES OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) 381.
- MIRAMICHI RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289.
- MIXED ACIDS: in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- MONEY ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVT. OF N.B.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 659.
- MONEY ORDERS AND POSTAL UNION: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 106.
- MONEY REQUIRED FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE. See B. 21.
- MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289. See B. 137.
- MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE, ACCIDENT AT: Ques. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 126.
- MONTREAL CUSTOM HOUSE, SUPERNUMERARY CLERKS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Curran*) 72.
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION AND PILOT BY-LAW: M. for copy of O.C. (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 776.
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1191. See "Ship Channel."
- Montreal, Ottawa and Western Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 73 (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- MORIN, LUCIEN, ARBITRATOR'S AWARD IN FAVOR OF: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 220.
- MORPETH HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 556.
- MOUNTED POLICE, N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 1041, 1110, 1191.
- MOUNT FOREST AND GLEN EDEN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.

- MOUNT JOHNSON, POSTMASTER AT :** Ques. (*Mr. Béchard*) 547.
- MURRAY BAY AND RIVER OUELLE WINTER SERVICE :** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 106.
- MURRAY CANAL, PROP. ROUTES :** M. for copies of Repts. (*Mr. Platt*) 204; in Com. of Sup., 1071. See "CANALS."
- MUNRO, T., COMPENSATION TO :** in Com. of Sup., 1245.
- MUSIC, PRINTED :** in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY., SUBSIDY TO CO. :** prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289. See B. 137.
- "**NAPOLEON III.**" See "Government Steamers."
- NAPIERVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION :** Judge's Rep., 3.
- NATIONAL DISTILLERS' ASSOCIATION (U.S.) AND CANADIAN CUSTOMS :** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 507.
- National Ins. Co. Winding-up B. No. 20 (Mr. Coursol).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 52; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 77; in Com., 426; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 471. (46 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- NATIONAL POLICY AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS :** Rep. of Sel. Com., Translation of, Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 89; M. for copies, 116.
- NATURALIZATION ACT OF CANADA :** Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 104.
- NATURALIZATION AND IMMIGRATION OF GERMANS :** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96; carried, 104.
- Naturalization of Aliens (1883) B. No. 60 (Mr. Wells).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 129.
- Naturalization of Aliens in Man. Legalization B. 140 (Sir John A. Macdonald).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 1335; 2<sup>o</sup>\* and in Com., 1387; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg., 1387; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1387. (46 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- NAVAL RESERVE.** See "Ordnance Lands."
- NAVIGATION, INLAND.** See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- NAVIGATION ON THE RIVER SYDENHAM :** Ques. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 1025.
- NAVIGABLE WATERS, BOOMS, &C., IN.** See "Booms."
- Navigable Waters, Holes, Openings, &c, in Ice (Criminal Law Amt.) B. No. 30 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton).** 1<sup>o</sup>, 67; 2<sup>o</sup> and ref. to Sel. Com., 125. In-corp. with B. (No. 6).
- NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B.C. LOCAL GOVT. in re DRY DOCK AND ISLAND RY. :** Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 657; explanation as to progress (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1392.
- NELSON VALLEY RY. CO.** See "Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry."
- NEW BRUNSWICK :**
- Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284.
- Caraquette Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284.
- Chatham and Escuminac Lighthouse Telegraph : Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
- Florenceville Postmaster, Charges against : M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 505.
- Fort Dufferin, St. John : in Com. of Sup., 1184, 1245.
- Freight Sheds, &c., Intercol. Ry., St. John, N.B. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- NEW BRUNSWICK—Con.**
- Harbors and Rivers : in Com. of Sup., 924, 1246, 1381.
- Indians : in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1098, 1191, 1249.
- Intercolonial Ry. and Coast and Island Communication : Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
- King's and Albert County Courts, Cases tried at : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- King's County Controverted Election : Judge's Rep., 3.
- Leases or Licenses to Fish : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 287. See "FISHERIES."
- Mill and Pond Streets, Lands expropriated for Intercol. Ry. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Miramichi Valley Ry., Subsidy to Co. : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289.
- Money Advances to Local Govt. : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 659.
- Petitcodiac and Havelock Corner Ry. Subsidy : prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290.
- Portage Island, Transfer of : M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 272.
- Preventive Officer at Woodstock : Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 289; M. for copies of Cor., 506.
- Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1182, 1241.
- Quaco Lighthouse, rebuilding of : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Queddy River Driving and Boom Co.'s Petition : M. to read, &c. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 185.
- Representation : remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) on The Address, 27.
- Richibucto River, Obstructions on the : Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1025.
- St. John River, Ry. Bridge over : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.
- New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No 57 (Mr. Weldon).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 129; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 165; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 767. (46 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- "**NEWFIELD**" AND "MORAVIAN" STEAMSHIPS : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Forbes*) 301. See "Government Steamers."
- NEW HARBOR (N.S.) BREAKWATER :** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 78; M. for Papers, &c., 116.
- NEW MEMBERS :** Certificates of Return, 3.
- NEWSPAPER EXTRACTS, READING OF :** remarks (*Mr. Speaker*) 1169.
- NEWSPAPERS, BINDING, &C. :** in Com. of Sup., 836.
- NEWSPAPERS, FREE DELIVERY OF :** Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 890.
- Niagara Ry. and Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. Ferguson, Welland).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 140; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 165.
- NITRIC ACIDS COMBINED :** in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- NORFOLK, SOUTH, CONTROVERTED ELECTION :** Judge's Rep., 3.
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING CO.'S CONTRACT WITH C. P. R. :** M. for copy (*Mr. Blake*) 778.
- Northern and North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. McCarthy).** 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 150; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 245; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 767. (46 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.** See B. 76.

NORTHERN AND WESTERN BOUNDARIES OF ONT.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 556.

"NORTHERN LIGHT." See "Government Steamers;" also "PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND."

"NORTHERN QUEEN," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."

**Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 93**—from the Senate (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°\*, 283; 2°, 375; ref. back to Com. on Rys., 803; 3° m., 1095; 3°\*, 1093. (46 *Vic., c. 56*.)

NORTH SHORE RY., FERRY BOATS AT TERMINUS OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 35, 376.

NORTH SHORE RY. See "Grand Trunk."

**North Western Bank Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 82** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°, 185.

**North-Western Bank Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 113**—from the Senate (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°\*, 693; 2°\*, 693; in Com. and 3°\*, 871. (46 *Vic., c. 53*.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

Claims of Inhabitants at Prince Albert and neighborhood: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 130.

Coal Lands, Sales and Leases: M. for copies of Applications (*Mr. Blake*) 41.

Emigrant Sheds and Improvements at Regina: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.

Expenses of Government of: in Com. of Sup., 1309.

Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1102, 1191, 1376.

Land Sales and amount realized: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

Lands, Simplification of System of Transfer: M. for Com. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

Mail Route *via* Regina: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.

Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 1041, 1110, 1191.

Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 913, 1243.

Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Watson*) 85.

Regina as a Port of Entry: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.

Regina Immigrant Sheds, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.

Roderick McLennan's Claim to Land: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 778.

Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 1160.

NOTES, UNSTAMPED, IN EVIDENCE. See "B. 78."

NOVA SCOTIA:

Antigonish and Guysborough Mail Route: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirk*) 77.

Bayfield Harbor Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 657.

Blandford Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 68.

Barrington and Cape Sable Island Cable: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.

Coffin's Island, Works at: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 501.

Cape George Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 502.

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 755.

Digby Pier Wharfage Dues: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Vail*) 525.

Fog Whistle at Shelburne Harbor: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

Geological Reps. of Victoria, Inverness and Richmond: M. for copy (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 779.

Goose Island Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 166.

Great American and European Short Line Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284.

Halifax and Cape Breton Ry. and Coal Co.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 129.

Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 922, 1245.

Indian Harbor Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 78; M. for papers, &c., 116.

Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1098, 1101.

Liverpool Bay Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 84; M. for Ret., 383.

Liverpool Harbor, Fog Whistle or Buoy at: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.

New Harbor Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 78; M. for papers, &c., 116.

Port Lorne Breakwater: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.

Petit Rivière Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 265.

Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 909, 1182, 1242.

Pudding Pan, Works at: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.

Quarantine (Sydney): in Com. of Sup., 1238.

Sable Island Communication: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.

Semaphores in Guysborough Co.: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 547.

Truro and Pictou Branch Ry.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 129.

Westport Pier, Vote for: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 376.

Westhaver's Point, Lighthouses at: M. for copies (*Mr. Keefer*) 780.

OAK ON WALPOLE ISLAND, SALE OF: M. for copy of Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 1031.

**Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°\*, 3.

**Oblat Fathers of the N. W. T., B No. 19** (*Mr. Royal*). 1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 244; recom. and 3°, 368. (46 *Vic., c. 96*.)

OBSCENE LITERATURE. See "Post Office Act Amt."

OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 957.

OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE RICHIBUCTO RIVER: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 1025.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 953, 956, 1249.

O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, SUMS PAID TO: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.

OCTAVE C. DE LA CHEVRETIÈRE, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 40.

**Offences against the Person (Criminal Law Amt.) Act Amt. B. No. 7** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°\*, 32; 2°, 87; in Com., 116; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ives*) 195; carried and in Com., 200; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bossé*) neg. (Y. 67, N. 101) 201; 3°\*, 302.

OFFENDERS, JUVENILE, ESCAPE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM OF C.P.R. Co.: M. for copies (*Mr. Blake*) 107.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES. See "Debates."

OILS, CARBOLIC AND HEAVY: in Com. on W. & M., 672.

OLIVER, DAVIDSON & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 1160.

**Ontario and Quebec Ry Incorp. Act Amt B.**

**No. 27** (*Mr. Wells*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 67; 2<sup>o</sup>, 88; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 261. (46 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

ONTARIO ELECTIONS, INTERFERENCE OF SENATORS: in Com. of Sup., 758.

ONTARIO:

Bayfield Harbor: M. for copies of Repts. of Engineers (*Mr. McMillan*) 774.

Boundaries, Northern and Western: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 556.

Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge: M. for Sp. Com. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 508.

Buckhorn, Pier at: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 890.

Civil Service Examinations: Ques. (*Mr. Kilvert*) 107.

Durham and Walkerton Mail Route: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 86.

Gravenhurst and Callander Ry. Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290.

Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 926, 1183, 1246, 1381.

Indians, Annual Grant to suppl. Fund: in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1098.

Iona Drill Shed: M. for copy of Contract (*Mr. Casey*) 133.

Jeannette's Creek, Obstruction of: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 890.

Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 753, 1237; conc., 1127.

Maritime Court, Rules, Practice and Procedure: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 105.

Midland Harbor Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 165.

Monument of Joseph Brant: in Com. of Sup., 1249.

Morpeth Harbor Improvements: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 551.

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289.

Norfolk, South, Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 3.

Port Albert Harbor Improvements: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 376.

Prince Edward County Mail Carriage: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Platt*) 266.

Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 911, 1182, 1242.

River Sydenham, Navigation on the: Ques. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 1025.

St. Thomas Drill Shed: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 132.

Timber, Licenses to Cut: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McNeill*) 292.

Water Lots in Harbors of Lakes Huron and Ontario: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Dawson*) 503.

**Ontario Pacific Ry. Co's Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 65** (*Mr. Bergin*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 140; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 185; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 556. (46 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT: Communication from His Excellency, 3; Speech from the Throne, 4; Formal Ceremonies: remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 4.

ORANGE ASSOCIATION, LOYAL: Deb. on Amt. (*Mr. Coursol*) to M. to fix day for 2<sup>o</sup> of B. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 254; (*Mr. Coursol*) 255; (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 255; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 255; (*Mr. Curran*) 256; (*Mr. Scriver*) 256; (*Mr. Burns*) 256; (*Mr. Auget*) 257; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 257; (*Mr. Hawkins*) 257; (*Mr. Dawson*) 259; (*Mr. Bowell*) 259; (*Mr. Ives*) 260; (*Mr. Beaty*) 260; (*Mr. McNeill*) 260; Amt. neg. (Y. 89, N. 94) 260; Deb. on M. for 2<sup>o</sup> (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 632, 666; (*Mr. Curran*) 632, Amt. 6 m. h., 637; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 637; (*Mr. Coursol*) 638; (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 639; (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 640; (*Mr. McNeill*) 641; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 642; (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) 643; (*Mr. Hawkins*) 644; (*Mr. Burns*) 646; (*Mr. Sproule*) 646; (*Mr. Hackett*) 646; (*Mr. Mackintosh*) 648; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 651; (*Mr. Beaty*) 652; (*Mr. Landry*) 653; (*Mr. Dupont*) 654; (*Mr. Farrow*) 655; Amt. carried (Y. 106, N. 70) 657; Correction (*Mr. Royal*) 741 (vol. ii.) See B. 87.

ORANGE DEMONSTRATION IN OTTAWA: Newspaper Rep. of Proceedings read (*Mr. Landry*) 1169.

**Orange Association of British America Incorp. B. No. 87** (*Mr. White, Hastings*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 254; prop. M. to fix day for 2<sup>o</sup>, 254; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Coursol*) 254; neg. (Y. 89, N. 94) 260; Order for 2<sup>o</sup> allowed to stand, 501; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 632; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Curran*) carried (Y. 106, N. 70) 657. For deb. see above.

ORDER OF BUSINESS: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 1391.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF: ORDER--

*Bothwell Election and conduct of County Judge.* Objection (*Mr. Hawkins*) to Member using improper language: checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 519, 520.

*Consolidated Ry. Act (1879) Amt. B.* Objection (*Mr. Blake*) to further progress, B. not being printed in French, maintained, 1212.

*Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 22.* Objection (*Mr. Blake*) to consdn. of an important Amt. except on two days' notice as required by the Rules of the House: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) Amt. not in Order, 219.

*Criminal Law Amt. (Incest, &c.) B. 7.* Amt. to M. that Com. rise: ruled (*Mr. Chairman*) that no Amt. can properly be made on M. for Com. to rise, 200.

*Debates, Official Repts. of. M. (Mr. Curran)* for copies containing deb. on National Policy: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) not in Order, as it would involve a charge, 503.

*Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B.* Unparliamentary language: request (*Mr. Speaker*) withdrawal of same, 948, 950.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Con.*

*Extracts from Newspapers reflecting on Members*: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) should be read by Clerk at Table, not by individual Members unless followed by a Motion, 1170.

*Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of*. Res. to ref. par. in Speech from the Throne to Sel. Com. objected to (*Mr. Casgrain*) on the ground that no B. relating to Trade can be introduced except through Com. of W.: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) Res. in Order, 235.

Incorrect statements: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that question cannot be again opened for discussion, 1369.

On formation of Sel. Com.: objections by *Mr. Blake* and others to serve: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Members, having declared against the principle of the Res., are exempt from serving on Com., 254.

*King's County (P. E. I.) Election*. Objection (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Amt. to Amt. as being in substance the Main Motion: precedents quoted and ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) in Order, 176.

*Members Speaking twice*: allowed by courtesy of the House, 949, 1120.

*Personal and Insulting Allusions in Deb.*: checked (*Mr. Speaker*) 71, 519, 520, 948, 950, 1367.

*Rule 78, Suspension of*. Objection (*Mr. Blake*): ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that notice having been given, it is within the power of the House to suspend the same, 253.

*Orange Demonstration at Ottawa*. Rep. of Proceedings read: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) any published Repts. reflecting on Members should be read by Clerk at Table, 1170.

*Rate of Interest B. M.* to place on Order Paper for 2° objected to: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) M. in Order, 957.

*St. Peter's Road (P.E.I.) Ry. Crossing*. Ques. respecting: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that no argument nor opinion can be offered, nor fact stated, in asking a question, 107.

*Steam Communication with P.E.I.* Unparliamentary language: request (*Mr. Speaker*) withdrawal of same, 71.

*Tariff Debate*. Objection (*Mr. Charlton*) to Member reading portion of a speech to give a false impression, 455; remarks (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on alleged garbled extract, 456.

Latitude in: Member to use his own discretion (*Mr. Speaker*) 551; permitted, 552.

*Throwing Missiles*. Members requested to desist (*Mr. Speaker*) 1086.

## PRIVILEGE—

*C. P. Ry. Commission, Evidence given before*. Explanation (*Mr. Mackintosh*) as to commercial relations with *Mr. Whitehead*, 1281.

*Intoxicating Liquors B.* Explanation (*Mr. Gigault*) respecting paragraph in *Minerve* and other papers as to vote on Amt. to 3°, 1386.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Con.*

*Increased Indemnity*. Correspondence in *Toronto Mail* reflecting on Members: explanations (*Messrs. Charlton and Ross, Middlesex*) 1057; (*Messrs. Paterson and Somerville, Brant*) 1058; (*Messrs. Davies and McMullen*) 1059.

*River Improvements between Montreal and Quebec*. Interview of deputation with the Government, Rep. of, in certain Montreal Journals: explanation (*Mr. Desjardins*) 785.

*Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec*. Explanation (*Mr. Landry*) respecting paragraph in *Montreal Gazette*, 1363.

*Vote on Orange B.* Explanation (*Mr. Berquin*) respecting paragraph in *Toronto Globe*, 709.

## PROCEDURE—

*Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B.* Objection (*Mr. Rykert*) to 2°: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) B. could not be carried if Member objected to 2°, but objection came after it was declared carried, and on reference to Ry. Com., 784.

*Criminal Law Amt. B. 7.* Amt. rep. from Com. of W.: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) addition to Amt. cannot be made, but can be made on M. for 3°, 201.

*Criminal Law Amts. (B. 6, 2, 4 and 30) dropped from Order Paper*. M. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to ref. B. to Com., 331; attention of House directed to the two days' notice as required by Rule 31 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 332: ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that no B. before the House can be killed by Com., 332.

*Debate, Adjournment of, Verbal Motions*: practice (*Mr. Speaker*) 1369.

*Fraud in Contracts B. 5.* After 2°: practice (*Mr. Speaker*) to ref. B. to Com. of W., and when Order is called for Com. of W. Order can be discharged and the B. then ref. to Sel. Com., 94.

*King's County (P.E.I.) Election*. Attention of House directed by *Mr. Blake* to Order for resuming adjd. deb. not appearing on Order Paper: practice (*Mr. Speaker*) to take subject up for subsequent deb. as a Ques. of Priv., 102.

*Northern Ry. Co.'s B.* Amts. made by Sel. Com. on Rys. to Sen. B. must be considered as having been reported from Com. of W. with Amts. (*Mr. Speaker*) 1098.

*Votes, Recording of*. Loss of time: remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 827.

For Constitutional Questions raised in deb. see

Acadia Powder Co.'s B. No. 40;

Carriers by Land B. No. 14;

Booms in Navigable Waters B. No. 96;

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 101;

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of, B. 132.

ORDNANCE LANDS AND NAVAL RESERVES RECEIPTS: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. O'Brien*) 54.

**Pacific and Peace River Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 64** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 749. (46 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

- PACIFIC RAILWAY. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- PALLISSER GUNS. See "GUNS" under "MILITIA."
- PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION: in Com. of Sup., 1197.
- PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY. See "Library of Parliament."
- PARLIAMENT, 5TH, FIRST SESSION, 1883, 46 VICTORIA: Meeting, 1; Opening, 3; Speech from the Throne, 3; Bills Assented to, 1397; Prorogation, 1399. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- PASSENGER ACCOMMODATION AT "THE CROSSING." Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 376.
- Patent Act Amt. B. No. 122—from the Senate (*Mr. Pope*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 957; 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1227. (46 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- PATENT RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 836; conc., 1128.
- Patent Rights, Prevention of Fraud in Sale of, B. No. 98 (*Mr. Mulock*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 315.
- PATTERSON, MR. JUSTICE: South Norfolk Controverted Election Rep., 3.
- PELLETIER, N. A., AND OTHERS, CLAIMS OF: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1025.
- PEMBINA BRANCH RY.: See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- PEMBROKE, TOWN OF, BONUS TO CAN. CENTRAL RY.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 229; in Com. of Sup., 1065.
- PENITENTIARIES: British Columbia, in Com. of Sup., 756. Dept. Rep.: presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 233. Dorchester: in Com. of Sup., 755. Kingston: in Com. of Sup., 753, 1237; conc., 1127. Manitoba: in Com. of Sup., 757. Prince Edward Island, Claim on Acct. of: in Com. of Sup., 1237. St. Vincent de Paul: in Com. of Sup., 754.
- PENITENTIARIES AND COUNTY JAILS, REMOVAL OF PRISONERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 133.
- Penitentiaries' Laws Consolidation Act Amt. B. No. 111—from the Senate (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 693; Res. in Com., 1035; 2<sup>o</sup> of B., 1038; in Com., 1309; recom., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1387. (46 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 852, 863, 1134.
- PENSIONS TO MILITIAMEN OF 1812: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 55. See "MILITIA."
- Pères Oblats de Marie Immaculée Incorp. B., No. 19 (*Mr. Royal*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 52; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 77; in Com., 244; recom. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 368. (46 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- PERLEY, EX-OVERSEER (FISHERY) CLAIM OF; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 660.
- Permanent Building Societies (Ont.) Act Amt. B. No. 17 (*Mr. Williams*). 1<sup>o</sup>, 40; 2<sup>o</sup>, 125.
- PERSONAL AND INSULTING ALLUSIONS IN DEBATE: See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: Tariff Deb. on unfair comparison (*Mr. Charlton*) 553; on being misquoted (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 552. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
- Persons charged with Misdemeanor competent as Witnesses B. No. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 32; 2<sup>o</sup>, 87; M. for Sel. Com., 315; B. in Com., 322; M. that Com. rise (*Mr. Curran*) carried on a div., 322; M. to reconsid. B. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 77, N. 101) 332.
- PETERS, MAJOR, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 781.
- PETITCODIAC AND HAVELOCK RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290. See B. 137.
- PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BS.: Ms. to read and receive: C. P. Mattock (*Mr. Hall*) 138; Gt. Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 139; W. V. Lawrence & Co. (*Mr. Abbott*) 139; Queddy River Driving and Boom Co. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 185; C. P. Ry. Co., (*Mr. Abbott*) 741 (vol. ii.)
- PETIT RIVIÈRE (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 265.
- PETROLEUM, INSPECTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1199.
- PHAIR vs. VENNING: in Com. of Sup., 1193.
- PHYSICIANS CERTIFICATES GRANTED UNDER CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 777.
- PICTON AND TRENTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 502.
- Pictou Harbor Act Amt. B. No. 108 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com. and 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 741 (vol. ii.); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 860; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 922. (46 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- Pig Iron, Encouragement to Manufacture, B. No. 131 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 693; in Com., 710—716; conc. in, 743; 1<sup>o</sup>\* of B., 1226; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1336. (46 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- PILOT BY-LAW AND MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION: M. for copy of O.C. (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 776.
- PILOTAGE ACTS AMT. CONSOLIDATION: Ques. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 165.
- PILOTS AND PILOTAGE IN B.C.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Baker, Victoria*) 204.
- PIPES, GLAZED AND UNGLAZED: in Com. on W. & M., 671.
- PIPES, IRON, &c.: in Com. on W. & M., 692.
- PITEAU, L. J., INDEMNIFICATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 1238.
- PLASTER, LAND, DUTY ON: Ques. (*Mr. Wheler*) 376.
- PLAYING CARDS: in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- POINT DES CASCADES AND LAKE ST. FRANCIS CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. De Beaujeu*) 266.
- POLICE, DOMINION: Rep. presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 40.
- POLICE, QUEBEC HARBOR: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- POINT DES CASCADES AND LAKE ST. FRANCIS CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. De Beaujeu*) 266.
- POINT LEVIS SHUNTING STATION. See "INTERCOL. RY."
- PORTAGE ISLAND (N.B.) TRANSFER OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 272.
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AS A CUSTOMS OUTPORT: Ques. (*Mr. Watson*) 166.
- Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 58 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 129; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 165; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 501. (46 *Vic.*, c. 68.)



- PORT ALBERT HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 376.
- PORT LOBNE (N.S) BREAKWATER: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 92—from the Senate (*Mr. Carling*). 1°\*, 283; 2°, 1037; in Com. and 3°\*, 1037. (46 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- POST OFFICE:
- Canada and the Postal Union: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 106.
- Contracts for Carrying Mails: M. for copies (*Mr. Laurier*) 86.
- Farnham and Guillaume Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 125.
- Flesherton and Vandeleur Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.
- Florenceville Postmaster, Charges against: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Irvine*) 505.
- Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Ry. Bi-daily Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 781.
- L'Avenir Postmaster, Complaints against: M. for copies (*Mr. Rinfret*) 902.
- Letter Postage, Reduction on: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 106.
- Mail Carriage in Prince Edward County: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Platt*) 266.
- Mail Route via Regina: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.
- Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 952, 953.
- Money Orders and the Postal Union: Ques. (*Coursol*) 106.
- Mount Forest and Glen Eden Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.
- Mount Johnson Postmaster: Ques. (*Mr. Brecken*) 547.
- Newspapers, Free Delivery: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 890.
- Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1197; conc., 1123.
- Pictou and Trenton Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 502.
- St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain Junction Ry. Mail Service: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 125.
- Undelivered Letters: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 889.
- Winnipeg Post Office Sites: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 889.
- POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS., CONTINGENCIES: conc., 1114.
- POST OFFICE DEPT.: Rep. presented (*Mr. Carling*) 106; in Com. of Sup., 748.
- POST OFFICE MAIL SERVICES. See respective headings.
- "POWHATAN," LOSS OF THE. See "Life-saving Stations."
- PREMIUMS ON INSURANCE: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1030.
- Presbyterian Church and Manse Building Fund (*Man.*) Incomp. B. No. 75 (*Mr. Ross, Lisgar*). 1°\*, 160; 2°\*, 165; in Com., 373; 3°\*, 475. (46 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- Presbyterian Church Temporalities Fund Act Amt. B. No. 39 (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°\*, 89; 2°, 162; withdn., 288.
- Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund (Maritime Prov.) Amalg. B. No. 63 (*Mr. Richey*). 1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; in Com., 372; 3°\*, 426. (46 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- PREVENTION OF CRIMES ACT. See B 133.
- PRINCE ALBERT AND N.W.T., CLAIMS OF INHABITANTS FOR LANDS: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 130.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING AND RAT PORTAGE RY: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 1025.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1182.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING TO RED RIVER. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY MAIL CARRIAGE: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Platt*) 266.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
- Cape Traverse Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Hackett*) 66; in Com. of Sup., 1064.
- Casumpec Harbor: in Com. of Sup., 924.
- Claim against Dom. Govt. for Wharves, &c.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 232.
- Claim for Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1178.
- Dominion Piers: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) in Com. of Sup., 1249.
- Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 924, 1246.
- Harmony Station and Elmira Ry. Surveys: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McIntyre*) 115.
- King's County Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 40.
- King's County Election: M. for Clerk of Crown in Chancery to attend House with Returns (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40; Clerk in attendance, 52; Res. declaring Mr. Robertson elected (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 89; deb. adjd., 93; Order for resuming adjd. deb. not appearing on Order Paper, 102; Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 116, 140; deb. resmd., 150; Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 151; deb. adjd., 161; resmd., 166; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 175; neg. (Y. 60, N. 118) 185; M. (*Mr. Blanchet*) to conc., in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 793; Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 800; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 806, neg. (Y. 64, N. 108) 825; Amt. neg. (Y. 66, N. 108) 826.
- Mail Subsidy to Great Britain: in Com. of Sup., 953.
- Malpeque Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 889.
- North Cape and East Point, Signal Stations: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1026.
- Northern Light*. See "Steam Communication" under this heading.
- Post Office, &c., Summerside: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 140.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 910, 1241.
- Queen's County Election Appeal: Supreme Court Judgment read (*Mr. Speaker*) 84.
- Rod Point Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 266; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 315.
- Refund of Duties paid to Merchants; in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- South River and Malpeque: in Com. of Sup., 1246.
- St. Peter's Road, Ry. Crossing at: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 107, 125.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

Steam Communication : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Davies*) 43; Deb. (*Mr. Yeo*) 46; (*Mr. Jenkins*) 47; (*Mr. Mc Intyre*) 48; (*Mr. Hackett*) 49; (*Mr. Casey*) 51; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Jenkins*) 68; Deb. (*Mr. Davies*) 68; (*Mr. Hackett*) 70; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 71; M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1027.

Summerside Harbor Surveys: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Hackett*) 215; deb. resmd., 225.

Summerside Ry. Station: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 84.

Superannuation of Judges: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 204.

Winter Mail Service: remarks (*Mr. Davies*) in Com. of Sup. 1376.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1073.

PRINTED MUSIC: in Com. on W. & M., 662.

PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 835, 1038.

PRISONERS, COST OF REMOVING, FROM COUNTY JAILS TO PENITENTIARIES: Ms. for Stmts. (*Messrs. Casey and Wilson*) 133.

PRIVATE BILLS: Ms. (*Mr. Beaty*) to extend time, 36, 66, 88, 161; (*Mr. Abbott*) 288.

PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 743.

Procedure in Criminal Cases B. No. 2 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*). 1°, 29; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com. 87. Incorp. with B. (No. 6).

Procedure in Criminal Cases (persons charged with indictable offences) Act Amt. B. No. 12 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*): 1°, 38.

PROCEDURE OF THE HOUSE: Recording Votes, remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 827.

PROCEDURE. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."

Promissory Notes, Drafts, Bills of Exchange Tax Repeal Act Amt. B. No. 78 (*Mr. Weldon*). 1°, 150; 2°\* and ref. to Sel. Com., 315; B. in Com., 426; 3°\*, 557. (46 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

PREROGATION OF PARLIAMENT: Communication from Gov. Gen's Sec., 1391; His Ex.'s Speech, 1399.

Provincial Courts Judges Provision B. No. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. in Com., 1310; 1°\* of B., 1316; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336. (46 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS' CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOM.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 266.

PROVINCIAL LAWS RESPECTING INTOXICATING LIQUORS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 380.

PUDDING PAN (N.S.) WORKS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR 1881-82; presented (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 35.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. See "PUBLIC WORKS."

PUBLIC BUSINESS, STATE OF: remarks on, 55, 106, 1235.

PUBLIC CONTRACTS, FRAUD IN RELATION TO. See B. 5.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, EXCHANGE OF: Remarks on M. to conc. in Sixth Rep. of Printing Com., 784.

## PUBLIC LANDS:

Agreements between Companies and Government: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.

Colonization, under Plans No. One and Two: Ms. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.

Consolidation B. See "Dominion Lands;" also B. 45.

Prince Albert and N.W.T., claims of inhabitants: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 130.

Sales and amount realized in Man. and N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

Sales of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.

Surveyed in the N.W.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 55.

Transfer, Simplification of System: M. for Com. (*Mr. Blake*) 79.

## Public Lands of the Dom. Acts Amt. B. No. 45

(*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 90; 2°\*, 546; M. for Com., 860; in Com., 873, 935; M. for 3°, 936; Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) 940; deb. resmd., 943; Amt. neg. (Y. 49, N. 101) 951; 3°\*, 951; Sen. Amts., 1310. (46 *Vic.*, c. 17.)

## PUBLIC WORKS:

Barrington and Cape Sable Island Cable: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.

Bayfield (N.S.) Harbor Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Mc Isaac*) 657.

Bayfield (Ont.) Breakwater: M. for copies of Reps. of Engineer (*Mr. McMillan, Huron*) 774.

Blandford (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 68.

Brandy Pots, Semaphore at: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.

Brandon, Post Office at: Ques. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 166.

Buckhorn (Ont.) Pier at: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 890.

Cape George (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 502.

Chatham to Escuminac (N.B.) Telegraph: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.

Coffin's Island (N.S.) Works at: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 501.

Cotton Wood Canon (B.C.) Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 315.

Dominion Piers in P.E.I.: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) in Com. of Sup., 1249.

Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 929.

Fort Dufferin, St. John, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184.

Frontenac Terrace (Que.): M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 54.

Grosse Isle and Mainland Semaphore Communication: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 78, 890.

Gulf Telegraph System, Extension of: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.

Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup. (N.S.) 922, 1245; (P.E.I.) 924, 1246; (N.B.) 924, 1246, 1381; (Maritime Provinces generally) 925; (Que.) 925, 1183, 1246; (Ont.) 926, 1183, 1246, 1381; (Man.) 927; (B.C.) 927, 1183; (General) 929; (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1247.

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- Indian Harbor (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 78; M. for papers, &c., 116.
- Iona Drill Shed Contract: M. for copy (*Mr. Casey*) 133.
- Isle aux Nois and St. Johns Barracks: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 1025; M. for copies of Repts. of Engineers, 1034.
- Juannette's Creek (Ont.) Obstruction of: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 890.
- Little Bear Creek (B.C.) Navigation of: Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
- Liverpool Bay (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 84; M. for R. 383.
- Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1078, 1079, 1199.
- Malpeque (P.E.I.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 889.
- Midland Harbor Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Cook*) 165.
- Montreal and Quebec, Channel between. See "QUEBEC."
- Monument to Joseph Brant: in Com. of Sup., 1249.
- Morpeth Harbor Improvements: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 556.
- New Harbor (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 78; M. for papers, &c., 116.
- North Cape and East Point (P.E.I.) Signal Stations: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1026.
- Petit Rivière (N.S.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Keefer*) 265.
- Port Albert Harbor Improvements: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 376.
- Port Lorne (N.S.) Breakwater: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup. (N.B.) 1182, 1241; (N.S.) 909, 1181, 1241; (P.E.I.) 910, 1241; (Que.) 910, 1182, 1242; (Ont.) 911, 1182, 1242; (Man.) 912, 1182, 1242; (N.W.T.) 913, 1243; (B.C.) 913, 1244; (General) 913; (Repairs, &c.) 913, 1182; (Prince Arthur's Landing) 1182.
- Public Buildings, Ottawa: Accommodation in, 784; in Com. of Sup., 907; conc., 1116.
- Pudding Pan (N.S.) Works: Ques. (*Mr. Forbes*) 130.
- Quaco (N.B.) Lighthouse: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- Red Point (P.E.I.) Breakwater: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 266; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 315.
- Regina, Immigrant Shed at: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.
- Rep. of Dept.: presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 36.
- Rivière du Loup, Semaphore at: M. for Cor., (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.
- Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 930.
- Sable Island and N.S. Telegraph: Ques. (*Mr. Paine*) 68.
- Salaries charged against Public Works: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 116.
- Site, purchase of, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1179.
- Ste. Anne, Chicoutimi, Wharf at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gagné*) 138.

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- St. Francis Wharf, Island of Orleans: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 41, 315; Ms. for Rets. 64, 377.
- St. Thomas Drill Shed: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 132.
- Summerside Post Office, &c.: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 140.
- Telegraphic Expenditure charged to Public Works: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 84.
- Telegraph Lines, Man. and N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1160.
- Telegraphs: in Com. of Sup., 930, 1249.
- Two Creeks Harbor (B.C.): Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
- Vaux, C., Compensation to: in Com. of Sup., 1181.
- Westhaver's Point, Lighthouse at: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Keefer*) 780.
- Winnipeg Post Office Site: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 889.
- Yamaska River Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 41.
- PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., EXPENDITURE ON TELEGRAMS: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 84.
- PUBLIC WORKS: Rep. presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 36; in Com. of Sup., 749, 750.
- PUBLIC WORKS: SALARIES CHARGED TO: M. for Stmtnt. (*Mr. Blake*) 86.
- QUACO LIGHTHOUSE, REBUILDING OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING CO.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Watson*) 85.
- Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stmtnt. Co. Incorp. B. No. 72 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 607. (46 Vic., c. 72.)
- QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1238.
- Quebec and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 54 (*Mr. Bossé*). 1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 606. (46 Vic., c. 70.)
- QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY., SUBSIDY TO CO.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290. See B. 137.
- QUEBEC:
- Brandy Pots, Semaphore at: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.
- Edmuntston to Rivière du Loup Ry.: Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 41.
- Frontenac Terrace, City of Quebec: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 54.
- Gatineau Valley Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1284.
- Geographical Society: in Com. of Sup., 1378.
- Grosse Isle and Mainland Communication: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- Harbor Police: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Sup., 925, 1183, 1246.
- Indians, Annual Grant to suppl. Fund: in Com. of Sup., 1094, 1098.

## QUEBEC—Con.

- Intercol. Ry. Offices at City: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 376.
- International Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1288.
- Isle aux Nois and St. Johns Barracks: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 1025; M. for copies of Reps. of Engineers, 1034.
- Isle Rouge Lightship, Dismissal of Captain: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (*Mr. Laurier*) 903.
- Jacques Cartier Controverted Election: Judge's Rep. 4.
- Joliette Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 3.
- Montreal and Western Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Res. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1289.
- Montreal Harbor Commission and Pilot By-law: M. for copy of O.C. (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 776.
- Mount Johnson Postmaster: Ques. (*Mr. Béchard*) 547.
- Murray Bay and River Ouelle Winter Service: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Blondeau*) 106.
- Napierville Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 3.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 910, 1182, 1242.
- Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Subsidy to Co.: prop. Rés. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252; Res. in Com., 1290.
- Quebec Central Ry. See "INTERCOL. RY."
- Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Ry. See "North Shore Ry."
- Rivière du Loup and River Ouelle Wharves, Ice Reps.: M. for copies (*Mr. Grandbois*) 215.
- Rivière du Loup, Semaphore at: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.
- Seigniorship of Mingan, Documents respecting: M. for copies (*Mr. Abbott*) 659.
- Semaphore Communication with Grosse Isle: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 78, 890.
- Scottsville Postmaster: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 52.
- Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec: Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 785; M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 903; Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1246, 1251. See B. 142.
- St. Francis Wharf, Island of Orleans: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- St. Jean Port Joli Wharf: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 41, 315; Ms. for Rest., 64, 377.
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 754.
- Ste. Anne, Chicoutimi, Wharf at: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gagne*) 138.
- Subsidy, Increase of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 779.
- Terrebonne Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 3.
- Verchères Controverted Election: Judge's Rep., 3.
- Veterans of 1812: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 56.
- Yamaska River Improvements: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 41.
- Quebec Fire Ins. Co.'s Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 23** (*Mr. Bossé*). 1°\*, 56; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 375. (46 Vic., c. 88.)
- Quebec Graving Dock Act Amt. B. No. 129** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1213; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1279. (46 Vic., c. 40.)
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. No. 130** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 1313; 1°\* of B., 1214; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1279. (46 Vic., c. 39.)
- QUEBEC SHIP CHANNEL. See "Ship Channel."
- QUEDDY RIVER DRIVING AND BOOM Co.'s PETITION: M. to read, &c. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 185.
- QUEEN'S BENCH (MAN.) CHIEF JUSTICESHIP: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 60.
- QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) ELECTION APPEAL: Supreme Court Judgment read (*Mr. Speaker*) 84.
- QUESNELLE FORKS AND BARKERVILLE (B.C.) MAIL SERVICE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Reid*) 302.
- QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE: (*Mr. Bergin*) 701; (*Mr. Desjardins*) 785; (*Mr. Charlton and others*) 1057; (*Mr. Mackintosh*) 1281; (*Mr. Landry*) 1365; (*Mr. Gigault*) 1386. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- Quinze Pier, Boom and Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 66** (*Mr. Tassé*). 1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165; M. for Com., 940; in Com. and 3°\*, 943. (46 Vic., c. 92.)
- Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. B. No. 15** (*Mr. Mulock*). 1°, 39; 2°, 103; withdn., 281.
- Railway Act (Consolidated) Amt. B. No. 32** (*Mr. Riopel*). 1°\*, 77; 2°, 125.
- Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. B. No. 69** (*Mr. White, Renfrew*). 1°\*, 140; 2°, 287.
- Railway Act, Consolidated (1879) Amt. B. No. 127** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 1081; 2° m., 1209; 2° and in Com., 1297; on M. for 3°, Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 78) 1317; recom. and 3°\*, 1318. (46 Vic., c. 24.)
- RAILWAY ACT, CONSOLIDATED: QUES. (*Mr. Mulock*) 383.
- RAILWAY BRIDGE OVER RIVER ST. JOHN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.
- RAILWAY CARS, SLEIGHS, &c.: in Com. on W. & M., 662.
- Railway Commissioners, Court of, B. No. 3** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 29; 2°, 140; M. for Com., 558; neg., 571.
- RAILWAY CROSSING AT ST. PETER'S ROAD (P.E.I.): QUES. (*Mr. Davies*) 107, 125.
- RAILWAY RESERVES (B.C.) SQUATTERS ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gordon*) 382.
- RAILWAY STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1065.
- RAILWAY SUBSIDIES: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 301.
- RAILWAY TRAFFIC ON THE LORD'S DAY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 899.
- Railway Trust and Construction Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 41** (*Mr. Small*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 164; in Com. and 3°\*, 749. (46 Vic., c. 75)
- Railway Trust and Construction Co. of Can. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 141** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1°\*, 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1336. (46 Vic., c. 76.)
- RAILWAYS, ACCIDENTS ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 659.
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 77; in Com. of Sup., 1235.

- RAILWAYS AND CANALS EXPENDITURE IN THE PROVINCES: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 412.
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1073, 1077, 1078, 1245.
- RAILWAYS, GENERAL (CHARGES ON REVENUE): in Com. of Sup., 1160, 1222.
- Railways, Minister of, transfer of certain powers of Min. of Pub. Works to, B. No. 94 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°\*, 298, 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1037. (46 *Vic.*, c. 5).
- RAILWAYS. See respective headings.
- Railways, Subsidies to, Authorization B. No. 137 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1252; in Com., 1283; Rep. of Com. consd., 1317; 1°\* of B., 1317; 2°\*, 1331; in Com., 1332; on M. for 3° Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1333; 3°\*, 1333. (46 *Vic.*, c. 25).
- Rainy River Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 38 (*Mr. Dawson*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138.
- RAPID TELEGRAPH CO. See "Canadian."
- Rathbun, H. B. & Sons Co. Incorp. B. No. 26 (*Mr. White, Hastings*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- RAT PORTAGE AND PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING RY.: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 1025.
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF ACCOUNTANT OF H. OF C.: presented (*Mr. Speaker*) 29.
- RECIPROCAL TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND BRAZIL, &c.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 767.
- RECIPROCITY WITH THE U.S.: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 267.
- RECIPROCITY WITH THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS: Ques. (*Mr. Homer*) 67; Res. prop., 231.
- REDEMPTION OF BILL STAMPS: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 502.
- RED POINT (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 266, 315.
- RED RIVER, WEST OF. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- REDUCTION ON LETTER POSTAGE: Ques. (*Mr. Auger*) 106.
- REFUND OF DUTIES PAID BY MERCHANTS IN P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1381.
- REGINA, EMIGRANT SHEDS AND IMPROVEMENTS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.
- REGINA AS THE CAPITAL OF THE N.W.: M. for O.C., &c. (*Mr. Casey*) 273.
- REGINA, MAIL ROUTE *via*: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.
- REGINA AS A PORT OF ENTRY: Ques. (*Mr. Orton*) 265.
- REMISSION OF DUTY ON IRON IMPORTED FOR DUFFERIN BRIDGE: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 897.
- RENOUF, DE, ACCOUNT OF: M. for copy (*Mr. Amyot*), 40.
- REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 913, 1182.
- REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Tassé*) 890.
- REPORTS, DEPARTMENTAL, COMPILATION OF: Res. prop. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 298.
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- Accountant of H. of C., Receipts and Expenditure (*Mr. Speaker*) 29.
- Adulteration of Food (*Mr. Costigan*) 36.
- Agriculture (*Mr. Pope*) 583.
- Auditor General (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 35.
- Canadian Pacific Ry., as to route, progress, &c. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 66, 77.
- Canadian Pacific Ry., in account with Govt. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 66.
- Civil Service Examiners (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 77.
- Dominion Police Expenditure (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 40.
- Indian Affairs (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 36.
- Inland Revenue (*Mr. Costigan*) 36.
- Interior (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 331.
- Justice, Penitentiaries Branch (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 233.
- Library of Parliament (*Mr. Speaker*) 4.
- Marine and Fisheries (*Mr. McLelan*) 66.
- Militia (*Mr. Caron*) 36.
- Postmaster General (*Mr. Carling*) 106.
- Public Accounts (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 35.
- Public Works (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 36.
- Public Works from 1867 to 1882 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1169.
- Railways and Canals (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 77.
- Secretary of State (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 36.
- Trade and Navigation Tables (*Mr. Bowell*) 36.
- Weights and Measures (*Mr. Costigan*) 36.
- REPRESENTATION IN N.B.: remarks (*Mr. Mitchell*) on the Address, 27.
- RETURNING OFFICERS IN G.E. 1882: M. for List (*Mr. Blake*) 57. See "Bothwell Election;" also "King's County (P.E.I.) Election."
- RETURNS AND REPORTS. See respective headings.
- RETURNS, PREPARATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 1196.
- RICHARDS, S., HOLDING ASSIZES: in Com. of Sup., 1178.
- RICHBUCKTO RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (*Mr. Kirā*) 1025.
- RICHMOND FIELD BATTERY, GUNS FOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ives*) 204.
- RIDEAU CANAL. See "CANALS."
- RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GRANTS TO: in Com. of Sup., 857.
- RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF FRENCH CANADIANS: remarks (*Mr. Tasse*) on the Address, 28.
- RITCHIE, SIR WM. JOHNSTONE, DEP. GOV.: Meeting of Parl., 1.
- RIVER DU LOUP AND RIVER OUELLE WHARVES, ICE REPS.: M. for copies (*Mr. Grandbois*) 215.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP TOWN BRANCH. See "INTERCOL. RY."
- ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 930.
- ROBERTSON *vs.* THE QUEEN: in Com. of Sup., 1197; in Com. on Fisheries Act Amt. B. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1200.
- RODERICK McLENNAN'S CLAIM TO LAND IN N.W.T.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 778.
- ROLLING STOCK PURCHASED FROM PURCELL & Co. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."

- ROLLING STOCK. See "INTERCOL. RY.;" also "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
- ROULEAU, MR. F. F.: Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1.
- ROUVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 187.
- ROWE, AMOS, AND THE GOVT., RELATIONS BETWEEN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1028.
- ROYAL ACADEMY OF ARTS: on M. for Com. of Sup. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1171; (*Mr. Wright*) 1172, 1174 (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1173; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1173.
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1397.
- Royal Canadian Passenger Steamship Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 55 (*Mr. Mitchell*). 1°\*, 129; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 501. (46 *Vic., c. 88.*)
- ROYAL LIFE-BOAT INSTITUTION. See "Life-saving Stations."
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE CADETS. See "MILITIA."
- ROYAL SOCIETY: in Com. of Sup., 1194.
- Royal Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 37 (*Mr. Tasse*). 1°\*, 89; 2°, 262; in Com. and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic., c. 46.*)
- RUSSELL vs. WOODWARD, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1133.
- RUSSELL vs. THE QUEEN: M. for copies of Judgments (*Mr. Blake*) 66.
- RUSSIAN JEWS, IMMIGRATION OF: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Casey*) 659.
- Rustico Farmer's Bank Incorp. Act Continuation B. No. 28 (*Mr. Davies*). 1°\*, 67; 2°\* 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 501. (46 *Vic., c. 49.*)
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH AND FERRY. See "INTERCOL. RY."
- ST. FRANCIS WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 890.
- ST. HYACINTHE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 187.
- ST. JEAN, BANQUE DE, ANNUAL RETURNS: M. for copies (*Mr. Bergeron*) 66.
- ST. JEAN PORT JOLI WHARF: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 41, 315; Ms. for Ret., 64, 377.
- St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. Provision B. No 138 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1199; M. for Com., 1333; Res. in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1335; 2°\*, in Com. and 3°, 1363. (46 *Vic., c. 26.*)
- ST. JOHN, INTERCOL. RY., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Sup., 1060, 1150.
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) LANDS EXPROPRIATED AT, FOR INTERCOL. RY.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- ST. JOHN (N.B.) INTERCOL. RY. FREIGHT SHEDS, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 106.
- ST. JOHN RIVER, RY. BRIDGE OVER: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.
- ST. JOHN AND ISLE AUX NOIX BARRACKS: Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 1025; M. for copies of Reps. of Engineers, 1034.
- ST. LAWRENCE AND LAKE CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 125.
- St. Lawrence Bridge and Manufacturing Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 68 (*Mr. Curran*). 1°\*, 140; 2°\*, 165.
- ST. LAWRENCE, CHANNEL OF THE: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 657; Ques. of Priv. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 785; Deepening of: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 903; Ques. (*Mr. Desjardins*) 1246, 1251. See B. 142.
- ST. LAWRENCE, INTERCOL. AND NORTH SHORE RY. FERRY BOATS: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 376.
- ST. LAWRENCE PILOTAGE. See "Montreal Harbor Commissioners."
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS. See "CANALS."
- ST. PETER'S CANAL. See "CANALS."
- ST. PETER'S ROAD (P.E.I.) RY. CROSSING: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 107, 125.
- ST. THOMAS DRILL SHED: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wilson*) 132.
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 754.
- STE ANNE CANAL. See "CANALS."
- STE. ANNE, PIER AT: M. for Reps., &c. (*Mr. Gagné*) 138.
- SABBATH, OBSERVANCE OF: Ques. (*Mr. McMullen*) 767; Railway Traffic on: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 899.
- SABLE ISLAND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.
- SALARIES, &c., LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 835; conc., 1114.
- SALARIES, &c., FISHERY OVERSEERS AND WARDENS: in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1186; conc., 1116, 1223.
- SALARIES CHARGED AGAINST PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Stmt., (*Mr. Bergeron*) 116.
- SALARIES OF JUDGES: in Com. on Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1310; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 1311, 1315; (*Mr. Baker, Missisquoi*) 1311; (*Mr. McCarthy*) 1311; (*Mr. Brecken*) 1312; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1312; (*Mr. Curran*) 1313; (*Mr. Davies*) 1313; (*Mr. Landry*) 1313; (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 1313; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1314; (*Mr. Woodworth*) 1314. See B. 134.
- SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN QUEBEC: M. for copies of Petitions (*Mr. Gigault*) 213. See B. 132.
- SALT DUTIES: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Wheler*) 232.
- Saskatchewan and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 74 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°\*, 150; 2°\*, 165; in Com. and 3°\*, 701. (46 *Vic., c. 71.*)
- Saskatchewan University Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Williams*). 1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 244; consd. and recom., 261; 3°\*, 261. (46 *Vic., c. 47.*)
- SCHOOLS OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 860.
- SCHREIBER, MR., ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE TO: in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1190.
- SCOTTSTVILLE (QUE.) POSTMASTERSHIP: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 52.
- SEAMEN'S WAGES, COLLECTION OF: M. to introduce B. (*Mr. O'Brien*) withdn., 53.
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 36.
- SECRETARY OF STATE, THE: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 951.

**Seduction, Punishment of (Criminal Law Amt.)**

**B. No. 13 (Mr. Charlton).** 1° 38; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 123; M. for Com., 220; B. in Com., 222; Order for consdn. read, 283; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Charlton*) carried (Y. 91, N. 73) 286; in Com., 286; M. for consdn., 286; deb. adjd., 287; M. to recom. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) carried (Y. 73, N. 61) 307; in Com., 313; rep., 314; 3°\*, 315.

**SEIGNIORY OF MINGAN, DOCUMENTS RESPECTING:** M. for copies (*Mr. Abbott*) 659.

**SEIZURE OF TOBACCO IN MONTMAGNY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 383.

**SEIZURE OF TOBACCO ON BRIG "ADELINE:"** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 382.

**SELECT COMMITTEES.** See "COMMITTEES."

**SELKIRK AS A PORT OF ENTRY:** Ques. (*Mr. Ross, Lisgar*) 315.

**SEMAPHORE COMMUNICATION WITH GROSSE ISLE, &c.:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 78.

**SEMAPHORES AT BRANDY POTS:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 134.

**SEMAPHORES IN GUYSBOROUGH Co.:** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 547.

**SENATE, SALARIES, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 757.

**SESSIONAL MESSENGERS, SALARIES OF:** remarks (*Mr. Royal and others*) 1386.

**SETTLERS.** See "Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co."

**SHANLEY, FRANK, WIDOW OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1378.

**SHELBURNE HARBOR FOG WHISTLE:** Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 107.

**SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, CLAIMS FOR DRAWBACKS ON:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 76.

**Ship Channel, Montreal and Quebec, Deepening of, Provision B. No. 142 (Sir Leonard Tilley).** Res., 1336; 1°\* of B., 2°\*, in Com. and 3°\*, 1338. (46 *Vic.*, c. 38).

**SHIPPING DISASTERS, INLAND.** See "Georgian Bay."

**SHOEBURYNNESS, ARTILLERYMEN'S EXPENSES TO:** in Com. of Sup., 860.

**SHORTHAND WRITERS:** M. to Employ for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Hackett*) 129; conc., 1214.

**SHOW CASES:** in Com. on W. & M., 671.

**SIGNAL STATIONS:** in Com. of Sup., 957.

**"SIMCOE," LOSS OF THE.** See "Inland Shipping Disasters."

**"SIR JAMES DOUGLAS."** See "Government Steamers."

**SITE, PURCHASE OF, OTTAWA:** in Com. of Sup., 1179.

**SLIDE AND BOOM DUES, COLLECTION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1079.

**SLIDE DUES.** See "Timber."

**SMELT FISHERY, MIRAMICHI.** See "FISHERIES."

**SOUTH NORFOLK CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep., 3.

**SOUTH RIVER AND MALPEQUE HARBOR:** in Com. of Sup., 1246.

**SPEAKER, ELECTION OF.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 3.** [For the Address, see "Address."]

**SPEEDY TRIALS ACT AMT.** See B. 11.

**SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS, IMPORTATION OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Kirk*) 502.

**SPRUCE LOGS, EXPORT DUTY ON:** Res. (*Mr. Ives*) 207; Ques. (*Mr. Bolduc*) 1025.

**SQUATTERS.** See "Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co."

**STAFF, MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT:** in Com. of Sup., 853.

**STAMP DUTY REPEAL ACT AMT.** See B. 78.

**STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE:** M. for Joint Com. to revise Rules, &c. (*Mr. Beatty*) 233; M. for Mess. to Sen., 291.

**STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE:** Res. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 741.

**STATION ACCOMMODATION.** See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.;" also "INTERCOL. RY."

**STATIONERY FURNISHED TO MEMBERS:** on M. to conc. in Seventh Rep. of Printing Com. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1251.

**STATIONERY OFFICE:** in Com. of Sup., 751.

**STATISTICS, VITAL:** Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 56.

**STATUTES, DOMINION, CONSOLIDATION OF, EXPENDITURE IN CONNECTION WITH:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 57; Ques. (*Mr. Richey*) 78; in Com. of Sup., 1040, 1378; conc., 1387.

**STATUTES, EXPIRING, CONTINUATION OF.** See B. 133.

**STATUTES, REPEAL OF.** See B. 95.

**STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 753.

**STEAMBOAT INSPECTION:** in Com. of Sup., 1190.

**STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN P.E.I. AND MAINLAND:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Davies*) 43; Deb. (*Mr. Yeo*) 46; (*Mr. Jenkins*) 47; (*Mr. McIntyre*) 48; (*Mr. Hackett*) 49; (*Mr. Casey*) 51; M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Jenkins*) 68; Deb. (*Mr. Davies*) 68; (*Mr. Hackett*) 70; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 71; M. to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (*Mr. Brecken*) 1027.

**STEAM SERVICE BETWEEN CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 504.

**STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMANY:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Kranz*) 96.

**STEAMSHIP SERVICE.** See "Mail Subsidies," under "SUPPLY."

**STEEL:** in Com. on W. & M., 692.

**STEWART, JOHN, APPLICATION OF:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 266.

**SUBSIDIES OR GRANTS TO MAN.:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 525.

**Subsidies to Rys. Authorization B. No. 137 (Sir Charles Tupper).** Res. prop., 1252; in Com., 1283; Rep. of Com. consd., 1317; 1°\* of B., 1317; 2°\*, 1331; in Com., 1332; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1333; 3°\*, 1333. (46 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

**SUBSIDIES TO RYS.:** Res. prop. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1252, 1275; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 1257, 1269; (*Mr. Rykert*) 1259, 1268; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1261; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1262, 1270; (*Mr. Burns*) 1265; (*Mr. Wright*) 1266; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1270; (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 1271; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 1272; (*Mr. Fairbank*) 1272; (*Mr. Pickard*) 1273; (*Mr. Tassé*) 1273; (*Mr. Bryson*) 1275; Res. in Com., 1284—1293. See B. 137.

SUBSIDIES TO RYS.: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 301. See B. 137 and respective headings.

SUBSIDY, INCREASED, TO QUEBEC: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Laurier*) 779.

SUBSIDY TO CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. Co.: in Com. of Sup., 999.

SUCCESSOR TO HIGH COMMISSIONER: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 376.

SUCCESSOR TO HIS EXCELLENCY: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) withdn., 65.

SUGAR, CLAIMS FOR DRAWBACKS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 80.

SULPHURIC ACID: in Com on W. & M., 662.

SUMMERSIDE HARBOR (P.E.I.) SURVEY OF: M. for copies of Reps. (*Mr. Hackett*) 215; deb. resmd., 225.

SUMMERSIDE POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 140.

SUMMERSIDE RY. STATION: Ques. (*Mr. Yeo*) 84.

SUPERANNUATION FUND: remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 301.

**Superannuation of Civil Service Employés Act Consolidation B. No. 91**—from the Senate (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°\*, 283; Res. prop., 791; 2° of B. m., 1227; 2° and in Com., 1234; 3° m., 1363; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) neg. (Y. 47, N. 100) 1364; 3°, 1364. (46 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

SUPERANNUATION OF P.E.I. JUDGES: Ques. (*Mr. Davies*) 204.

SUPREME COURT, LAW REPS. FOR: in Com. of Sup., 835.

SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT RESPECTING QUEEN'S COUNTY (P.E.I.) ELECTION: read (*Mr. Speaker*) 84.

**Supreme Court Jurisdiction in Appeal B. No. 100** (*Mr. Landry*). 1°, 383.

SUPREME COURT: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 29.

SUPERNUMERARY CLERKS. See "Montreal Custom House."

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: 1882-83, 999; 1883-84, 1207; Further, 1883-84, 1363.

#### SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Estimates for 1883-84, 288; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1882-83, 999; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1883-84, 1207; Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Further Suppl. Estimates for 1883-84, 1363.

Res. for Com., 28; in Com., 743, 835, 907, 922, 952, 997, 1000, 1038, 1060, 1089, 1131, 1137, 1174, 1235.

#### COMMITTEE:

##### *Administration of Justice:*

Duval, Geo., Purchase of Books from, 1133.

Fisher, Judge, Widow of, 1236; explanation, 1387.

Mackenzie, Judge, Gratuity to Widow of, 1132.

Purcell vs. Woodward, Legal Expenses, 1133.

Richards, S., Holding Assizes, 1178.

Stipendiary Magistrates Expenses, 753.

*Adulteration of Food*, 1113.

#### SUPPLY—Con.

##### *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:*

Agricultural and Industrial Statistics, 844.

Archives, care of, 836.

Census, 837.

Criminal Statistics, 837.

Dominion Exhibition, 840.

Health Statistics, 841; conc., 1115.

Patent Record, 836; conc., 1128.

*Charges of Management*, 743.

##### *Civil Government:*

Agriculture, Dept. of, 748, 1132.

Auditor General's Office, 746.

Civil Service Board, 752.

Contingencies, Departmental, 750.

High Commissioner, 751; suppl., 1177.

Post Office and Finance Depts., 752; conc., 1114.

Privy Council Office, 1249.

Customs Dept., 747, 1131.

Finance Dept. and Treasury Board, 746; suppl., 1235.

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 743; suppl., 1235.

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 746; suppl., 1177.

Inland Revenue Dept., 746, 1131.

Interior, Dept. of, 744, 1174; suppl., 1237.

Justice, Dept. of, 744.

Penitentiaries Branch, 774.

Marine and Fisheries Dept., 748.

Post Office Dept., 748.

Privy Council Office, 743.

Public Works Dept., 749, 750.

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 1235.

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 1235.

Stationery Office, 751.

##### *Collection of Revenues:*

Excise, 1249; conc., 1317.

Public Works—Maintenance and Repairs:

Agent and Contingencies, B.C., 1079.

Harbors and Slides, 1078.

Slide and Boom Dues, Collection of, 1079.

Telegraph Lines, B.C., 1079.

Telegraph Lines, Manitoba and N.W.T., 1078.

Railways and Canals—Repairs, &c.:

Canals, 1077.

Intercolonial Ry., 1073.

Prince Edward Island Ry., 1073.

Salaries and Contingencies Canal Officers, 1078.

Welland Canal—Compensation to T. Munro, 1245.

Windsor Branch Ry., 1073.

Weights and Measures, 1251.

##### *Customs:*

Manitoba, 1198; conc., 1226.

Salaries and Contingencies of the several Ports, 1000.



SUPPLY—*Con.**Charges on Revenue :*

- Canals—General, 1169.
- Customs—Manitoba, 1198.
- Excise—Stamps, &c., 1198.
- Inspection of Petroleum—Extra services (Battle) 1199.
- Public Works: Maintenance and Repairs—Telegraph Lines, B.C., 1199.
- Railways—General, 1160; Compensation to Mrs. McInnis, 1222.

*Dominion Lands—Capital :*

- Surveys, 1111; suppl., 1199.

*Dominion Lands—Income :*

- Land Guides, &c., additional, 1380.
- Outside Service, 1113.

*Dominion Police, 753; conc., 1126.**Excise :*

- Inspector of Tobacco Manufactories, 1383.
- Salaries, &c., 1020; conc., 1117.

*Fisheries :*

- Bounties to Fishermen, Expenses in connection with, 1186; conc., 1223.
- Salaries and disbursements of Fishery Overseers and Wardens, 1010; conc., 1116.

*Geological Survey, 1088.**Immigration :*

- Expenses, further, in connection with, 1134.
- Salaries and Contingencies, &c., 845; conc., 1114.
- Winnipeg General Hospital, 1134; conc., 1214.

*Immigration and Quarantine :*

- Quarantine, Sydney, N.S., 1238.

*Indians :*

- Annual Grants to supplement Indian Fund—Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces, 1094, 1098.
- British Columbia—Indians generally, Surveys, &c., 1101; suppl. (additional agents) 1378.
- Manitoba and the North-West, 1102, suppl., 1191; (Industrial Schools) 1376.
- New Brunswick—Bannon, Rev. Mr., Compensation to, 1191; suppl. (Missionary, Medical Grant and Medical Officer) 1249.
- Nova Scotia—Indians generally, 1101.

*Legislation :*

- House of Commons—Salaries, 763.
- Senate—Salaries and Contingencies, 757.

*Miscellaneous :*

- Clerk of Crown in Chancery, 835.
- Debates, Publication of, 763.
- Houde, Mr. F., M.P., Sessional Indemnity, 1380.
- Library, Grant to, 765.
- Miscellaneous Books, 1133.
- Salaries and Contingencies, 835; conc., 1114.
- Laws, Printing, &c., 835.
- Newspapers, &c., Binding, 836.

SUPPLY—*Con.**Legislation—Con.*

- Printing, Miscellaneous, 835.
- Piteau, L. J., Indemnification for loss of Appointment, 1238.
- Shorthand Writers, &c., conc., 1214.
- Supreme Court, Purchase of Law Reps. for, 835.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

- Cape Race Light, Montreal Harbor Commission, and Surveys of Lakes Huron and Superior, 1191.
- Colchester Reef Lighthouse, 956.
- Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., 956; conc., 1116.
- Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1019.
- Meteorological Observations, &c., 957.
- Observatories, 957.
- Signal Stations, 957.

*Mail Subsidies :*

- Canada and Germany, 953.
- Canada and West Indies and Brazil, 952.
- Cape Canso and Port Hood, 952.
- France and Quebec, 952.
- Halifax to Murray Harbor, &c., 953.
- Lakes Huron and Superior, 952.
- Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., 952.
- Prince Edward Island to Great Britain, 953.

*Militia :*

- Ammunition, Clothing, &c., 853.
- Associations, Grants to, 857.
- "A" and "B" Batteries, 860.
- Artillery Battery and Cavalry and Infantry Schools, &c., 1239.
- Contingencies, &c., 857.
- Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, 855.
- Military Stores, Purchase of Property for (Ottawa) 1239; conc., 1316.
- Properties, care of, 858.
- Royal Military College, 858.
- Staff, Military Branch and District, 853.
- Schools of Gunnery, 860.
- Shoeburyness, Artillerymen's Expenses to, 860.

*Miscellaneous :*

- Audet, A., Translating Rep. of C.P.R. Commissioners, 1280.
- B.N.A. Act, 1867, Publication of Cases decided under, 1045; conc., 1128.
- Burgess, John, Legal Expenses, 1192.
- Canada Gazette, 1038; conc., 1120.
- C.P.R. Commission, Sundry Accounts, 1280.
- Cartier, Sir G. E., Allowance to Widow of, 1378.
- Dominion Statutes, Consolidation of, 1040, suppl., 1378; conc., 1387.
- Demers, L. J., Printing Volumes of Evidence taken before C.P.R. Commission, conc., 1279.

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dominion Police, Gratuities to retiring Members of the Force, 1192.

Factory Commission, advance to Mr. Blakely, 1197.

Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 1379.

Governor-General's Visit to B.C., 1191.

Géographical Society, Quebec, 1378.

International Fisheries Exhibition, 1044, 1191.

Keewatin, Expenses of Govt., &c., 1040.

Library, Dept. of Justice, 1044; conc., 1128.

Litigation, costs of, 1381.

Mounted Police, Compensation to Members of, 1041.

Mounted Police Barracks, 1041.

Merchants' Bank vs. Regina, Cost of Suit, 1197; suppl. (refund) 1379.

North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt., &c., 1039.

Printing, Miscellaneous, 1038.

Prince Edward Island, Refund of Duties paid by Merchants to the United States in 1871, 1381; withdn., 1383.

Phair vs. Venning, Damages and Costs, 1193.

Royal Society, Publication of Proceedings of, 1194.

Returns, Preparation of, Expenses, 1196.

Parliamentary Companion, Purchase of copies, 1197.

Robertson vs. The Queen, Damages, 1197.

Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron, 1044.

Shanly, Frank, Gratuity to Widow of, 1378.

*North-West Mounted Police :*

Barracks, Erection of, 1041.

Compensation for Injuries, 1041.

Pay of Force, &c., 1110; suppl., 1191.

*Ocean and River Service :*

Life-boats, &c., and Rewards for Saving Life, 953; suppl., 1249.

Masters and Mates, Examination of, 953.

Steamers *Napoleon III*, *Druid*, *Newfield*, *Sir James Douglas*, *Northern Light*, *La Canadienne*, Maintenance, &c., 953.

Triennial List of Shipping, Printing of, 956.

*Penitentiaries :*

British Columbia, 756.

Dillon, J. (Kingston) Gratuity, 1237.

Dorchester, 755.

Kingston, 753; conc., 1127.

Manitoba, 757.

Prince Edward Island, Claim of, 1178.

St. Vincent de Paul, 754.

*Pensions :*

Duckett, Mrs. Edward, 1134.

Pensioners, Compensation to, 853.

Veterans of War of 1812, 852.

*Post Office :*

Mail Service, Salaries, and Miscellaneous, 1079; conc., 1123; suppl., 1197.

SUPPLY—*Con.**Public Works—Capital :*

Public Buildings, Ottawa, 907; conc., 1116; Purchase of Site, 1179; Compensation to C.Vaux, 1181.

Telegraph Lines, Manitoba and N.W.T. (Oliver, Davidson & Co.'s Contract) 1160.

*Public Works—Income :**Public Buildings :*

British Columbia, 913; suppl., 1244.

General, 913.

Manitoba, 912; suppl., 1182, 1242.

New Brunswick, 1182; suppl., 1241.

North-West Territories 913; suppl., 1243.

Nova Scotia, 909; suppl., 1181, 1241.

Ontario, 911; suppl., 1182, 1242.

Prince Arthur's Landing, 1182.

Prince Edward Island, 910; suppl., 1241.

Quebec, 910; suppl., 1182, 1242.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 913; suppl., 1182.

*Harbors and Rivers :*

British Columbia, 927; suppl., 1183.

Dredging, 929.

General, 929

Manitoba, 927.

Maritime Provinces generally, 925.

Miscellaneous, 930; suppl. (Fort Dufferin, St. John, N.B.) 1184, 1245; (Monument to Joseph Brant) 1249.

New Brunswick, 924; suppl., 1246, 1381.

Nova Scotia, 922; suppl., 1245.

Ontario, 926; suppl., 1183, 1246, 1381.

Prince Arthur's Landing, 1247.

Prince Edward Island (Cascumpee) 924; suppl. (South River and Malpeque) 1246.

Quebec, 925; suppl., 1183, 1246.

Roads and Bridges, 930.

Telegraphs, 930; suppl. (British Columbia) 1249.

*Railways and Canal—Capital :**Canadian Pacific Railway :*

British Columbia, 998.

Canada Central Railway Subsidy, 997.

Contract 15 (Whitehead) 1141; conc., 1259.

Dick, Capt., Award of Arbitrator, 1139; conc., 1214.

Georgian Bay Branch, 1137.

Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, 998.

Red River, West of, 1137.

Rolling Stock purchased from Parcett & Co., 1149.

Station Accommodation, 999.

Subsidy, C.P.R. Co., 999.

*General :*

Bridge over Red River at Emerson, 1158.

Pembroke, Town of, Claim, 1065.

Railway Statistics, 1065.

Schreiber, Allowance to, 1158.

Surveys and Inspection, 1064.

SUPPLY—*Con.**Railways and Canals: Capital—Con.*

## Intercolonial Railway :

- Commission, Staff and Expenses, 1244.  
 Construction Accounts (old) Commission, &c., 1150.  
 Dalhousie Branch, 1244.  
 Dartmouth Branch, 1380.  
 Halifax Extension, 1061, 1150.  
 Increased Accommodation at St. John, 1060, 1150.  
 Ketchum, Refund on account of Over charge, 1154 ;  
 conc., 1219.  
 Land and other claims, 1156.  
 Legal Expenses *in re* Western Counties Ry. Co.  
 and Attorney General *vs.* Windsor and An-  
 napolis Ry. Co., 1157.  
 Mann, Claim of, 1157.  
 Rivière du Loup Town Branch, 1244.  
 Rolling Stock, 1061.  
 St. Charles Branch and Ferry, 1063 ; conc., 1121 ;  
 Shunting and Station Yard, Point Levis,  
 suppl., 1244.

Walsh, of Halifax, Damages to Property, 1158.

## Prince Edward Island Railway :

Cape Traverse Railway, 1064.

## Canals :

- Carillon—Canal, Dam and Slide, 1071.  
 Cornwall, 1070 ; Enlargement, 1159.  
 Culbute, 1159 ; suppl., 1245.  
 Grenville, 1072 ; Heney, Stewart, & Co. Award,  
 1158, conc., 1221.  
 Lachine, 1068.  
 Murray, 1071.  
 St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1070.  
 St. Peter's, 1245.  
 Ste. Anne, 1071.  
 Tay—Construction of Works, 1072.  
 Trent River Navigation—Locks, &c., 1071.  
 Welland, 1072 ; Compensation to Messrs. Dunn  
 and Page, 1160.  
 Williamsburg—Lock at Rapide Plat, 1070 ; Com-  
 pensation to Owners of Land, 1159 ; suppl.,  
 1245 ; conc., 1317.  
 Miscellaneous, 1245.

*Railways and Canals—Income :*

## Canals :

- Beauharnois—Swing Bridge at Valleyfield, 1072.  
 Burlington—Renewal of Piers, 1072.  
 Chambly—Raising Banks, &c., 1073.  
 Cornwall—Drain between Town and Canal, 1072.  
 Rideau—Expenses for Repairs, 1073.  
 Trent Valley—Survey of Navigation, 1072 ; conc.,  
 1123.  
 Welland—Cleaning out Back Ditches, 1072 ; Pur-  
 chase of Steam Pump, 1160.

SUPPLY—*Con.**Scientific Institutions :*

Meteorological Service and Magnetic Observatory,  
 Toronto, 1190.

*Steamboat Inspection :*

Expenses in connection with, 1190.

*Weights and Measures and Gas :*

Salaries, &c., 1045 ; conc., 1120.

*Unprovided Items*, 1199 ; conc., 1280.

## CONCURRENCE :

Audet, A., Translating Rep. of C.P.R. Commission, 1280.  
 British North America Act, Cases decided under, 1128.  
 Bounties to Fishermen, Expenses in connection with,  
 1223.

*Canada Gazette*, 1120.

C.P.R. Commission, Sundry Accounts, 1280.

Customs, Manitoba, 1226.

Demers, L. J., Printing Volumes of Evidence taken be-  
 fore C.P.R. Commission, 1279.

Dick, Capt., Award of Arbitrators to, 1214.

Dominion Police, 1126.

Dominion Statutes, Consolidation of, 1387.

Excise, Salaries, &c., 1117, 1317.

Fisheries, Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens, 1116,  
 1223.

Health Statistics, 1115.

Heney, Stewart, & Co., Award of Arbitrators, 1221.

House of Commons, Shorthand Writers, &c., 1214.

Immigration, 1114 ; Winnipeg General Hospital, 1214.

Justice, Dept. of, Library, 1128.

Ketchum, H. G. C., Refund to, 1219.

Kingston Penitentiary, 1127.

Libraries, Salaries, &c., 1114.

Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 1116.

McInnis, Mrs. A. A., Compensation to, 1222.

Military Stores, Purchase of Property for (Ottawa)  
 1316.

Patent Record, 1128.

Post Office and Finance Depts., Contingencies, 1114.

Post Office, Mail Service, Salaries, &c., 1123.

Public Buildings, Ottawa, 1116.

St. Charles Branch and Ferry, 1121.

Trent Valley Navigation Survey, 1123.

Weights and Measures and Gas, Salaries, &c., 1120.

Whitehead, Mr., Contract 15, 1219.

Williamsburg Canal, 1317.

Winnipeg General Hospital, 1214.

Unprovided Items, 1280.

**Supply B. 128.** (*Sir Leonrad Tilley*). 1°\* and 2° m,  
 1388 ; 2°\* and 3°\*, 1391. (46 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

SURVEY, HYDROGRAPHIC, OF CANADIAN WATERS : M. for  
 Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 82.

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS, RAILWAYS : in Com. of Sup., 1064.

SURVEYS OF LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR : in Com. of Sup.,  
 1044, 1191.

- SUSPENSION OF RULE 78:** objected to (*Mr. Blake*) 252.
- SYDENHAM RIVER, NAVIGATION OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Hawkins*) 1025.
- TARIFF ALTERATIONS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 547; Deb. (*Mr. Bowell*) 547; (*Mr. Blake*) 548; (*Mr. Mitchell*) 549, 551; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 549; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 549; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 550; (*Mr. Burns*) 551; (*Mr. Farrow*) 552; (*Mr. Charlton*) 552; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 553; (*Mr. Casey*) 555; neg. (Y. 65, N. 115) 555.
- TARIFF RESOLUTIONS, SPECIFIC AND AD VAL. DUTIES:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 556.
- TOBACCO, CANADIAN:** Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 574; Deb. (*Mr. Laurier*) 576; (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 576; (*Mr. Landry*) 577; (*Mr. Lesage*) 578; (*Mr. Béchard*) 578; (*Mr. Gigault*) 579; (*Mr. Dugas*) 579; (*Mr. Labrosse*) 580; (*Mr. Dupont*) 580; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 580; (*Mr. Amyot*) 581; (*Mr. De St. Georges*) 582. See B. 115.
- TARIFF, THE:** on M. for Com on W. & M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 596; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 600; (*Mr. Davies*) 602; (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 612; (*Mr. McCallum*) 613; (*Mr. Foster*) 614; (*Mr. Brecken*) 615; (*Mr. Benson*) 618; (*Mr. Hesson*) 619; (*Mr. Hackett*) 620; (*Mr. McMullen*) 624; (*Mr. Farrow*) 623; (*Mr. Watson*) 627. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- TAY CANAL.** See "CANALS."
- TERREBONNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep., 3.
- TELEGRAMS, EXPENDITURE ON, IN PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.:** M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Blake*) 84.
- Telegraph (Marine) Pacific Coast of Can. and Asia Co.'s Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 116** (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1°\*, 791; 2°\*, 860; in Com. and 3°\*, 935. (46 Vic., c. 45.)
- TELEGRAPHS:**
- Bermuda, Communication with: Ques. (*Mr. Daly*) 39; explanation (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 81.
  - British Columbia: in Com. of Sup., 1079, 1199, 1249.
  - Chatham to Escuminac Lighthouse: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
  - General: in Com. of Sup., 936.
  - Gulf System, Extension of, to N.S., N.B., and C.B.: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.
  - Manitoba and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1078, 1160.
  - Nova Scotia and Sable Island: Ques. (*Mr. Paint*) 68.
- TEMPERANCE.** See "Intoxicating Liquors" B. 132.
- "THE CROSSING." See "INTERCOL. RY."
- Three Rivers, Harbor Master of, B. No. 121** (*Mr. Bowell*). 1°\*, 999; 2°, in Com. and 3°\*, 1038. (46 Vic., c. 41.)
- THROWING MISSILES:** Ques. of Order (*Mr. Thompson*) 1086.
- TIMBER AND MINING PERMITS IN DISPUTED TERRITORY:** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Jackson*) 232.
- TIMBER, LICENSES TO CUT, IN QNT.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McNeill*) 292.
- TIMBER LICENSES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 61; adjd. deb. resmd., 229.
- TIMBER PERMITS IN DISPUTED TERRITORY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCraney*) 777.
- Timber Tolls on Government Slides, &c., Collection of, provision B. No. 126** (*Mr. Costigan*). Res. prop., 709; in Com. and 1°\* of B., 1037; 2° and in Com., 1207; 3°\*, 1227. (46 Vic., c. 16.)
- Titles to Land, Transfer of, in Canada B. No. 97** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 572.
- TOBACCO, CANADIAN, LICENSED MANUFACTURERS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gigault*) 86.
- TOBACCO, CANADIAN, REGULATIONS:** Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 41.
- TOBACCO MANUFACTORIES, INSPECTOR OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1383.
- TOBACCO SEIZURE ON BRIG "ADELINE.":** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 382.
- TOBACCO SEIZURES IN MONTMAGNY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 383.
- TOLLS AND DUES ON TIMBER AND LUMBER:** prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 709.
- Toronto Harbor and Esplanade B. No. 106** (*Mr. Small*). 1°, 574; 2°, 709.
- TORONTO, PORT OF, REFUND OF DUTIES AT:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McMullen*) 660.
- TOWN OF PEMBROKE BONUS TO CAN. CENTRAL RY.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 229.
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION TABLES:** presented (*Mr. Bowell*) 36.
- TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND BRAZIL, &c.:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fortin*) 767.
- TRADE, INTER-PROVINCIAL:** M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Paint*) 113; Com. appointed, 135; M. to send for persons, &c., 139.
- TRANSFER OF PORTAGE ISLAND (N.B.):** M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 272.
- TRANSLATING REP. OF C. P. R. COMMISSION:** in Com. of Sup., 1280.
- TRANSLATION OF REP. OF SEL. COM. ON NATIONAL POLICY:** Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 89.
- TRANSLATION OF VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS:** remarks (*Mr. Landry*) 828.
- TREATIES.** See "Commercial Treaties;" also "Washington Treaty."
- TRENTON AND PICTON MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (*Mr. Platt*) 502.
- TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION.** See "CANALS."
- Trial of Cases before County Court Judges Criminal Court Act Amt. B. No. 11** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 38; 2°, 103; ref. to Sp. Com., 118.
- TRIENNIAL LIST OF SHIPPING:** in Com of Sup., 956.
- TROOPS, WITHDRAWAL OF, FROM HALIFAX:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.

- TRUBO AND PICTOU BRANCH RY.: M. for copies of Cor., (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 129.
- TWO CREEKS HARBOR (B.C.): Ques. (*Mr. Smyth*) 56.
- UNDELIVERED LETTERS: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 889.
- Union Assurance Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. No. 47** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°\*, 106; 2°\*, 138.
- Union Bank of P.E.I. and Bank of N.S. Amalgamation B. No. 10** (*Mr. Tupper*). 1°\*, 38; 2°\*, 77; in Com. and 3°\*, 374. (46 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- UNITED STATES:
- Canadian Wheat, Transport of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
- Hemlock Bark, Import Duty on: Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 78.
- National Distillers' Association and Can. Customs: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Kirk*) 507.
- Reciprocity with: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 267.
- Washington Treaty, Congressional Proceedings: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
- University of Saskatchewan Incorp. B. No. 18** (*Mr. Williams*). 1°\*, 52; 2°\*, 77; in Com., 244; consid. and recom., 261; 3°\*, 261. (46 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE, 71, 519, 520, 948, 950, 1367. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1199; conc., 1280.
- UPPER FRASER (B.C.) NAVIGATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Reid*) 315.
- VACANCIES IN "A" AND "B" BATTERIES: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 204.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF: Ques. (*Mr. Gordon*) 376.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. AND DRY DOCK: Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 657; explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1392.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND, SQUATTERS ON RY. RESERVE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gordon*) 382.
- VANDELEUR AND FLESHERTON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Landerkin*) 547.
- "VANDERBILT," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- VAUX, C., COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 1181.
- VERCHÈRES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep., 3.
- VETERANS OF 1812: M. for Stmt. of number surviving, &c. (*Mr. Massue*) 40; M. for Stmt. of Names and Residences (*Mr. Bourassa*) 55; Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 56; Increase of Pensions: Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 657; in Com. of Sup., 852.
- VICE-ADMIRALTY COURTS, EMOLUMENTS OF JUDGES AND REGISTRARS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Daly*) 902.
- VICTUALLERS, LICENSED, AND LIQUOR LEGISLATION: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 80.
- VITAL STATISTICS: Ques. (*Mr. Lesage*) 56.
- VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 266.
- VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, TRANSLATION OF: remarks (*Mr. Landry*) 828.
- VOTES, RECORDING OF, LOSS OF TIME: remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 827.
- WALPOLE ISLAND, SALE OF OAK ON: M. for copy of Cor. (*Mr. Lister*) 1031.
- WALSH, MR., DAMAGES TO PROPERTY. in Com. of Sup., 1158.
- WASHINGTON TREATY: Ques. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 81.
- WATER LOTS IN HARBORS OF LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Dawson*) 503.
- "WAUBUNO," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- WAYS AND MEANS:
- Res. for Com. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 28; The Budget Speech, 332; reply (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 345; Deb. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 357; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 383; (*Mr. Rykert*) 392; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 399; (*Mr. Amyot*) 405; (*Mr. Armstrong*) 410; (*Mr. Charlton*) 431, personal explanation, 455; (*Mr. Foster*) 446; (*Mr. King*) 456; (*Mr. Jamieson*) 459; (*Mr. Wigle*) 460; (*Mr. McMillan, Huron*) 463; (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) 466; (*Mr. Sproule*) 463; (*Mr. Taylor*) 475; (*Mr. Burns*) 476; (*Mr. Sutherland, Selkirk*) 480; (*Mr. Hawkins*) 484; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 487; (*Mr. Vail*) 494; (*Mr. McLelan*) 496; (*Mr. Hesson*) 497. Res. 1 in Com., 629; Res. 2 in Com., 660-692; on conc. (*Mr. Blake*) 732; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 732, 735; (*Mr. Fisher*) 736; (*Mr. Hall*) 738; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 738; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 739; (*Mr. Sproule*) 740; Res. conc. in, 741; Res. rep. from Com., 1388. See "SUPPLY."
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: Rep. presented (*Mr. Costigan*) 36; in Com. of Sup., 1045, 1251; conc., 1120.
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT: prop. Res. (*Mr. Irvine*) 289.
- WELLAND CANAL. See "CANALS."
- WELLS, MR., BREWER OF GODERICH, RETURN RESPECTING: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 889.
- WESTERN COUNTIES RY. vs. WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1157.
- WESTHAVER'S POINT, LIGHTHOUSE AT: M. for copies of Cor. (*Mr. Keefer*) 780.
- Wesleyan Methodist Church Missionary Soc.'s Incorp. Act. Amt. B. No. 43** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°\*, 89; 2°\*, 138; in Com. and 3°\*, 471. (46 *Vic.* c. 95.)
- WESTPORT PIER (N.S.) VOTE FOR: Ques. (*Mr. Vail*) 376.
- WHARFAGE DUES, DIGBY PIER: M. for Stmt. (*Mr. Vail*) 525.
- WHARF AT STE. ANNE, CHICOUTIMI: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gagné*) 138.
- WHEAT IN BOND, MILLING: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 56.
- WHITEHEAD, JOSEPH, AND CONTRACT 15 C.P.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1141; conc., 1259.

- WICKSTEED, MR. G. W.: Commissioner to Administer Oaths, 1.
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL. See "CANALS."
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 1073.
- Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s B. No. 88 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 261; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 426; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 749. (46 *Vic., c.* 69.)
- WINNIPEG EXHIBITION, GRANT OF LAND FOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Scott*) 1034.
- WINNIPEG GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 1134; conc., 1214.
- "WINNIPEG," LOSS OF THE. See "Inland Shipping Disasters."
- WINNIPEG POST OFFICE SITE.: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 889.
- WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM HALIFAX: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 502.
- WITNESSES, PERSONS CHARGED WITH MISDEMEANOR COMPROMENT AB. See B. 6.
- Wood Mountain. Qu'Appelle and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s, Incorp. B. No. 48 (*Mr. Leaty*). 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 106; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 138; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 471; Sen. Amts. disagreed to, 767. (46 *Vic., c.* 74.)
- YAMASKA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (*Mr. Dupont*) 41.